
Corrie

Posted by Aidan - 21-04-2008 13:36

When he's out of prison, will David Platt stay around the Street, given that everyone hates him ?
Who else is sick of the Michelle/Ryan/Alex scenario ? It's like one of these ridiculous rambling US films that hasn't
beginning, middle or end at this stage.
Looking forward to your comments.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Gangster Octopus - 21-04-2008 13:38

Lost interest when they went from two episodes a week to three. And it stopped being funny.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by The_Liquidator - 21-04-2008 15:57

Who gives a flying fuck?

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by WornOldMotorbike - 21-04-2008 16:29

You're an angry man, Liq.

David Platt goes to prison? Aw fuck. I knew I shouldn't have opened this. We're 8 months behind over here.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by EIM - 21-04-2008 19:03

Who gives a flying fuck?

Me, you bone-headed cockney cunt.

I very nearly started a Corrie thread last week, so good has it been recently. The Roy Cropper batgate storyline has been
hilarious, with marvellous cameos from Beckeh in the caff. The chemistry between those two is superb, proper laugh out
loud funny at times.

As for David, he'll stay around, I reckon. He's been the best character in it for a year or so. I'm not sure how good he'll be
if he matures whilst in the clink, half of the fun was in his unrelenting evil. I have high hopes for his shed-dwelling mate,
Darryl, however.

The vast difference in quality between Corrie and Eastenders is never more obvious than on the Monday night soap
sandwich. That half hour between the two Corrie episodes seems to drag like a mother-fucker. And we all know what
they drag like.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Jon - 21-04-2008 20:48

Do what I do, EIM, and turn over for University Challenge in that half hour.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Harry Carpenter - 21-04-2008 22:31

GO has never been more right than he is on this thread.

If 'Eastenders' is on one of it's good plot runs (like the Max & Tanya one recently) it's watchable but 'Coronation Street' is a dessicated husk of the show it used to be.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by hobbles - 22-04-2008 00:39

The best thing about selling my soul to Murdoch for the price of a Sky+ box, is that I never EVER have to watch shit like Coronation Street or Eastenders.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 22-04-2008 10:10

You never did when you only had terrestrial

"Neighbours" is hotting up

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Nil a fhios agam - 22-04-2008 11:00

Everybody on this thread bar The Liquidator should be thoroughly ashamed of themselves.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Harry Carpenter - 22-04-2008 11:03

I suspect that Liquidator has 'Eastenders' sympathies though.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by hobbles - 22-04-2008 11:26

Everybody on this thread bar The Liquidator should be thoroughly ashamed of themselves.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 22-04-2008 11:28

I hate this cultural snobbery that makes out that it is wrong to indulge in some mindless TV watching occasionally. It is a form of meditation

Also "Neighbour" has hot babes in swim suits

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by The_Liquidator - 22-04-2008 12:42

I suspect that Liquidator has 'Eastenders' sympathies though.

You wash your mouth out right this instant young man.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Nil a fhios agam - 22-04-2008 12:45

You sold your soul to Murdoch, are you not ashamed?

Perhaps, I should do better than skimread if I am going to make sweeping generalisations.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by hobbes - 22-04-2008 12:54

hate this cultural snobbery that makes out that it is wrong to indulge in some mindless TV watching occasionally. There's nothing wrong with indulging in mindless television watching. I watch Most Haunted, for fucks sake. There are limits though. And soap operas, especially Corrie and S'enders turn your tv into the shit-pump it so obviously longs to be, spurting brain destroying effluent all over your living room. I'd seriously rather watch the testcard than hear another faux cockernee sparra trying to polish a steaming turd on their way to a guest shot on "I'm a celebrity dancing queen on ice mary poppins cunt."

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Nil a fhios agam - 22-04-2008 13:00

Watching mindless television occasionally doesn't tally with watching Corrie, Eastenders, Emmerdale, Home & Away or Neighbours. You're making a big commitment of your time if you want to watch any one of those regularly.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Harry Carpenter - 22-04-2008 13:23

The_Liquidator wrote:
I suspect that Liquidator has 'Eastenders' sympathies though.

You wash your mouth out right this instant young man.

Apologies, I recall you concurring with my appreciation of Tanya and assumed you watched it at least occasionally.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Mighty Mudhsuden - 22-04-2008 13:35

I used to find Coronation Street a bit saccharine until my eyes were opened to it by reading Douglas Hofstadter's articles in Metamagical Themas. I realised that I'd been watching only at the very surface.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by King Mob - 22-04-2008 13:47

There's nothing at all wrong with watching an occasional bit of mindless TV. The thing about the prime time terrestrial soaps is that although they have pretensions to be serious drama (and are marketed as such), the standards of production, scripting and performance are uniformly so low as to be laughable. Watching Eastenders or Coronation Street is like watching an acting masterclass, with a succession of earnest but ungifted hopefuls parading their meagre and patently overstretched talents.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by The_Liquidator - 22-04-2008 14:09

Apologies, I recall you concurring with my appreciation of Tanya and assumed you watched it at least occasionally.

Oh yes. Well, that was an aberration. Honest.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by EIM - 22-04-2008 16:51

What the fuck is Hobbes talking about, the deranged buffoon?

He'll be willingly watching Liverpool v Chelsea on his telly-welly tonight. There's more entertainment in the opening sequence of Correh than there is in two legs of that 'programme that turns your tv in to the shit-pump blah blah blah'.

