
Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Kid Dynamite - 22-05-2008 17:15

fuck off Dr. Jones.

Went to the midnight screening of the Indiana Jones film last night. It wasn't pretty.

Good bits: Karen Allen and a fun chase scene about half way through.

Bad bits: everything else. But special mentions for John Hurt, Ray Winstone, Cate Blanchett, CGI monkeys and the painfully dull last 25 minutes.

It felt like a bad imitation of an Indiana Jones film. In fact it felt a lot like The Mummy Returns. That bad.

I think Spielberg may have done so much worthy oscar bait recently that he's completely forgotten how to pace an action film. And how to time visual gags. And how to balance sentimentality with nastiness. And how to be better than Michael cunting Bay.

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Reed of the Valley People - 22-05-2008 17:28

I liked The Mummy Returns.

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Matej - 22-05-2008 18:06

I really felt all along that this would suck. Hopefully it is slightly better than my expectations.

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Nathan Helena Handcart - 22-05-2008 18:37

I don't want to see this, having had memories of Star Wars upset by the latter day car crashes. I love Raiders; it's in my all-time top 3.

But since Indy came along, the genre is saturated. Tomb Raider, National Treasure, The Da Vinci Code all play on Indy riffs, and basically, there are so many bad Indy clones out there that I can't help but think that this is going to be a bad Indy clone. Hell, I thought Temple of Doom was shite and Last Crusade was way overrated, so I should probably steer well clear here.

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by rick derris - 22-05-2008 18:41

i thought national treasure was ok

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Reed of the Valley People - 22-05-2008 18:54

Me too. Sahara was ok too.

Da Vinci Code is shit, however. If you're going to take yourself that seriously, you have to come up with a vaguely plausible story. The plot line of all of the Indiana Jones films have more historical credibility than Da Vinci Code. Come to think of it, Star Wars was more plausible than the Da Vinci code.

Nothing can compete with Raiders of the Lost Ark. It's an absolute stone-cold classic, not only because it was a great film, but at the time it was released, it was like nothing we'd seen before (we being people who were kids at the time).

But that doesn't mean the later films don't have their charms. The title character is still just as fun to watch.

I'm a little suspicious that this crystal skull (while based on real life artifact) just can't create the gravitas of the Lost Ark of the Covenant or the Holy Grail. And, since this takes place in the 1950s, the Nazis are gone. The Nazis in Raiders of the Lost Ark especially are some of the greatest film villains of all time. Especially the guy in the white suit and panama hat. Nothing says evil like a white suit.

Communists just aren't as good.

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Nathan Helena Handcart - 22-05-2008 20:05

Don't get me wrong - I loved National treasure and even liked the follow-up, but that's because I accepted they the nearest I was going to get to Indy-style romping, and accepted it's Indy-liteness and it was cool. I'll be watching the new one with a heavy heart thinking I wish they'd have never made the Temple of Doom, and an error has been compounded by a mistake and now a tragedy.

I'm so going to see this at a cinema now. Feckers.

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by The_Liquidator - 22-05-2008 23:34

I really liked Temple of Doom. It might have been a bit self-referential, but the Ford/Connery dynamic added some great comedy to the format.

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by EIM - 22-05-2008 23:43

You mean Last Crusade?

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by The_Liquidator - 22-05-2008 23:44

Yeah. The above post is also how I articulated my thoughts as a ten-year-old.

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by erwin - 23-05-2008 01:35

.

I remember seeing Raiders when it first came out (in Reading - opposite the Jack of Both Sides - what was that cinema called?). I sat through the whole film gaping in amazement (from the brilliant rolling stone ball scene onwards), while my mate Mark was sat next to me shouting "You're joking!" at every twist. So new, so fresh.

The others were bollix, and I don't hold out much hope for this new one.

.
=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Stumpy Pepys - 23-05-2008 08:00

I'm a little suspicious that this crystal skull (while based on real life artifact)...

Crystal skulls were apparently all knocked up from quartz by some German artisans in the 19th century.

"Here mate, want to buy a magic Aztec skull?"

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Rogin the Armchair Fan - 23-05-2008 09:35

So Indiana is going to be fighting the communists for the control of some 19th-century artifacts that will raise a fortune on "Cash in the Attic"?

