Remake of a movie

Every once in a while a remake is made of a movie. Most of the time it is because the first movie was very good, and they think the remake will be as good. Such movies that come to my mind are "The Thomas Crown Affair" ([1999](#) and [1968](#)) and "Oceans Eleven" ([2001](#) and [1960](#)). Today I saw a remake of an different sort. One that was made because the first movie wasn't everything it could be. Today I saw "The Incredible Hulk" ([2008](#)).

I'm going to try very hard not to give any big spoilers, I won't tell you the end or anything about the big battle we all know I HULK movie should have. I just want to talk about what was done right this time. The original HULK movie was one I barely mention that I saw. From somebody who really likes comic book movies (see other posts — shameless plug for my own writing), The first Hulk really does not exist for me other than a bad dream.

So what did the 2008 version of the HULK have? Let's start with the most important need of any movie. It had a very good story line and plot. The action of the plot drove the characters. The characters seemed to react and not act. All the characters, from the leads to the cameos and the supporting to the CGI actors were believable. Could I tell it was a CGI character, sure, but that did not detract from the movie (Its about a comic book, should that really make a difference?) But the CGI characters were believable. They had expression and enough realism to be considered as other parts of the story. This had a lot to do with the quality of the story in addition to the quality of the actors.

Now on to the characters. I've seen most of the main characters in at least one other movie. Some of these movies were very memorable. I didn't see those characters in this movie. Again this is one of my best compliments to actors and

writers. I don't want to see an Elf princess as a respected scientist, love interest in a movie that has no elves. I don't want to see an illusionist as a studious scientist either. I didn't see that. They became their characters, and the story drove them, or they drove the story. This would have been a good movie even if the comic never existed.

My rating —- This will be one I see again in the expensive (stadium seating) theater. That, of course, means the DVD will join my collection.

Slight spoilers… Things I liked because I liked the campy TV show…. And I like comics

****
Bruce Banner's eyes when he changes to the Hulk look very similar to the old TV show.

The lab equipment that is used to create the Hulk also looks a lot like the old TV show.

At the beginning of the movie, Bruce Banner is watching TV, a clip from the old Bill Bixby TV show "The Courtship of Eddie's Father" is on.

Bruce Banner using the line or trying "You won't like me when I'm angry"

Lou Ferrigno's cameo and his being the Voice of the Hulk.

Stan Lee's Cameo.

Tony Stark showing up during the movie.

The super soldier serum from WWII is mentioned.

There were others, but I can't remember them now.

Ignorant Viewpoint of Iron Man

I've never read a comic book in my life, so why did I go see [Iron Man](#)? Easy — Tuesday is movie night for us, my local movie theater had 3 movies available, and it only cost $3 for both of us to see one. The choices were [What Happens in Vegas](#), which I wasn't going to touch with a ten foot pole. I don't like [Ashton Kutche](#)r, I'm not a big fan of [Cameron Diaz](#), and I heard a reviewer say something about the audience being tortured, not to mention that the premise itself sounded terrible — more like a Saturday Night Live skit than a movie. Another choice was [Prince Caspian](#), which I was somewhat open-minded about watching since I did read the first of the Narnia books way way back when, but my husband wasn't interested in seeing that one at all, and the 2 hour and 20 minute running time kinda turned us away also. So Iron Man it was.

The movie started out interesting enough — it was never boring, so don't let the fact that I fell asleep fool you. That's just what I do when I don't have time to nap during the day and I see a movie too early before I've gotten my second wind that carries me through the evening. So I would say that there was too much of a backstory given, even for people like us who had never really heard of Iron Man before and especially didn't know his backstory. The backstory seemed to go on and on, but my husband liked that, and since I was sleeping through most of it, I can't really fairly say that it was too long. Super hero movies are not even close to being my favorite kind of movie, but I did enjoy this one. It had the perfect amount of action (too much action makes my mind wander), cool special effects, and an interesting story line. The acting wasn't horrible or even bad, but what do you expect

with veterans like [Robert Downey Jr.](#) and [Gwyneth Paltrow](#)? They had good chemistry; the love story wasn't too cheesy, and I liked the ending of the movie. I really enjoyed seeing all the technology as Robert Downey Jr. was working in his "cave" and whatnot, and the huge enemy suit was really fun to watch in the showdown between good and evil. The people behind us came close to ruining things though, since it was a grown woman exclaiming things like, "Cool! That's awesome! I wish I could do that!" I'm glad she was enjoying herself, but it was distracting to the rest of us.