(Seriously, there is. That bit where they CGId a tram going along the end of the street, brilliant)

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by hobbess - 22-04-2008 17:17

No one would watch Liverpool vs Chelsea willingly, you spindly northern oaf. It's a matter of duty.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Wyatt Earp - 22-04-2008 17:42

I hate this cultural snobbery ...Oh for fuck's sake.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by hobbess - 22-04-2008 20:07

Word.

I hate this accusation of cultural snobbery when you call a turd a turd.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 22-04-2008 21:49

Oh, fuck off. I hate umbrage being taken when you call a cultural snob a cultural snob.

The thing about the prime time terrestrial soaps is that although they have pretentions to be serious drama (and are marketed as such),

Erm, did I mention that "Neighbours" was my soap of choice? Not prime time, I will admit

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 23-04-2008 07:13

The thing is, hobbes, you weren't calling a "a turd a turd" you were being a condescending twat about other people's watching habits.

Anyway, even if you were calling "a turd a turd"...No? Really? You don't say. You know, we are all intelligent people, we know that a lot of it is crap.

As I say, in some ways, it is a form of meditation, a time when we can switch, rest the mind and drift off somewhere else for a bit. A bit of light relief.

It is the equivalent of reading Heat at the supermarket queue, watching an England freindly or talking about confectionary on the internet. There is no real value to it as such, it is "just" entertainment.

You will notice that a lot of people have talked about soaps not being as good after they have gone to three episodes a week. Part of this is that the writing is stretched but, I think, that part of it is that it is more time than they need on meditative escapist TV.

I stopped watching Eastenders and Brookside after they went to 5 days a week as I had too much of a life to spend on them.

Having said this about mindless entertainment, there is a lot about soaps that is culturally important.

In a world that is increasingly fragmented and losing its social hubs (the pub, the water cooler, the church, the post office, the school gates etc) soaps provide people with a virtual community in a lot of places. Instead of gossiping about Mabel down the road, they are gossiping about Roy and Beckah or whoever.

Now it is sad that we are losing the real social hubs and replacing them with imaginary ones but that is the way the world is going

In other words, they are discussing issues to do with inter-personal relationships, which let's face it is what most soaps are about unless they are jumping the shark and having a plane crash or a lesbian kiss.

This is another point about soaps is that they provide useful springboards for discussion of important matters in an everyday manner for a lot of people.

People learnt a lot more about AIDS for instance through Mark Fowler than they did from any ham-fisted government programme.

I have an eight year old son on a household where we listen to Radio 4 a lot and he sees a lot of news but Hollyoaks (which I don't even like) has provided a catalyst for us to talk about homosexuality in great deal while Neighbours has meant that we have talked about adoption.

I am pretty sure that soaps have provided the same catalyts over the years between myself and other adults. Certainly,

around the time we were trying for a child, I remember a lot of storylines that were relevant to us.

It is not just the smaller personal issues that soaps bring to a wider audience (almost exclusively in some cases) but they can also show the bigger issues through the prism of the everyday e.g. Mark Fowler's AIDS and many other similar issues.

When done well, in a lot of ways, they are exactly like Dickens' newspaper serialisations in the they are bringing the bigger issues into the everyday.

Before you scoff about the Dickens' comparison, don't forget that Jimmy McGovern and Ken Loach, very much the Dickens of our day, started as soap writers as have many others. Equally a great many of our best actors have appeared in soaps at some point...and Kylie and Holly Vallance.

At the end of the day, the cultural importance of soaps can still be ignored as the importance of them as "meaningless TV" as meditation is still relevant within a wide spectrum of entertainment.

There is a great tradition on OTF, which I have rightfully fallen foul of in the past, of people being called for wading into a thread and holding forth about something they know nothing about.

You, The Liquidator and, to an extent, Nil have come on here and stunk out the thread with absolutely no basis and no real argument to back it up.

Indeed, I believe it is called "doing a hobbes" and with good reason

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by hobbes - 23-04-2008 09:26

The thing is, hobbes, you weren't calling a "a turd a turd" you were being a condescending twat about other people's watching habits.

Was I bollocks. this is a debating board. If you want back-patting and felatory agreement, fuck off to the "I Love Soaps" forum.

And you want condesending? How about calling someone a cultural snob simply because they disagree with you over something shit. If we'd been arguing about Fellini and I disagreed with you, you wouldn't make the same accusation would you? Cultural snobbery is when you don't like something because it's low brow. Not because you think it's patently shit. And accusing people of such is disingenuous, sneaky and twattish.

soaps provide people with a virtual community in a lot of places. Instead of gossiping about Mabel down the road, they are gossiping about Roy and Beckah or whoever.

That's as may be, but it doesn't make it any less crap. People talk about Big Brother all the time. I'd rather gouge my eyes out. Not because it's low brow, but because it's stomach churningly awful.

Now it is sad that we are losing the real social hubs and replacing them with imaginary ones but that is the way the world is going

Great, society's breaking down. It's a good thing we've got the Mitchell brothers to show us the way.

I am pretty sure that soaps have provided the same catalysts over the years between myself and other adults. This could be said of hundreds of things.

When done well, in a lot of ways, they are exactly like Dickens' newspaper serialisations in the they are bringing the bigger issues into the everyday.

Exactly like that, yes.

Before you scoff about the Dickens' comparison too late don't forget that Jimmy McGovern and Ken Loach, very much the Dickens of our day, started as soap writers as have many others. Equally a great many of our best actors have appeared in soaps at some point...and Kylie and Holly Vallance.

