
Subject: Re: Star Wars (new v old)

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sat, 15 Aug 2009 23:26:09 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The original films, by far.

You know, because the cast could act. They were cliché, they were campy, but the characters had good chemistry and good lines. Special effects don't make good films, people do.

Ewan MacGregor, IMHO, was the only saving grace of the prequels. The handful of reprised roles were a nice touch, and Samuel L. Jackson was fun to watch, but the rest of the acting was wooden and the chemistry was nonexistent. Many of the effects came across as shoehorned in, existing lore was completely disregarded (hot tip, Lucas- you may be the creator, but you can't just let people publish fiction for more than two decades then throw it all out the window), and the camp- of which there was much- was decidedly not of the good variety. Anakin blows up giant starship by mistake? WTF? "Roger Roger?" Fuck you, Lucas.

Nevermind that the entire "plot" of the second prequel can be summed up thusly:
WWWAAAAAAANNNNNGGGSSSSSTTT!!!!!!1111!1!1!!!1oneoneoneeleventyshiftone!!!

And don't even get me started on the retconning inflicted upon the original movies after the prequels came out. That there was no DVD release before those three abortions of cinematic spooage is a horrible tragedy.

Pfeh.
