
Subject: Crash

Posted by [lon](#) on Sat, 29 Oct 2005 19:29:16 GMT

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

While looking up info on David Cronenberg's "Crash" from 1996 or whenever it was, I spied this release on IMDb. It piqued my curiosity with its rave reviews. The reviews are elsewhere and I'm not going to give away much of the story as many net reviewers tend to do. Crash contains a full range of emotions for the viewer to experience from laughter to shock. A smaller picture like this and ones such as *Monsters Ball* (to which I think it has some affinity) get recognized by the critics and the awards outfits as a 'good taste' film. The good taste film is something that H'wood is obligated to do about once a year or so as a break from making fantasies about killing the demons (the war in Iraq) or historical epics about Crusades into foreign lands (the war in Iraq). Crash has to be considered a good taste film, even though it deals extensively with the important subject of modern-day racism. My big beef with the film which is admirably written by Paul Haggis (*Million Dollar Baby*, *Red Hot* -- one of my faves -- and others) is that he has gone to the same well that other H'wood good taste film makers have dipped in all too often. The well in this example is a plot line in which all (too many) characters are interweaved in a way that we, the audience, are supposed to perceive as being clever. Well, if *I* can spot this similarity, you probably will to. Crash is a worthwhile film for the emotional content. Just be advised that if it looks slightly familiar to other recent releases, that's because it is.

Crash promo at IMDb