Of course they have. Just like TV presenters often start as runners or journos start working on the local free-ads. It's a way to get your face known in the business. It's a gateway onto other things. The people you mentioned all went on to bigger and (crucially) better things.

At the end of the day, the cultural importance of soaps can still be ignored as the importance of them as "meaningless TV" as meditation is still relevant within a wide spectrum of entertainment

You can talk up the cultural significance of pretty much anything that exists as a medium. maybe some people meditate

or switch off or whatever, watching the testcard. Or a blank screen. Or static. Or here's an idea, something not involving the telly at all.

At the end of the day, I don't completely disagree with some of what you've said. But in a spectacular example of wrong end of stick grabbing, your arguments aren't against what I said. I didn't say that soaps fulfill no role. I didn't say they have no cultural impact. I didn't even say that people who watch them are idiots as you seem to want to make out I do, to give yourself some moral highground that doesn't really exist. I said they are shit. Which they are. Patently.

Indeed, I believe it is called "doing a hobbes" and with good reason
And a cheap shot to end on. Well done. Anything else or would you rather just get to back to whining over us horrible cultural snobs?

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 23-04-2008 09:38

Your whole argument revolves around this

And you want condesending? How about calling someone a cultural snob simply because they disagree with you over something shit.

Aiden came on here enthusing about Coronation Street and Liq,Nil and especially you came on and attacked them from a position of seeming ignorance.

Certainly you wouldn't write some of the their remerks if you has actually watched a fair amount of soaps. You weren't saying Coronation Street was shit or soaps nowadays were shit, you making a blanket remark that all soaps are shit

If Aiden enthusing about, say, the Wolves-Cardiff game last night, the lastest Duffy single or the Chicken Dhansak and you had come on saying "Football/Pop Music/Indian Food is a shit pump" then he would be attackingrich and varied topic with a blanket comment arrived at through ignorance and would be attacked for it and even you eould expect to be.

Equally, It is similar to people ponificating about how "Elvis was good until he went to Vegas and then he was shit and fat"

It is criticising something just because it is popular and populist and that, to me, is cultural snobbery.

There are a lot of shit parts of soap but that doesn't mean that you can call all soaps shit in the same way as a 0-0 draw at Mansfield doesn't make all football crap, a dodgy Checken Tikka doesn't make all Indian food crap and "Elvis In Concert" doesn't make the whole of Elvis' Vegas career crap.

You haven't come up with any argument why soaps are shit and you haven't evne come up with anything sensible as to what I have said as to the cultural importance about soaps (although as I said it is not the main thrust of my argument. Like good pop music, sometimes its unimportance is it importance)

Your whole argument appears to be "soaps are shit" because you say so.

If you think it wrong to call you a cultural snob then don't make statements that have cultural snobbery written all over them.

Equally, if you don't want "doing a hobbes" to become common parlance, stop making arguments which have at their basis as "I am right because I think so even though Ia m totally ignorant of the subject"

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 23-04-2008 09:42

Of course they have. Just like TV presenters often start as runners or journos start working on the local free-ads. It's a way to get your face known in the business. It's a gateway onto other things. The people you mentioned all went on to bigger and (crucially) better things.

Absolutely wrong. McGovern has returned to soaps with "The Street" in order to do almost the ultimate soap. Crucially, he was addressing very similar issues as he was, to great effect and with good actors in "Brookside" when he was there

For fuck's sake, give this up man, you have absolutely no idea what you are talking about

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 23-04-2008 09:47

Oliver Twist (1837-39), Nicholas Nickleby (1838-39), The Old Curiosity Shop and, finally, Barnaby Rudge: A Tale of the Riots of 'Eighty as part of the Master Humphrey's Clock

Also, if you meant Dickens went onto better things, Olver Twist, Nicholas Nickleby and The Pickwick Papers were all serialisations before they were books.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Wyatt Earp - 23-04-2008 09:53

See, what you've not done, in all your enthusiastic advocacy of the soaps, BotD, is offer the slightest scintilla of an argument for why the people who disagree with you about this can only be doing so for reasons of snobbery. Not a hint of a sniff of an iota.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Gangster Octopus - 23-04-2008 09:55

Bored Of The Dance wrote:
a 0-0 draw at MansfieldThat's all we're asking for on Saturday...

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 23-04-2008 10:04

For fuck's sake, Wyatt, look for it, it is there throughout.

hobbes has condescendingly trashed a whole diverse genre with absolutely no reason other than he thinks it "shit"

Equally, he has come up with no reason why he should scoff the soaps/Dickens comparison other than, seemingly, he thinks it not so

With such little to work on, the only obvious rationale to me that he is saying this is that he hates it because it is popular and populist.

There is good writing, direction and acting all over soaps and yet he dismisses all of it out of hand.

The only other reason he can have is monumental ignorance of the subject but, even then, why would he dismiss it so.

I can't think of any other reason for his blanket judgement on soaps other than cultural snobbery.

It is certainly what I would call cultural snobbery. Have you got a better definition.

I mean I don't like a lot of reality shows but I would never say they are "all shit". I might say that they are cheap TV. Equally, I don't like a lot of branded sportswear but I wouldn't say it is "all shit"

Really, WE, your shrewd input into this seems to me that you think that I have no basis for my argument when I have given you considered explanation.

hobbes whole polemic is "it's shit because I said so" and that is allowed to stand? Come on

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by The_Liquidator - 23-04-2008 10:11

Aiden came on here enthusing about Coronation Street and Liq,Nil and especially you came on and attacked them from a position of seeming ignorance.