Should be a right roller-coaster this one. I'm going to see it at lunchtime (double student rate discount)!

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Big Daves Gussett - 23-05-2008 09:43

"Two for Indiana Jones and the Kingdom of the Crystal Skull please"

"You have chosen...poorly"

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Rogin the Armchair Fan - 23-05-2008 14:48

It's nowhere near as bad as Kid D made out above. It's not Raiders, but it's nowhere near as dumb as Tomb Raider or as boring as The Mummy. I'd say it's better than the Temple of Doom, and would have been better than the Last Crusade if only the ending had been less predictable.

It's well worth a viewing, if you've no better way to kill a couple of hours. However, do NOT go expecting a sensible plot (as if you would). Apparently several writers had scripts for a fourth Indy film turned down over the years while Lucas and Spielberg waited for the "perfect plot". If this is what they were waiting for, I'd sue the fuckers if I was one of the ones they turned down.

SPOILERS

Good bit - Ray Winstone being introduced as a character to help explain Indy's life over the last 20 years (they've been spies together for MI6 and the OSS, respectively, which makes kind of sense).

Bad bit - Ray Winstone still being in it at the end. Should have found a way to kill him off half way through (ideally, the KGB should have topped him themselves, as soon as his "part" in the plot was exposed).

Good bit - The KGB taking Indy to the hangar where the Ark was hidden at the end of Raiders .

Bad bit - the first moment you realise, in the hangar, that what the KGB are after is Roswell remains. Oh shit, you think, this is going to be Indiana Jones meets the X-Files.

Good bit - Indy realising he's in the middle of a dummy town in Nevada about to be blown up in a nuclear detonation. And the CGI of the explosion itself.

Bad bit - how he "escapes" the nuke. Come on .

Good bit - Indy linking up with his long-lost son.

Bad bit - When you realise the "tough kid" is the little lad out of "Even Stevens".

Good bit - the plot device of Indy tracking down the crystal skull from the directions sent to him by "Ox".

Bad bit - John Hurt as "Ox" when Indy finally finds him.

Good bit - the tank chase next to the Amazon gorge, and the subsequent drop over the Iguazu Falls.

Bad bit - the punch-up inbetween the two between Indy and the KGB bloke, which went on for ever and reminded me of the two Geordies on the dockside on the Fast Show beating each other up interminably.

Good and bad bit - the whole ending. Spectacular to watch, but a real "what the fuck?". Not least, how did one of the skulls come to be "missing" in the first place, if these things are all so-powerful? Who nicked it to start with?

****SPOILERS****

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Reed of the Valley People - 25-05-2008 03:06

I saw it today.

It's nowhere near as bad as Kid D made out above. It's not Raiders , but it's nowhere near as dumb as Tomb Raider or as boring as The Mummy. I'd say it's better than the Temple of Doom, and would have been better than the Last Crusade if only the ending had been less predictable.

I agree with that, except that I liked the Mummy.

It's well worth a viewing, if you've no better way to kill a couple of hours. However, do NOT go expecting a sensible plot (as if you would). Apparently several writers had scripts for a fourth Indy film turned down over the years while Lucas and Spielberg waited for the "perfect plot". If this is what they were waiting for, I'd sue the fuckers if I was one of the ones they turned down.

I think the plot was as sensible as the previous films, albeit a bit more muddled, but I agree that it shouldn't have taken 20 years to get this together.

SPOILERS

Good bit - Ray Winstone being introduced as a character to help explain Indy's life over the last 20 years (they've been spies together for MI6 and the OSS, respectively, which makes kind of sense).

They said they were spies during the war, not necessarily for that whole 20 years. Besides, the OSS changed into the CIA soon after the war, as I recall.

Indy still has his post at Marshall College (i.e. Yale).

Bad bit - Ray Winstone still being in it at the end. Should have found a way to kill him off half way through (ideally, the

KGB should have topped him themselves, as soon as his "part" in the plot was exposed).

Ray Winstone's character didn't really serve any purpose whatsoever as far as I can tell. All of his crosses and double crosses just cluttered the film. And he was excessively sweaty throughout the film, which was hard to look at.

Good bit - The KGB taking Indy to the hangar where the Ark was hidden at the end of Raiders .

