

# THERE'S NO NEED TO FEAR...

This afternoon after attending Easter services and eating our huge dinner, the kids gathered around the big television to watch what any red-blooded American child would... *Underdog* (ok... so perhaps not that many). I was pleasantly surprised by the live-action version of the cartoon I remember watching as a child. It remained fairly faithful to the cartoon rekindling enough memories for the old and being fun for the young ones who probably do not remember the television series.

A bomb-sniffing beagle is released from the police force after he mistakenly sniffs out a ham instead of a bomb. While roaming the streets, the dog is captured by the evil scientist Dr. Simon Barsinister and is injected with a serum which gives him amazing superpowers. The dog escapes and becomes the pet of a security guard (played by Jim not John Belushi) and his teenage son, Jack and is given the name Shoeshine.

After discovering Shoeshine's powers, Jack decides to keep the secret to himself and convinces the reluctant pooch to use his powers to help those in distress. However as *Underdog* begins his exploits of daring-do, Simon and his henchman Cad continue to hunt for the beagle to use in their own sinister plot.

Ok... while it may not be the most ambitious movie ever made, *Underdog* did keep 7 children occupied for 90 minutes. It also had many tie-ins to the cartoon (Shoeshine, Sweet Polly Purebred voiced by *Enchanted's* Amy Adams, Simon Barsinister and his sidekick Cad, and Riff-Raff who was voiced by Brad Garrett). It was far better than what I expected. It also had a nice nod to another Disney animated film. *Underdog* and Sweet Polly's first date was reminiscent of *Lady and the Tramp's* spaghetti dinner (down to the single meatball).

---

# Betcha I've Seen Shutter More Than You!

Not that it's anything to brag about, but I saw the new movie [Shutter](#) not once, but twice this weekend! It was pretty good, if you like movies like [The Ring](#) and [The Grudge](#). There are a few other movies people say Shutter is like, but I haven't seen them. It did remind me a lot of The Ring – they were both super-natural ghost stories. I should have known I'd like it, at least that I'd like it better than [Doomsday](#), because the guy who gave Doomsday an "A" rating on [movies.com](#) gave Shutter a "D"! I'm starting to think he's a moron. I gave you the quote he made about Doomsday in a previous post of mine; he talked about how great all the violence was, yada, yada, so just to prove his idiocy, here is a snippet of what he thought of Shutter:

*"As unfrightening PG-13 horror films go, this unfrightening PG-13 horror film is the most unfrightening of the year. It's even more unfrightening than [The Eye](#), which featured such unfrightening scenes as [Jessica Alba](#) yelling into an oven. This one has unfrightening scenes of [Joshua Jackson](#) sitting in a chair. Okay, there is one jumpy moment. That happens when Joshua Jackson turns around really fast in that chair. All the 11 year-olds in the audience went, "AUUGGH!" when that part happened. So if you're 11, then that part is really going to freak you out."*

So according to the movies.com review guy, a movie is not good or scary if it doesn't have at least 3 decapitations, exploding animals, and some cannibalism. Whatever. He does have a point though – the 11-year-old in the theater with us was scared silly – which brings me to the reason we saw it

twice in one day...

Grandma was in town for a visit. Despite the impending snow storm (again), she was able to travel the 200+ miles to see her grandchildren, thank goodness. Who would have believed that we'd have to deal with Grandma almost having to cancel her spring break trip to Ohio because of still more SNOW! Thank you, Grandma, for taking the time and energy it took to come early to ensure the special time you were able to spend with the girls wasn't ruined by yet another snow storm. So anyway, with Grandma being in town, that left Hubby and I with a whole afternoon and evening to ourselves! Snowstorm or not, we were going to make the most of it... So we saw a matinee of Shutter, which we enjoyed. It wasn't scary, comes no where close to the creepiness of The Ring, but it was entertaining, and it saved itself from getting unbearably cheesy several times... A lot of the reviewers didn't like it, but I think they're just sick of the whole PG13-Asian-horror-movie-remake genre. As a side effect of the PG13 rating, during our matinee, there were obnoxious teenagers in the theater. Their laughing and running up and down the aisles wasn't totally obscene, but it did take away from some of the enjoyment of a horror movie. When they left the movie at the end, they had a younger boy with them who looked scared beyond belief. I think maybe all the laughing and whatnot was because they were actually really nervous and scared. So, when we explained their antics to the movie theater manager, they were completely understanding and told us we could go ahead and see it again. I didn't really catch anything that I missed the first time (except for one itty bitty scene where I dozed yet again), but it was fun to watch a horror movie again that no one else in the theater had seen yet because it was its first day out in the theaters – you knew when the scary parts were coming and could watch the whole theater jump and gasp.