Fuck off. I said 'who gives a flying fuck?' because I think Corrie is shit. I have seen it you know, and it is shit.

Your long rambling post up there is one of the worst things I've ever read on of. 'Cultural snobbery' my arse.

edit

Incidentally I've seen early episodes of Corrie back when it was still a serious dramatic serial. It was well acted, tightly scripted and culturally relevant, much like the Dickens serials you reference. What it has become in the intervening four decades has nothing whatsoever in common with that at all.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Nil a fhios agam - 23-04-2008 10:12

I'm not talking from a position of ignorance. My mother watches Emmerdale, Corrie, Home & Away and Eastenders religiously. She also watched Brookside when it was on. I've seen more episodes of soaps than I've had hot dinners. I'm not being snobbish when I say it's shit and I stand by my point that you have to invest too much time in them for the benefit of the zoning out that you initially talked about.

You made a valid point about how it can act as a catalyst to talk about issues with children. However, there are many ways this can be done without the need to watch a television show every evening.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 23-04-2008 10:14

Watching Eastenders or Coronation Street is like watching an acting masterclass, with a succession of earnest but ungifted hopefuls parading their meagre and patently overstretched talents.

Again, soaps ebb & flow but, even though I am a fan of neither, considering the sheer quantity of output of both of these shows, there is some consistently good acting and writing on them.

I like Ken Loach but a good Eastenders or Coronation Street episode pisses all over "It's a Free World" or Adrian Brody's acting in "Bread & Roses"

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Wyatt Earp - 23-04-2008 10:24

I can't think of any other reason for his blanket judgement on soaps other than cultural snobbery. Well, you know, clearly. But your personal inability to entertain other explanations isn't an argument. Is it?

hobbes whole polemic is "it's shit because I said so" and that is allowed to stand? Well, it might be more interesting if he enlarged on it, but in the end it is going to come down to a personal judgement, yeah. Unlike accusations of snobbery,

which ought to depend in some way on evidence. Norms vs facts and all that.

My own position on this, if it's relevant, is that some of the soaps have, on occasion, been very good indeed (the early kitchen-sink Corries spring to mind, as do Den and Ange at their most magnificently Who's-Afraid-Of-Virginia-Woolfish), but that it's been years since this has struck me as true and that I now find them all excruciatingly badly done. I think the necessity of churning out episode after episode militates in favour of mediocrity. And the argument that it makes folk discuss Issues Of The Day, while it may or may not be sound, doesn't let them off the hook artistically.

Now, if you think this is coming from a "High art good, low art bad" place, you have to explain why, and your explanation has to deal with things like my love of Dr Who. I'm sure there are hobbesian equivalents.

Hobbes himself, though I love him as a brother, has been apt on occasion to accuse us real ale types of snobbery, without much more evidence than you've offered for your own position. Though with less ill nature.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 23-04-2008 10:25

Your long rambling post up there is one of the worst things I've ever read on of. 'Cultural snobbery' my arse

Really? Worse than the whole "it's shit" point to back up the initial "Who gives a flyin fuck" interjection? OTF is really raising its game in the new world.

Oh, but you have wittily used a Jim Royle quote so you can't be a snob, can you?

Has anyone got any proper points to make from any viewpoint of actually having seen a soap?

I will give you it, Liquidator, if you mean that the current Corrie storyline is shit compared to others (as Harry pointed out) bit I am pretty sure you didn't mean that

To be honest, Nil, I perhaps shouldn't have included you in my post as you seemed more cosidered and offered an explanation but your point about the low quality of the acting and the direction across the board, that I refer to above, seemed to mistaken that I assumed that you had never seen many soaps.

Having said that, it isn't like osmosis or something (wrong metaphor, I am sure) you can't claim to be an expert on soaps because your mum watches. Unless, of course, you are like my dad who harrumphes from behind the paper and says that he doesn't watch soaps yet knows all the plotlines

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by hobbes - 23-04-2008 10:32

With such little to work on, the only obvious rationale to me that he is saying this is that he hates it because it is popular and populist.

I can't think of any other reason for his blanket judgement on soaps other than cultural snobbery. So let me get this straight. Because you lack the imagination to think of another reason, then the only one you can think of must be true? Fantastic bit of logic there.

Also, if you meant Dickens went onto better things, Olver Twist, Nicholas Nickleby and The Pickwick Papers were all serialisations before they were books. I really can't see the relevance of this.

You weren't saying Coronation Street was shit or soaps nowadays were shit, you making a blanket remark that all soaps are shit

Aye. From what I've seen they're poorly acted, cheaply made, low budget, low quality crap. Also by the very nature of them they fail one of the most important things that TV should be and that's fresh. Even something as wonderful as The Simpsons got stale by about series 9 or 10. Most good programmes shark-jump after about 40-60 episodes. Soaps are on far more often than this. Therefore they can't really help becoming either bland and repetitive and a shadow of what

they were meant to be like Corrie, or they go the other way with ever expanding farcical storylines. (See Emerdale's plane crash, Corrie's car-into the river and the never ending returns of Nasty Nick, the Mitchells and Dirty fucking Den. I've often heard it said by people that you can not see one of these for months and slip right back into it. And it's said as if it's a good thing! I can't think of anything that more undermines the concept of entertainment. It's like being in a pub where the jukebox plays exactly the same songs every night. Surely, surely after about a week you'd want to pull the fucking thing off the wall. That's why I say they're shit. Their very structure makes them so. Equally, if you don't want "doing a hobbes" to become common parlance, stop making arguments which have at their basis as "I am right because I think so even though I am totally ignorant of the subject" It will only become so if eejits like you misrepresent me in order to make yourself feel superior. At present it actually means just being wrong about everything. I can live with that. After all it's based on my opinion of terribly low-brow lagers. What a snob I am.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 23-04-2008 10:39

For what its worth, WE, you have put forward a good argument. Not one I agree with but considered.