Point of fact. I'm about 99% sure that at the end of Raiders, that warehouse is labeled "Somewhere in Washington, DC." So this is a different warehouse, but the ark is there now. Apparently, that scene really resonated with archaeologists because every museum and university on the planet has storage rooms full of artifacts that have been poorly marked and recorded and nobody knows what they are. No doubt some great treasures are tucked away in the dark.

Bad bit - the first moment you realize, in the hangar, that what the KGB are after is Roswell remains. Oh shit, you think, this is going to be Indiana Jones meets the X-Files.

I thought that was good. Like I said upthread, it's important that the story surround an artifact or myth that the audience has heard of and understands as significant. Of course, that crystal skull isn't part of the established lore, I don't think, but everyone has heard of Roswell as well as stories about ancient civilizations founded or influenced by aliens.

Good bit - Indy realizing he's in the middle of a dummy town in Nevada about to be blown up in a nuclear detonation. And the CGI of the explosion itself.

Agreed.

Bad bit - how he "escapes" the nuke. Come on .

Agreed. Although, their easy survival of three massive waterfalls was far harder to believe.

Good bit - Indy linking up with his long-lost son.

Agreed.

Bad bit - When you realise the "tough kid" is the little lad out of "Even Stevens".

Everybody has to start somewhere. I think he's a good young actor and good for the part. He's also a pretty interesting kid. He had a very unusual upbringing. His dad was, essentially, a professional grifter.

Good bit - the plot device of Indy tracking down the crystal skull from the directions sent to him by "Ox".

Agreed.

Bad bit - John Hurt as "Ox" when Indy finally finds him.

Why is that bad? I know John Hurt is famous, but the only part I can recall him playing is the professor in Hellboy.

Good bit - the tank chase next to the Amazon gorge, and the subsequent drop over the Iguazu Falls.

Agreed.

Bad bit - the punch-up inbetween the two between Indy and the KGB bloke, which went on for ever and reminded me of

the two Geordies on the dockside on the Fast Show beating each other up interminably.

It's good to see a good old fashioned fist fight in a film, but that did go on too long.

Good and bad bit - the whole ending. Spectacular to watch, but a real "what the fuck?". Not least, how did one of the skulls come to be "missing" in the first place, if these things are all so-powerful? Who nicked it to start with?

Agreed, it was pretty cool, but nowhere near as good as the end of Raiders or the Holy Grail bit at the end of Last Crusade.

It went missing because the conquistadors stole it. What wasn't clear was who were those people guarding the conquistadors tomb, and who were those Indians that emerged from the walls of that pyramid thing later on in the film?

Other objections:

I think it went way too far out of its way to let us know THIS IS THE 1950s and then provide a completely Hollywoodized cliché version of the 1950s. The music, the Red Scare, the nuclear testing, Mutt's Brando-in-The-Wild-One costume (seriously, they could have varied it a little), the "greaser"-vs.-jock fight in the diner, Howdy Doody, etc. Of course, that was necessary to explain why Harrison Ford has aged so much and it fits in with the alien landing business as well as the Soviet's interest in that (I believe I've read that Stalin was interested in that stuff).

I also thought the romance was a bit forced. Do people really fall right back in love after 20 years of no contact? That seems implausible.

But I guess it worked well as a counter to the scene where he mentions that his dad and friend Marcus Brody have passed on (the guy who played Brody, Denholm Elliot, passed in 92). The "new" dean, ably played by Jim Broadbent, says "I guess we've reached the point where life stops giving us things and starts taking them away." It would have been a real downer to think of Indiana Jones depressed and full of regrets, so it's nice that he ends up finding a son and a wife.

Also, at the end, Indy is named "Assistant Dean." From what I know of how universities work from my dad, that is not the sort of job a guy like him would want. He would not want to be so involved in university politics, donor schmoozing and bullshit, especially since he spends so much time doing fieldwork and on various "consulting" gigs.

I imagine this is the last IJ film we'll see starring Harrison Ford, but I think there's latitude for more films or TV series in the Indiana Jones "world." Many years back, there was a "Young Indiana Jones" TV series that was pretty cool. He was always meeting other young versions of famous people/characters like Eliot Ness and Ernest Hemingway. That was cool.