If you are a fan of the PG13-Asian-horror-movie-remake genre, I think you'll like Shutter. If not, it might not be what

you're looking for in a movie, unless you're between the ages of 14-23.

---

## Doomsday – Not Just a Clever Title

The movie [Doomsday](#) is about a virus that wipes out all of Scotland. I'm not really inspired to write much about it because I didn't like the movie. I can't even think of anyone I know who would. I wasn't bored at the theater, but you couldn't pay me to watch this movie again. First of all, it wasn't my type of movie. It was sci-fi and took place in the future, which is already 2 strikes against it as far as I'm concerned. And then there was the violence. The never-ending, non-stop, constantly gruesome and always bloody violence. People died in any and every way you can imagine and some hopefully you can't. I lost count after 5 decapitations, all very graphic, and there were also scenes of people getting squished, burned alive, smashed by cars... like I said, you name a method of torture, it was in this movie. I was not expecting this. I thought the movie was going to be more like *Outbreak*, where people try to combat the virus together – I would classify that as more of a drama from what I can remember. After seeing *Doomsday*, I even had a dream involving severed limbs last night... thank goodness it wasn't nearly as graphic or bloody as the movie... I wouldn't even classify it as a nightmare. And don't go thinking I'm some kind of weirdo – if you were exposed to almost 2 hrs. of that kind of violence, you would understand why it came across in my sleep! But anyway, *Doomsday* definitely goes on my *Worst Movies I've Seen* list. So far the list consists of:

1. [The Night Listener](#)
2. [The Producers](#) (2005)
3. [Doomsday](#)
4. [The Devil's Rejects](#)
5. [Meet the Spartans](#) – I'm actually going to remove this one – it doesn't really qualify as a movie, plus I didn't see the whole thing. I KNEW it was going to be horrible, but my husband wanted to try it for some reason... we lasted for about 10 mins, if that.

This list is in no particular order. It's really difficult to do that because they were all horrible in their own unique ways. I liked the original [Producers](#) (1968), but I never even saw the whole remake with [Nathan Lane](#) and [Matthew Broderick](#) because I couldn't get past the first scene, which is rare for me, usually I will stick it out. The Night Listener was horrible because it was predictable and dumb, but I would much rather sit thru that movie again than be subjected to Doomsday and all the violence again... But when I saw each of them for the first time, I was more entertained by Doomsday than by The Night Listener... so it just depends on the movie and what you mean by worst. But they are all worthy of being classified as the worst movies I've ever seen, for one reason or another, some more than others.

I was totally surprised that Doomsday ended up being so bad after seeing that [movies.com](#) gave it an "A" as a rating! I used to have this theory that I would go opposite whatever the critics said about a movie, and I think I will have to continue that trend. If I remember correctly, Ebert and Roeper gave Devil's Rejects "2 Thumbs Up". As I said, [movies.com](#) liked Doomsday, but I think the following excerpt of their critic's review just about says it all – I say, see this movie at your own risk, on a dare, or if for some reason you are getting paid. Otherwise, don't

bother with it, don't know why we did!

From movies.com:

*"Name something you want in an ultraviolent action thriller and this movie delivers it. Impalement, decapitation, decapitated heads being affixed back onto bodies only to then take arrows through the skull and fall off again, motorcycles decorated with human skeletons, cannibalism, exploding bunnies, insane car chases, wacky costumes, incomprehensible editing, an indestructible a hot chick heroine (Rhona Mitra, who looks like what would happen if Kate Beckinsale and Victoria Beckham had a baby that was the Terminator) whose hotness grows in tandem with the number of people she mows down in the name of truth. Does it suck? Sorta. Is that awesome? Absolutely. In terms of sheer excitement, it's the best movie of 2008."*

NOTE FROM ME – Best movie of 2008? I don't think it's a coincidence that we're only in the 3rd month!

---

## **You Can't Make This Up**

There are so many movies out there that no one has ever heard of least of all seen. I am sure that there are entire sites dedicated to the B-movie genre. Just cruising the net I came up with a few dandies which may be worth a peek on 3AM television or in the 50 cent rack at your local video rental shop.

How about "Attack of the Killer Refrigerator?" The refrigerator of fitness guru Richard Simmons is fed up with the Sweatin' to the Oldies and the lack of good old fashioned junk food. The appliance develops a complex and seeks revenge

by tracking down the thousands of people helped by the exercise video series and turns them into zombies.