And the argument that it makes folk discuss Issues Of The Day, while it may or may not be sound, doesn't let them off the hook artistically.

I agree and I did point out that that wasn't the main thrust of my argument but a useful by-product and a highly effective one.

I think that me saying that hobbes is a cultural snob based on his blanket dismissal of soaps as "shit" needs far less basis than him just saying that they are all shit repeatedly but, there again, I don't view him like a brother. Indeed, I would and have been far more stringent with my own brother and he similar

However, hobbes' remarks have got the stink of cultural snobbery throughout them. They are essentially "Here is a widely popular TV genre and it is shit. I have no reasons to give you for this"

He has repeated this over and over. He is dismissing programmes that are hugely popular with the general public with no back-up.

As I say, Nil might be wrong in saying that they are all bad actors but, at least, he backing up his point, Liquidator has a point if he is saying that Coronation Street isn't as good at the moment (I am not sure he is)

The best we can say of hobbes is that he is making vapid and shallow generalisations based out of complete ignorance but I do feel that his whole attitude is based on cultural snobbery.

I mean, I will hold my hands up if I am using the phrase "cultural snob" incorrectly here without realising. Please tell if I am and what the correct usage is?

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Nil a fhios agam - 23-04-2008 10:41

To be honest, Nil, I perhaps shouldn't have included you in my post as you seemed more considered and offered an explanation but your point about the low quality of the acting and the direction across the board, that I refer to above, seemed to mistaken that I assumed that you had never seen many soaps.

Having said that, it isn't like osmosis or something (wrong metaphor, I am sure) you can't claim to be an expert on soaps because your mum watches. Unless, of course, you are like my dad who harrumphes from behind the paper and says that he doesn't watch soaps yet knows all the plotlines

When I lived at home and when I visit I'm like your dad. King Mob made the point about poor acting and direction. My input was an attempted Kermode gag and pointing out that the benefit of mindless TV was pretty small compared to the amount of time invested.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 23-04-2008 10:46

See, I will forever on this board read your posts as coming from my Dad now.

I partly agree with your Kermodism hence me giving up on Brookside and Coronation Street when they went to five days a week but two hours of "Neighbours" a week I can handle especially as my mother-in-law tapes the omnibus for me.

Equally, I agree in some respect with what you, WE and others have said that increased quantity can dilute the quality but this doesn't mean that it is all low quality as you say or that it is all unmitigated shit as hobbes says repeatedly

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Wyatt Earp - 23-04-2008 10:49

I think that me saying that hobbes is a cultural snob based on his blanket dismissal of soaps as "shit" needs far less basis than him just saying that they are all shit repeatedly ...The latter is just an aesthetic opinion; the former is an ad hominem criticism. So not only does it need, in conscience, more evidence; even if you came up with some, it's irrelevant. Even someone who's motivated by cultural snobbery could, in principle, be right in this particular case.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Nil a fhios agam - 23-04-2008 10:52

I'm guessing there is about a 40 to 50 year age gap between me and your dad but I've had the same problem with WOM ever since he started talking about watching Location, Location, Location.

You may have missed hobbes post at the end of page 2 where he gives his reasons for disliking soaps?

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by hobbes - 23-04-2008 10:58

"Here is a widely popular TV genre and it is shit. I have no reasons to give you for this"

He has repeated this over and over. He is dismissing programmes that are hugely popular with the general public with no back-up.

Aye. From what I've seen they're poorly acted, cheaply made, low budget, low quality crap. Also by the very nature of them they fail one of the most important things that TV should be and that's fresh. Even something as wonderful as The Simpsons got stale by about series 9 or 10. Most good programmes shark-jump after about 40-60 episodes. Soaps are on far more often than this. Therefore they can't really help becoming either bland and repetitive and a shadow of what they were meant to be like Corrie, or they go the other way with ever expanding farcical storylines. (See Emmerdale's plane crash, Corrie's car-into the river and the never ending returns of Nasty Nick, the Mitchells and Dirty fucking Den. I've often heard it said by people that you can not see one of these for months and slip right back into it. And it's said as if it's a good thing! I can't think of anything that more undermines the concept of entertainment. It's like being in a pub where the jukebox plays exactly the same songs every night. Surely, surely after about a week you'd want to pull the fucking thing off the wall. That's why I say they're shit. Their very structure makes them so.

The irony is, you're having a go at me for merely repeating myself over and over, by doing exactly the same thing.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by hobbes - 23-04-2008 11:00

but I do feel that his whole attitude is based on cultural snobbery.
Well as you obviously don't know what it actually means, then perhaps you should stop bandying it around.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 23-04-2008 11:03

Even something as wonderful as The Simpsons got stale by about series 9 or 10. Most good programmes shark-jump after about 40-60 episodes. Soaps are on far more often than this. Therefore they can't really help becoming either bland and repetitive and a shadow of what they were meant to be like Corrie, or they go the other way with ever expanding farcical storylines. (See Emeraldale's plane crash, Corrie's car-into the river and the never ending returns of Nasty Nick, the Mitchells and Dirty fucking Den.