I think they could maybe do something with Shia Labouf's character or perhaps do something about a young version of Sean Connery's character, something about WWI or Jack the Ripper or somesuch. They've never explained what happened to Indiana's mom or why they named the dog Indiana, so there's room there for some fun stories.

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Mighty Mudhsuden - 27-05-2008 11:32

Reed of the Valley People wrote:
Me too. Sahara was ok too.

The Nazis in Raiders of the Lost Ark especially are some of the greatest film villains of all time. Especially the guy in the white suit and panama hat. Nothing says evil like a white suit.

Communists just aren't as good.

Isn't the bloke in the white hat Belloq?

Everyone's right about Raiders. The ending is still as shit-your-pants scary to me as it was when I was a wee'en.

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Gangster Octopus - 27-05-2008 11:42

Reed of the Valley People wrote:
Nothing says evil like a white suit. Quite.

<http://www.edgehill.ac.uk/edgeways/issue7/images/MartinBell.jpg>

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Gangster Octopus - 27-05-2008 11:44

Reed of the Valley People wrote:
Do people really fall right back in love after 20 years of no contact? Friends Reunited relies on it...

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Disco Sea Shanties - 27-05-2008 12:11

Ultimately, a disappointing film. I think it started off really well and when we had the motorcycle chase scene at the beginning, I thought we were in for a good fun movie. But somehow it went really off the rails about half way through, about the same time as John Hurt's character showed up. And yes the ending really was a "What the fuck?" moment. You don't expect Indiana Jones films to be well plotted but you at least expect them to make sense.

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Crusoe - 27-05-2008 12:14

Saw this yesterday. I'd agree with Rogin's comments.

The opening sequence is really well done; the plot exposition is just tiresome (you're begging for an action sequence to move things along); Ray Winstone and John Hurt's characters are completely unnecessary; Shia LeBoeuf continues a surprisingly inoffensive career as teen hero (following on from the Transformers movie); and the ending really lacked oomph (and is so close to both Congo and The Mummy Returns that they should be ashamed).

I think it is time to retire Indy now; I'm not entirely sure about a new generation of films, although they've left themselves open to that possibility. And, sucker that I am, I did enjoy the poignant moment where Jim Broadbent mentions Indy's father and Marcus Brody.

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by And I am the Life - 27-05-2008 14:45

My polish flatmates went to see it at the weekend and left before the end, and they've watched Alien vs Predator II, all the way to the end. It must be dreadful.

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Reed of the Valley People - 27-05-2008 15:23

Nonsense. They missed out.

spoiler

The ending did indeed lack "oomph" but it made sense. The aliens skeletons are still "alive" in that they're all connected to their central consciousness. But they need all of their skulls in place in order to create their portal to their home dimension. One skull is missing, (because the Spaniards nicked it) the circuit.

When all of them are in place, the portal opens and Cate Blanchett gets sucked through it.

The legend says whoever puts all the skulls in place will give the person great "treasure." But their treasure isn't stuff, it's knowledge. Cate Blanchett got all the knowledge, but was sucked into oblivion in the process.

See? It's really quite simple.

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Rogin the Armchair Fan - 27-05-2008 15:28

Still doesn't adequately explain how, once the 13th skull is returned, the "interdimensional beings" manage to come back to life, destroy the entire city of El Dorado and piss off back to where they came from - why didn't they just crush the Conquistadors like ants in the first place instead of allowing them to nick one of their heads?

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Matej - 27-05-2008 15:28

Having read Reed's spoilers... it sounds even more shit.

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Rogin the Armchair Fan - 27-05-2008 15:34

Point of fact. I'm about 99% sure that at the end of Raiders, that warehouse is labeled "Somewhere in Washington, DC." So this is a different warehouse, but the ark is there now.

That bit's okay with me - WW2 had happened in the meantime, it's entirely plausible the US moved all its important stuff from Washington DC (which would have been a target for bombing raids had the war ever reached the eastern US seaboard) to somewhere in the middle of the Nevada desert.

The UK did exactly the same with its (paper) records of births, marriages and deaths, which were moved lock stock and barrel from Somerset House (on the Thames) to a depot in Southport in Lancashire.

Somerset House never got a scratch in the blitz, whereas one of the few buildings destroyed in Southport was ... you can guess the rest.