Another fine title: "The Brain that Wouldn't Die" is one that I have actually heard of. This masterpiece concerns a doctor whose girlfriend loses her head. The good physician preserves the head and still functioning brain in order to reattach it to a suitable body.

My personal favorite title: "Incredibly Strange Creatures Who Stopped Living And Became Mixed Up Zombies." This is the epic story of a pig who is jilted by his porcine princess. The porker turns into a zombie and vows revenge.

If you are a fan of cult movies, Mystery Science Theatre 3000, or just plain bad movies that no one in their right mind would ever watch, then I urge you to track them down. Or, they may just pop in in a great game of Balderdash.

---

## Skating On Very Thin Ice

I was debating on which blog to write this post. I, personally, have had enough of filmmakers making the same movie over and over again and attempting to make it a sequel. There has been Cruel [Intentions I and II](#) (based on the film [Dangerous Liaisons](#)). It even had the same characters but played by different actors. Last night, [The Cutting Edge 3](#) premiered. I did not tune in as I have seen the [first movie](#) at least once (and that is enough, thank you). The first movie starred D.B. Sweeney (a B-movie actor if there ever was one) as a hockey player who either is passed his prime or is injured. Somehow, he becomes the partner of an Olympic-medal hopeful figure skater (Moirra Kelley). What follows is as predictable as any [Dirty Dancing](#)-esque movie could be. The two meet, argue,

attempt to work together, fall apart, get back together, and finally perfect their routine enough to compete. Did I mention that they also fall in love... how predictable?

OH... forgive me please. [The Cutting Edge 2](#) features the daughter of the characters of the original. It seems she has the same dream as her mother and meets and falls for her headstrong, stubborn skating partner. I'm sure that it is as brilliant as the first movie... only the character names have been changed (or most) to protect the integrity of the first movie.

Unfortunately, I could find no synopsis for The Cutting Edge 3 to compare the plots of the trilogy. However, I can provide the following as a possible scenario:

A former hockey pro reluctantly agrees to become the partner of a stubborn, self-centered Olympic figure skating hopeful. Sexual tension begins to rise as they struggle to go for the gold.

Strange, but they seem like a case of been there, seen that, and seeing that was not so great. So enough of Hollywood rehashes posing as sequels even if they are direct to video or made-for-television. At the very least, [Grease 2](#) attempted to be a completely different story... but that is another turkey.

---

## **Horton Hears a ZZZzzzzz...**

Took the kids to see [Horton Hears a Who](#) today. Ok, so the title of the blog is a bit misleading... it wasn't really boring. I am just so tired that I'm 2 for 2 in the falling asleep in the movie theater tally this week. I actually liked what I saw of the movie. With the exception of my 3-year-old



running up and down the aisle, I enjoyed the experience. It wasn't totally her fault though; we went to an Easter egg hunt this morning, so she had LOTS of sugar coursing through her veins, which is why she was extra-hyper and running around the movie theater. Once we flushed the sugar with plenty of non-sugary fluids, I was able to relax and enjoy the show – after a trip to the bathroom, of course. It should actually be called a candy clean-up since they pick candy up off the floor; it has nothing to do with Easter eggs or hunting. Still fun though, I'm just saying.

Before the movie started, I found myself wishing I had read the book, just to see how close the movie is to the book because now I have no idea. But as far as Dr. Suess movies go, this is the best one I've seen. Then again, I HATED [The Cat in the Hat](#), and never saw the live-action version of [How the Grinch Stole Christmas](#), so there's not much to compare it to in that respect.

The movie is about an elephant named Horton who lives in a jungle in what must be a fictional place because to my knowledge, there aren't any jungles that have both kangaroos and elephants as indigenous species. I know, it's just a Dr. Suess movie and I'm probably reading too far into it, but I can't help but think of that sort of thing. And judging by Horton's ears, he is an African elephant, not an Asian elephant... ok, I'll stop. So anyway, Horton hears a Who. A Who is actually a type of teeny-tiny person that lives in Whoville, all of which is located on a speck on a clover. The rest of the story is about how Horton tries to save Whoville from a conniving kangaroo (played by the brilliant [Carol Burnett](#)) intent on destroying it. I don't usually like when I know the big-name actors voicing roles in an animated movie – it kind of distracts me, which is what happened when I heard [Jim Carrey](#) as the voice of Horton. His voice also made the Horton character seem less cute to me, but I did like Carol Burnett as that scheming kangaroo. And, hearing [Steve](#)

[Carell](#) as the mayor of Whoville was not distracting at all – he is even good at voice-over acting – is there ever a role he'll butcher? Watching the opening credits, I noticed a plethora of recognizable actors lending voicework for this movie; among them: Jim Carrey, Steve Carell, Carol Burnett, [Will Arnett](#) (from Arrested Development), [Seth Rogan](#), [Isla Fisher](#) (from Wedding Crashers – she was surprisingly good as a cartoon voice), [Jonah Hill](#), and [Amy Poehler](#).