Ok, the first statement is your matter of opinion but you seemed to have worked out a whole theory based on that because all soaps go on for longer than the hobbesian 40-60 episodes, they must be shit. Interesting, certainly better developed than your "all soaps are shit" point but again wrong through ignorance.

Soaps, by their very never-ending quality, ebb & flow in quality. Plane crashes, character returns and lesbian kisses are usually a sign that a soap is ebbing. Crucially, they very rarely work for regular soap watchers and are not what regular viewers watch them for.

Equally, as Harry points out, when Corrie becomes shit, there is a high chance that Eastenders is good (or, even, Brookside or Neighbours). This is vastly different from "all soaps are shit"

I've often heard it said by people that you can not see one of these for months and slip right back into it. And it's said as if it's a good thing!

Really? Often said by people you say? Oh it must be true then. Would these be people be the same people that come up with the sort of generalising dismissals that you do by any chance?

I watch "Neighbours" which is the soap that has this point said about it the most. It is partly true but mainly because they have the refresher bit at the start of every episode. Even having that, you only are up-to-date with the current week's storylines not the previous four months.

It is a similar deal I am sure with other soaps but only because you can watch a two hour omnibus to get you back into the characters stories.

Your accusation is similar to saying that you can get back into the Corleone's lives in Godfather II even though we haven't seen what's happened in the intervening years

It will only become so if eejits like you misrepresent me in order to make yourself feel superior.
At present it actually means just being wrong about everything. I can live with that. After all it's based on my opinion of terribly low-brow lagers. What a snob I am

I didn't make up the saying, it seems to be going all through this board.

As it goes, this ale/lager seems to be a private thing between you and WE but, for what it is worth, I can't see how WE can be a snob for drinking real ale. He is to be pitied for that

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 23-04-2008 11:07

Well as you obviously don't know what it actually means, then perhaps you should stop bandying it around.

Oh, is it obvious what I mean? I must have missed that?

Look, just because I say that I stand to be corrected on the usage doesn't mean that I am wrong, it merely means I am open to the possibility.

It's what makes me so open-minded

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 23-04-2008 11:10

For fuck's sake, hobbes, you finally came up with your considered points eight minutes before I made that post about you repeating that they were shit. It was a cross-post.

I then addressed your points.

Having said that, it still doesn't detract from the fact that your first detailed response was one long riff on "They're shit because I said so"

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Wyatt Earp - 23-04-2008 11:12

"Doing a hobbes" just means "Holding a startlingly wrong opinion" doesn't it? There's no imputation of ignorance. And it's generally a bit of, you know, jocular ribbing stroke badinage, rather than the bitter criticism you seem to be taking it for.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by hobbes - 23-04-2008 11:13

Ok as this seems to be the bone of contention for you and opinions, even ones backed up with reasoning just don't cut it, answer me something.

What is, objectively the definition of "good" and "bad?"

What is it in BotD land that constitutes quality? Remember, it's categorical FACT that I'm after. Not your opinion.

As it goes, this ale/lager seems to be a private thing between you and WE but

It's between me and about half the board. And it usually comes from people I know, like and respect and who I hope feel much the same way in return.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by hobbes - 23-04-2008 11:15

For fuck's sake, hobbes, you finally came up with your considered points eight minutes before I made that post about you repeating that they were shit. It was a cross-post

Fair enough, I withdraw that bit.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 23-04-2008 11:19

I thought I was using it as "holding a startlingly wrong opinion" but, you know, I will retract it if I have missed the original intent

I am not entirely sure what ad hominam means so I am not sure what point you are making but, if you mean that it is

purely my opinion, I am not entirely sure what else it would be and what evidence I would be able to gather as to cultural snobbery. Surely it is always going to be a judgement call. Genuine question

Even someone who's motivated by cultural snobbery could, in principle, be right in this particular case.

I agree to an extent. Simply using a scattergun/shit sticks effect, hobbes could be right that a lot of it was shit but that wasn't what he was saying. He was saying it was all shit

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Gangster Octopus - 23-04-2008 11:21

Bored Of The Dance wrote:

I can't see how WE can be a snob for drinking real ale. He is to be pitied for that Ah ha. Another slop-drinker...

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 23-04-2008 11:26

Ok as this seems to be the bone of contention for you and opinions, even ones backed up with reasoning just don't cut it, answer me something.

Hold on, I haven't said anything like that since you put your points on page 2.

My problem isn't that you have opinions on stuff, to a certain extent even opinions like "it's shit".

My problem was that you were addressing that opinion to all soaps all of the time.

You softened that approach on page 2 but, as I pointed out to you, your shark-jumping theory, while interesting, doesn't hold for soaps by their nature and your opinions based on non-specific "people(s)" comments hold no water either

You have stopped repeating "they're shit" so I have stopped attacking that line of argument

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 23-04-2008 11:27

QUOTE:

I can't see how WE can be a snob for drinking real ale. He is to be pitied for that Ah ha. Another slop-drinker...

Bloody hell, is someone else here? Organic lager though, sometimes and wheat beer, does that count?

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Harry Carpenter - 23-04-2008 12:37

I will admit to not having read all of this debate but how does BotD's comment ;

we are all intelligent people, we know that a lot of it is crap.

As I say, in some ways, it is a form of meditation, a time when we can switch, rest the mind and drift off somewhere else for a bit. A bit of light relief.

differ markedly from hobbes opinion that they're "shit"?