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Reed of the Valley People - 27-05-2008 15:37

Still doesn't adequately explain how, once the 13th skull is returned, the "interdimensional beings" manage to come back to life,

That's just how they're built. The skulls were always alive. Just sort of dormant. Waiting until they could all reconnect with each other.

destroy the entire city of El Dorado and piss off back to where they came from
That was just collateral damage from creating their big vortex portal thingy.

- why didn't they just crush the Conquistadors like ants in the first place instead of allowing them to nick one of their heads?
They weren't interested in crushing anyone. They're scientists. The details of how the Spaniards managed to decapitate one of them isn't explained, but it doesn't really need explanation. The aliens are powerful, but not invincible. After all, one of them crashed in New Mexico.

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Mark Felt - 27-05-2008 16:05

It's pretty terrible. Easily the worst movie Spielberg has directed since 1941.

There are some entertaining sequences, absolutely, but this is also the first time I can remember actually nodding off in a cinema. The crystal skull is both too purely a McGuffin (so there is no urgency or tension to the revelatory final sequence - contrast with the Grail which was needed to save Dr. Jones and the incorrect replicas of which killed spectacularly, or with the obvious power of the Ark of the Covenant), and too over-exposed to be any good as a McGuffin. It totally fucks the movie - and that destruction has George Lucas' grubby fingerprints all over it.

The only explanation for it that I can see is that Spielberg was too embarrassed to tell George what a crock of shit he had dreamed up, so he just did the best he could.

It is definitely intermittently entertaining, but spectacle divorced from character and story just becomes boring very quickly.

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Gangster Octopus - 27-05-2008 16:25

Mark Felt wrote:

Easily the worst movie Spielberg has directed since 1941. Crikey, nearly seventy years...

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Reed of the Valley People - 27-05-2008 16:25

Easily the worst movie Spielberg has directed since 1941.

Hardly. AI, War of the Worlds, The Terminal and The Lost World: Jurassic Park were all worse than this.

I agree that the plot is too muddled with extra characters and the skull was too over-exposed. I agree that Lucas (who merely cowrote this) isn't a great writer.

What, exactly, is George Lucas good for? The recent Star Wars films, especially in contrast to the early ones that he didn't direct, show he's not a very good director.

The recent Star Wars films, as well as the latest Indiana Jones film, suggest he's not really a great writer.

He's good at distilling some good ideas from old movie serials and pulp novels and he's good at hiring some very good CGI people, artists, character designers and so forth. And he's good at merchandising. So basically he's a brilliant producer and studio exec who thinks he's a writer-director.

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Rogin the Armchair Fan - 27-05-2008 16:32

Yeah, I get the impression that Lucas came up with a brilliant "concept" for the original Star Wars film, and Hollywood being Hollywood they've indulged him ever since, with generally disastrous results.

It would be like J.K. Rowling demanding to direct the Harry Potter movies.

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Gyuri - 27-05-2008 17:23

I saw this over the weekend and more or less enjoyed myself, though the enjoyment was based almost entirely on the earned goodwill I have for Indy as the movie itself was pretty terrible for many of the reasons listed above, but also because:

* The Tarzan-like scene was embarrassing and, may have even been so in the animated Disney film in which it belonged.

* To amplify Mark Felt's good points about the crystal skull as MacGuffin, the other problem was that it made no sense as part of Indy's character arc. The Ark, the stones and the grail all tied together with what Indy was going through/learning about himself in the movies, and so MacGuffins were themselves resonant. Here they served no purpose but to look like a larger-than-scale version of something you'd get out of a coin-machine in a biker bar.

* Leaving aside the portions of the plot that seemed to be introduced for no real reason and then dropped, the main plot felt like something out of the post-Franklin W. Dixon-era Hardy Boys. . . very much a poorly thought out, badly written thin reed to hang a movie on. Plus, they somehow managed to put together a Indy-has-a-son story completely without emotional resonance. I would have thought that would be hard to do. The only explanation for it that I can see is that Spielberg was too embarrassed to tell George what a crock of shit he had dreamed up, so he just did the best he could. The whole aliens/crystal skull thing reminded me very much of a story Kevin Smith (Clerks, Dogma, etc.) tells about writing a Superman script in the late '90s. The producer, Joel Silver, kept telling him that the script was good, but what it needed to be great was a big, mechanical spider. Eventually, this became one of the reasons Superman didn't get remade until two years ago, and it's also why the Will Smith movie Wild, Wild West had a huge mechanical spider in it. Apparently, Lucas had a stick up his ass about there being aliens in the Indy movies since the beginning, and Spielberg had managed to back him down until, unfortunately now.