It's a cute movie that's perfect for the whole family, even though my 3-year-old asked about where the princesses were until the last 10 minutes of the movie. When it was over, she did say she liked it, sans princesses and all. There are some jokes for the parents that will go over the kids' heads, and that's always enjoyable in a kids' movie – although I could have done without the kangaroo saying, "This is the jungle; we can't behave like wild animals." – just WAY too cheesy, think I've even heard that joke before somewhere else! I loved how the Mayor of Whoville has 96 daughters and 1 son – someday I might know what that is like! Is that in the book I wonder? It seems almost too clever to be an add-in for the movie... Either way, I will have to go borrow the book from the library to see how close the movie followed it, but I have heard that the book is pretty closely followed. I've always liked Dr. Suess, and it's a shame he's not still around to gift us with any more of his work or to see his creations come to life on the big screen.

---

## **Winning Isn't Everything**

While having a few minutes free today, I flipped through the endless array of nothingness which is television (especially on a late Saturday afternoon). I happened across the game show

“Greed.” One of the multiple choice questions was: “Which four of the following has won a Best Actor Oscar.” The six possible answers were:

Al Pacino  
Robert Redford  
Paul Newman  
Michael Douglas  
Tom Cruise  
Nicolas Cage

The question got my head spinning about controversies in the category. George C. Scott refused the award for his portrayal of [Patton](#) because he did not like the way in which the character was presented. Marlon Brando refused the award for his role in one of the most acclaimed films in motion picture history, [The Godfather](#), in order to protest the mistreatment of Native Americans in motion pictures. Those are two of the most notable controversies in the 80 year history of the Best Actor award. Are there any others?

As for the question itself, I had to check the veracity of one of the correct responses. I was absolutely sure of one of the actors until it came up wrong. I was even certain of the role for which I was sure he had won. See if you can guess the correct four.

---

## **10,000 B.C. – When Movies Cost \$3**

Oh wait, that was tonight. Seriously. We saw [10,000 B.C.](#) (a new release, no less!) for **\$3 for 2 people!** It was a 5:00 movie at matinee price, plus bring a guest for free night =

\$3! Add in our popcorn and pop, and we spent less than \$10 for a new movie at the theater, with popcorn and a drink! Can't beat that! If we didn't live around the corner from the theater, we would have spent more on the gas to get there – more about gas prices in my next post, ugh.

We had heard that 10,000 B.C. was not a very good movie, but the other choices were [Spiderwick Chronicles](#) (which we really liked but have already seen) or [Fool's Gold](#), which I have no desire to see for some reason. 10,000 B.C. was exactly what the previews showed – an adventure movie set way way back into the past. I don't know how accurate it is, but the computer animation depicting early humans (though you forgot this fact given that many of them spoke perfect English) hunting woolly mammoths was pretty good, actually. In the movie, they also used the mammoths as “work horses” to haul blocks to build pyramids, which I didn't know, if this is indeed fact... interesting theory. Though they aren't clear if these are the Great Pyramids of Egypt, which I think were actually started more likely around 3,000 B.C. or after... but I'm no expert, this movie did get me thinking and wanted to research a bunch of stuff. It was neat to see everything interacting together, the early humans and the dwellings they built, the animals, the environment – a great way to envision the past, but it did have me wondering how much is based on scientific fact, like I said. I won't go into the plot, mostly because I sheepishly admit that I couldn't follow it. I didn't get my nap today, and I fell asleep during what were apparently a few pivotal scenes in the movie. But, for \$3, who cares? And don't think that the movie is boring either. I have 3 kids and I'm pregnant, I get very tired and could probably fall asleep anywhere without that daily nap I've been so lucky to have most days. And I did get to see [The Dark Knight](#) preview, which was pretty cool. I'm not a big fan of the Batman movies – I've only seen 1 and 3, but this one looks really dark and creepy. I think the whole [Heath Ledger](#) (R.I.P.) incident will sell tickets, but the previews might do a little ticket-

selling themselves... I can see why they say that role affected him in such a negative way – he looked really scary.