BotD, you seem to be saying soaps are largely bad art but that you don't mind that bad art because it gives you a chance to , er, ignore it or treat it as white noise which is a peculiar argument in it's favour.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 23-04-2008 12:51

Read the thread, Harry.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by The_Liquidator - 23-04-2008 12:51

Really? Worse than the whole "it's shit" point to back up the initial "Who gives a flyin fuck" interjection? OTF is really raising its game in the new world.

Yes, actually. Because Corrie is shit. Has been shit ever since it abandoned its original style as a dramatic serial, a point that you conveniently chose to not respond to and pretend that I am speaking from a position of ignorance. I'm not, and my opinion of Corrie as doesn't become invalid because lots of people like it. Much like any criticism of Nickelback doesn't become invalid because lots of people like them.

The scripting is consistently poor because of the format, the acting is consistently poor because of the way they're casted and the production values are shite. Should I now change my mind about the programme because it's popular?

Oh, but you have wittily used a Jim Royle quote so you can't be a snob, can you?

You know, for someone complaining about cultural snobbery you're being a real condescending asshole. Maybe if you watched less shit telly you'd realise 'my arse' is a general expression and not a Jim Royle quote.

Has anyone got any proper points to make from any viewpoint of actually having seen a soap?

Yes, they've been made already, about how it's not casual mindless TV because of the time you have to devote to them, the format, acting and scripting, but you've chose to ignore them.

I will give you it, Liquidator, if you mean that the current Corrie storyline is shit compared to others (as Harry pointed out) bit I am pretty sure you didn't mean that

No I mean Corrie, Eastenders (another programme that started promisingly then became tacky soap bollocks), Hollyoaks, Neightbours, Home and Away and all the rest are toilet. That opinion isn't going to change, even if Todd Carty gives a virtuoso performance after being laid up in Walford General with cancer of the AIDS.

Shit on a stick.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Harry Carpenter - 23-04-2008 13:03

Bored Of The Dance wrote:
Read the thread, Harry.

I have , at least speed-read it, but it doesn't explain how bad art is OK because that means you ignore it or treat it as background noise/visuals while you "meditate".

Oh, and I think you are misrepresting me with "as Harry points out, when Corrie becomes shit, there is a high chance that Eastenders is good". Coronation Street (I hate the term "Corrie" and that is me being a snob) has been "shit" for decades and Brookside, Emmerdale etc always were.

Eastenders appears to have veins of form which normally mean they have a good writer or writers handling a chunk of

episodes/plotlines. When they have good writing on Eastenders it can often offset the frequent poor acting and rushed rehearsal/filming schedule and be absorbing.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 23-04-2008 13:10

Has been shit ever since it abandoned its original style as a dramatic serial, a point that you conveniently chose to not respond to and pretend that I am speaking from a position of ignorance.

Liquidator, a late-in-the-day edit on your previous post and this post means that you have come up with a criticism that I left the door open for in this quote

I will give you it, Liquidator, if you mean that the current Corrie storyline is shit compared to others (as Harry pointed out) but I am pretty sure you didn't mean that

so I was hardly ignoring it. I was obviously wrong in my assumption at the end but your original unedited quote didn't make this clear.

I would disagree with you that it has been shit for 40 years. I haven't seen properly for 10 years so can't comment but certainly, 15 years ago, there were still good patches.

I am not sure where you are going as far as your opinion being invalid because soaps are popular. I am not saying that at all. I am saying that they are not "all shit" because they are popular

Yes, they've been made already, about how it's not casual mindless TV because of the time you have to devote to them, the format, acting and scripting, but you've chose to ignore them.

No, I bloody haven't. I've addressed them all. Read the thread.

No I mean Corrie, Eastenders (another programme that started promisingly then became tacky soap bollocks), Hollyoaks, Neightbours, Home and Away and all the rest are toilet. That opinion isn't going to change, even if Todd Carty gives a virtuoso performance after being laid up in Walford General with cancer of the AIDS.

Shit on a stick.

Ah, sorry, I was wrong. OTF is still a forum for openmindedness and considered debate

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by The_Liquidator - 23-04-2008 13:16

How can you expect to change someone's mind on something that is a matter of taste? I haven't close-mindedly decided that Corrie is shit on no evidence, it's based on actually watching the programme and having all manner of other soaps forced upon me from the age of about five.

It has nothing to do with being a cultural snob or close minded, it's a matter of taste.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 23-04-2008 13:20

I have , at least speed-read it, but it doesn't explain how bad art is OK because that means you ignore it or treat it as background noise/visuals while you "meditate".

I was saying at was all "bad art" or all "shit". I was saying that we all know that there is a lot of soap that was shit not that we sit through the shit stuff to meditate or zone out to.

I was saying that, even with soaps that aren't shit, you can tend to use it as escapism, as entertainment but there are parts that are entirely gripping. Similar to how I watched last night's Liverpool-Chelsea match.

The thrusts of my argument are that, one, they are light entertainment and, two, they can also be quite culturally important on occasion.

I have also since argued that they, by no means, are badly acted, scripted or directed across the board.

Apologies for misrepresenting you. I was trying to illustrate that soaps have ebbs & flows. As you point out, you weren't suggesting it was a fairly frequent turnaround. I would disagree with you on when and what soaps were/are shit but that isn't the really the debate.

I suppose you are answering the original premise of the thread if memory serves me correct though

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 23-04-2008 13:26

How can you expect to change someone's mind on something that is a matter of taste?