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Reed of the Valley People - 27-05-2008 20:02

and Hollywood being Hollywood they've indulged him ever since, with generally disastrous results.

I don't know if anyone is indulging him, at least not willingly. He made so much fucking money off of Star Wars and all the related tat that he was able to create and maintain Lucasfilm, ILM and Skywalker Sound. He's essentially the biggest budget independent filmmaker in history.

20th Century Fox distributes his stuff because it's going to make money no matter how bad it is, but they don't have much influence on how it gets made.

Marvel seems to be following this model. They've set up their own studio. Universal or whomever distributes it but they have more or less total control over their superhero films. I think that will usually result in better films, but not always. Marvel has a lot of confidence in its "properties," in the case of Spider-man and Iron Man that's good, because the film benefits by sticking to the source material instead of letting Hollywood ruin it with their committee-think. On the other hand, some of Marvel's properties don't deserve to see the light of day.

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Gyuri - 27-05-2008 21:20

Marvel seems to be following this model. I believe this was also the Pixar model, before Disney acquired it last year. To tie this together with the thread, Pixar became a stand-alone production house after Steve Jobs bought it from George Lucas.

As for the film, one thing I did find to be amusing/clever, was that Indy's son called himself the dog-themed name "Mutt" rather than his given name, Henry (just like Indy called himself Indiana, after his dog, rather than Henry).

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by battylad - 28-05-2008 22:23

My 7 year old loved it!

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Kowalski - 30-05-2008 22:16

I thought it was quite enjoyable, not exactly brilliant but not "Dude, where's my Car".

The story may not be believable but what's believable about a cup that grants everlasting life or a golden box that kills Nazis?

As Indy's supposed to be an homage to B movies to me it seems to do what it says on the tin. Besides it cost me £6.40 to watch it (and I wasn't even in London town) so I tried to get my money's worth.

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Desperately Seeking - 31-05-2008 17:50

I liked it.

It suffered from the same problems as attack of the clones - way too much hype.

Did anybody else feel cheated by the fact that this Indiana movie wasn't two movies in one? The opening scenes of the past three Indiana movies conclude a story- this one didn't. I was pissed off.

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 31-05-2008 19:15

I watched and realised that I have seen the first one about 13 times, the second probably 6 and the third none and none of the them at the cinema

I went with a birthday party of 8 8-year-olds at to the cinema. I enjoyed but agree that the ending was bit unfocussed but, you know, it's not Sixth Sense.

Obviously the Ray Winstone character was pretty rubbish but, there again, it's Ray Winstone, what do you expect, he has been doing a Michael Caine for forever and he hasn't even done a reasonable job of playing Ray Winstone since, I don't know, Sexy Beast? Births Marriages Deaths?

I also quite fancied Cate Blanchett in it, which I have never done before

I think it could have dropped the four swear words in it which were pointless.

Other than that it was OK but not classic.

Mind you, I went to a TGI Fridays after and enjoyed it so my critical faculties are obviously shot to fuck

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Harry Carpenter - 31-05-2008 20:28

Bored Of The Dance wrote:

I also quite fancied Cate Blanchett in it, which I have never done before

Four words; 'Notes on a Scandal'.

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 31-05-2008 23:11

Another four. I haven't seen it.

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Matej - 16-06-2008 12:27

It met my expectations. Which, since they were incredibly low, means it is pretty awful.

I echo the sentiments above. If they were waiting for this script, they should have kept waiting.

=====

Re:Dr. Jones, Dr. Jones, calling Dr. Jones . . .

Posted by Ginger Yellow - 16-06-2008 16:16

"I thought it was quite enjoyable, not exactly brilliant but not "Dude, where's my Car". "

Hey! Dude, Where's My Car is at least "quite enjoyable". It has no right to be, but it is.

=====