Since I'm not a comic book fan, I will pose a question to those who are. What percentage of superheros are filthy rich tech geeks who develop their weapons in reclusive mansions? This seems to be a common theme, but maybe it's just in the superhero movies I've seen. But anyway, I liked the movie; it tempted me to possibly check out Dark Knight this summer, unless I'm too busy like, having a baby or something. Iron Man was well worth our $3. I don't think I would have said the same for What Happens in Vegas.

Comic Books, Movies and things I think about them

I've been watching the Animated Superman DVD's I picked up. I also went to see[Iron Man](#) last night. So I thought I would try and explain what I like and don't like in movies/shows based on comic books.

For some insight, I've only purchased comic books on rare occasions, most of the time I would borrow them from somebody else. My college roommate was/and still is a collector of

comic books. I still go to a sight or two to try to keep up with what is going on. I generally liked most comic books I've read, but have really come to appreciate what they can do in the movies. Finally the movies can make the heroes of the comics do all the things they were able to in those comic pages.

My first objective to any movie, comic book based or otherwise, is very simple: When I leave the movie, did I enjoy myself? Nothing other than that. After that I will start look for other things in the movie. If based on a book or story I know, did it follow the thing it was based on. If not, why not? Was the acting good? Did I see the actor, or the character? That's it, not much deeper than that. This does explain why I've liked movies that other people just can't stand.

For comic book movies, I add one more item. Based on the technology of the day, did the comic action seem real? Why say based on tech, well the latest Superman film released had much better tech than the Superman movies with Christopher Reeve. But for its time, the older Superman movies did as well as they could, they were some of the best SFX during that time frame. I expect more from new movies than I do from older movies.

Now onto the movies…

Most of the Superman animated I've watched have been decent shows. The story lines on some of them would have made better movies than anything released to date. These seem to follow what I remember from the comic books better than any movie has done. In short, I am entertained by them. Well worth the money spent. I will tend to watch some of the shows more often than others, but as a set they are at least a 3 out of 5 stars.

Ironman… I left the movie and could honestly say I had enjoyed it. There were parts that made me do some thinking (planned by

the filmmakers of course), but that is what I expected going into the show. As with most of the comic book movies, there is a need to introduce the character to people who never read the comic. There is the big 3 of course (Superman, Batman and Spiderman) that could have gotten by without the "introduction" movie, but it seems that most others have to have that. Ironman was an introduction movie. We are given a background of the character, and how he became "Ironman", then the major "comic book" action sequence takes place. Without giving too much away, I found that the actors became the characters. Even though I knew most of them from other movies, they became the parts they played. Good writing and acting all around, I give this movie one of my better reviews scores…. I'll buy it when released.

My review scores for movies are (from best to worst) Both See it again categories will mean that I get the DVD later.

See it again (At the high priced place)
See it again (Cheap seats)
Buy the DVD when released
Rent the DVD when released
I'll watch if someone else has it
I don't ever want to see it again
Can I have my money back?
Leave the theater, and never tell anyone I saw it (you won't ever see this review mark, but if you ask about a movie, and I say I haven't seen it. Well I guess I could have, but it was a real stinker in my estimation.)

Recent Movie Ratings…

Spiderman I II and III all were See it again (cheap seats)
Superman Returns that was really a rent when the DVD comes out, but I bought it for my DVD collection of Superman movies
Fantastic Four — same as Superman Returns. I'm collecting Marvel Comic Movies too.
Batman Begins — See it again (cheap seats)

X-Men I, II, and III — See it again (cheap seats)

If you have comic book movies you want my long version review of, just ask