I'm not particularly. Maybe, in your case, it would have been easier to answer "Who gives a fuck" would have been to answer "Aiden, WoM (possibly) and my wife"

What I am addressing are the sweeping generalisations of people saying all soaps are "shit", "shit on a stick" or variations thereof.

As I say, they are banal and as useless comments as saying that all Chinese food is "shit"

Somone wanted posts that were above the level of "I love soaps" forums and I am attempting that

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by EIM - 23-04-2008 15:39

CORRIE RULES! WOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO!

I think the acting in Corrie is fine. It's certainly through the Mohorovicic discontinuity and out in to the wide open spaces compared to the subterranean efforts of Hollyoaks (eh?). Yer man Roy Cropper is a fine actor. Sort of troubled like De Niro in Taxi Driver, but with a deeper, more significant social conscience. I see him very much as a figurehead for a new, better society. When the cockroaches take over, and there's a small cabal of us humans left, we'll turn to Cropper for leadership. And he will broker a deal to let us live peacefully alongside each other, until such a time as David is released from juvey. Then we will CRUSH THEM ALL, by pushing them down the stairs and pretending it wasn't us.

Corrie isn't shit, I don't think. It's better when it is doing stupid shit about serial killers and what have you. It's miles better than Eastenders with its 'every third person is a gangster' bullshit. And you can't compare it to Hollyoaks as that's a kids' programme.

It's daft, amusing, well scripted (it is, actually, you Doubting Thomas bastards) and well acted. There's nowt wrong with it. And if anyone says there is, I'll lock them in a small room with Blanche and Audrey for a couple of hours. That'll learn 'em.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 23-04-2008 16:01

When thinking of incidents when there have been fine acting in soap, one of the times was when Jack and Vera

Duckworth were discussing their failure to buy the Rovers and Jack went into a speech about how it wasn't the place of people like them to succeed in such a way only to fail.

I am not relating it very well but it was a fantastic scene and one I somewhat pinched for my own script.

It wasn't dissimilar to the finest last lines in a film of all time

The old man was right. Only the farmers won. We lost. We always lose

As far as Eastenders goes, some of the two hander episodes have been excellent especially with the actress that plays Dot Cotton although I understand they have been overdone in recent years.

Also, I defy anyone to say that Karl and Susan Kennedy in Neighbours are excellent actors

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Jon - 23-04-2008 23:16

It's daft, amusing, well scripted (it is, actually, you Doubting Thomas bastards) and well acted.

Word.

The acting and scripts are the best you'll find in soapland. Not saying much I know. The writers do still acknowledge the value of character-driven storylines, rather than plot-driven ones. However, I concede that the fanciful plots have taken over more and more since the switch to multi-episodes per week. But you can still find some good stuff in there most weeks. At the moment I'm loving all the Becky-related storylines.

My litmus test for both Corrie and Eastenders is this: watch the first five minutes of an episode and you can normally tell whether it's going to be a good one or not. I don't stick around if it looks like it's going to be a shit one.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Wyatt Earp - 24-04-2008 07:41

I think you can generally tell within about 30 seconds if a telly programme's going to be any good. I've occasionally been wrong, but so rarely it hardly counts.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 24-04-2008 09:12

Broadly, I agree although the story arcs are so massive in terms of time on soaps and the knowledge the scriptwriters have that the viewers are so loyal means that this isn't necessarily true of soaps.

I tend to find that, if you watch an omnibus, the story arcs over that rather than in the half-hour although they work hard, obviously, to have the daily cliff-hanger. Where this doesn't work is when the cliff-hanger jars as a contractual obligation, both in the daily episode and the omnibus.

To be fair, this doesn't happen that often

If I am reading Harry right, this is where Eastenders is different from other soaps in that you have a writer that carries over 4 or 5 episodes (probably an omnibus-worth I would have thought) whereas, in other soaps, you have different writers on different storylines on each episode. Coronation Street may be similar to Eastenders, I am not sure.

I was trying to explain similar to my son about the Secret Seven books the other night. As we read a chapter a night, he is just getting the idea that, although one chapter in itself isn't exciting, it is leading up onto the next chapter which might be and adding to the book's plot as a whole.

He's fallen asleep by this point

Actually, going back to Dickens, I haven't read him since I found out that so many of the novels were serialisations. Has anyone read them and noticed where the days started or ended or was it as simple as a chapter a day? Does it distract somewhat from the book as a whole when you realise it was written as a serial?

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 24-04-2008 09:13

I wish I had your skill with crap films, WE, I have wasted many a half an hour before I have realised a film is crap.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Harry Carpenter - 24-04-2008 10:20

I'm really not sure about this 'BotD lauds the soaps' plotline. The writing is rushed and the central character is unconvincing and wooden. He's really not the same since he switched to 5 posts an hour.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 24-04-2008 10:59

The irony indeed.

Luckily, the Harry and Bored plotline has a large story arc and a significant backstory so we don't have to pack it into one thread's episode.

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 24-04-2008 10:59

Good though, Harry. I like it

=====

Re:Corrie

Posted by Aidan - 28-04-2008 10:40

One of the 'actors' on RTE's Fair City is leaving the soap after 15yrs to train as an actor. That'll tell ya....
The piece of drama that came closest to making me cry was Alice's death in Emmerdale (good but on at a lousy time).
The acting in 'Endersseems to be ok from the little I see of it but it's been the one storyline since the show began.

=====