So, if you like lots of fighting; epic battle movies set in the past, or are just an admirer of CGI animation, check out 10,000 B.C. – especially if you can find it for \$1.50 / person!

---

## In The Beginning... .

There seems to be a fascination with franchise re-boots in movies today. If memory serves, one of the first was George Lucas' idea of deciding to tell the back story of Darth Vader. While the idea of *Star Wars* Episodes 1-3 seemed good in theory, it failed in many respects.

The plot of the trilogy had more to do with political mumbo-jumbo than actual lightsaber and space battles. It took three movies to explain how a Republic failed and became the Empire of the original *Star Wars* trilogy. Anakin Skywalker's transformation into Darth Vader almost seems like a secondary plot. And don't even get me started on the ridiculous concept of "midichlorians."

The acting seems stuffy in Episodes 1-3. Hayden Christensen's acting style is so wooden and forced that the audience really does not care about Anakin Skywalker. The dialogue makes it sound as if the audience is watching a Shakespearean play instead of the fun, swashbuckling atmosphere of episodes 4-6.

However, there are good moments in the second trilogy. [The Phantom Menace](#) includes a lightsaber duel between Obi-Wan Kenobi, his mentor Qui-Gon Ginn, and the evil Sith Lord Darth Maul. By the time [Attack of the Clones](#) came about, enough

technology had been created to allow Yoda to become more than a mere puppet and engage in his own lightsaber fight. Finally, [Revenge of the Sith](#) features the climactic battle between Obi-Wan Kenobi and Anakin Skywalker.

On a side note, the title *Revenge of the Sith* is a nod to the title which Episode 6 was to be. *Revenge of the Jedi* was to be the title of the final movie. At the last minute after posters, advertisements, and merchandise had already been created, George Lucas decided that a Jedi does not seek revenge. Therefore, the title was changed to [Return of the Jedi](#). *Star Wars* collectors must have a field day looking for and selling these rare pieces of memorabilia on [ebay](#) and at conventions.

While both trilogies are among the most popular movies in history, the redemption of Anakin Skywalker as seen in episodes 4-6 are much more imaginative than the newer films. However, if you are a *Star Wars* purist and want to know how and why Darth Vader came to be then you should watch the newer films which are the first in the timeline of the series...  
**WOOLY SHEEP!!! MORAT CONFUSING SELF!!!!!!**

---

## Awake... but I should have been asleep

Last night's movie was called [Awake](#), and it starred [Jessica Alba](#) and [Hayden Christensen](#). When I first saw Jessica Alba, I was not looking forward to seeing the movie, and I don't know why. It's not like I've seen anything else with her in it, but for some reason, I was under the impression that I didn't like her as an actress. I think it might be an interview I

saw with her on the Tyra Banks show – she came across as self-absorbed and dumb, and then the whole pregnant-out-of-wedlock thing doesn't score her many points either... Anyway, surprisingly, she was not the weak link in the movie. It was the script. The movie had tons of accuracy flaws, and I really don't want to spoil it for you in case you'd like to waste your time on it, but let's just say the movie was kind of pointless. It's about a young man who has a heart condition and must undergo a heart transplant. When they put him under anesthesia, he does not fall asleep but instead overhears the doctors plotting his murder. There actually is more to the plot, at least they pretend there is, and there are some so-called twists and turns that anyone with any movie watching experience can see coming from a mile away. Aside from the unbelievability of the plot – and I'm not talking about staying awake during surgery; according to the movie's tagline, it's actually more common than you'd like to think – I'm talking about when this guy is getting his surgery, his "spirit" is walking around the hospital experiencing flashbacks. It's just dumb and ridiculous. Anyway, aside from the unbelievability of the plot, I have to share what the dumbest part about the whole movie is. And I'm going to risk spoiling the movie for you, so if you might see this movie, stop reading now. But I just have to say what the dumbest thing about the whole movie is: there is no point to the main character's overhearing his murder plot! His mother, while waiting for his surgery to be completed, overhears everything anyway, the cops are called, yada, yada! I still don't consider watching this movie a waste of time – it's really difficult for me to say that about a movie. It was only 84 minutes long, and one of the rewards of watching the movie was seeing [Christopher McDonald](#) (aka Shooter McGavin from [Happy Gilmore](#)) as an alcoholic doctor who is too oblivious to stop the murder plot. But I would much rather see him for the 100th time as Shooter any day – I would suggest you don't waste your time with *Awake*, and go for something with more substance instead – like *Happy Gilmore*!

That sounds like a joke, but this movie was so bad, it's really not that funny – Happy Gilmore is a much better movie in my opinion!