

---

Subject: Sin City

Posted by [lon](#) on Thu, 03 Nov 2005 21:56:32 GMT

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

---

Maybe I should make an outline: Sin City as a cartoon movie Sin City chiaroscuro: the use of light and shadow Sin City, the fantasy fulfillment of Ralph Bakshi's animation. Sin City: 13 year old-style jerk off film Sin City: cartoon as story board for an actual shoot. I'm over in windows now. i don't normally lose posts in Windows like I do in Linux, I lose mail. :-/ We wanted to talk about something different and I have recently seen Sin City-- twice. Got it on loan from the local library and so it's taken a while for me to get hold of it. After blowing off one long review type piece (the one you lose are always the best) I thought of Dark City with relation to this film because, you know, they're dark: dark in story and dark as in nighttime. For this reason and unlike Dark City, the world of Sin City is incomplete. We know why it's dark in Dark City. Where does Marv get his hair cut? This started to bother me. The characters are so narrow you can't really see them as having lives of their own. Would marv take an ax to his barber if the barber did not get his flat top just right? Things like this never bothered me in Dick Tracy with Warren Beatty. Next the chiaroscuro. That's a term from painting which means light against dark. This is the true art of Sin City. I recall over and over one scene of Bruce Willis whose eyes were just 'slits' that the light has captured just so... cartoon eyes like at the beginning of a Pink Panther film. It's likely that Sin City will and has been written about extensively for capturing that netherworld between animation/morphing/live action. Ralph Bakshi was the first mainstream animation filmmaker to explore the desire to see what is under the cloths of cartoon characters-- to sex them up beyond what is available to underage readers. So that desire remains dormant until--well, I can't say mine has ever been satisfied. Sin City is not a cartoon. What I put at the end of the first piece I wrote on this was the look of Sin City as comic made into storyboard for film and how that framed storyboard image was just on the edge of perception by the viewer in Sin City. This wasn't an artifice or maybe it was. To me, I saw "this is the end of that board" in a way that violated the normal willing suspension of disbelief. Robert Crumb and the film that was made about him called "Crumb" also came to mind after seeing Frank Miller himself. I got the idea that that ol' Frank was having more than a little Freudian compensation and displacement if not pure "transference" with his male characters. Well, it all turned out better the first time I wrote it, but now it's open for discussion. Wait, I forgot to mention "Sky Captain and the World of Tomorrow" as another all digital feature film and how that worked well in that as opposed to Sin City. Ok, here it comes before I lose it again...

---

Subject: Re: Sin City

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Thu, 03 Nov 2005 22:01:50 GMT

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

---

I dug it. Didn't put much thought into it, but I dug it.

---

Subject: Re: Sin City

Posted by [lon](#) on Thu, 03 Nov 2005 22:21:39 GMT

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

---

There's a lot in it-- some ground breaking stuff I think. some would say breaking that ground is not the best idea. I disagree. Back before the turn of the 20th Century there was a theater style called "Grande Guinol": a real buckets of blood theatre which, being live performance, often explained to the audience what body part was being ripped off. Grande Guinol always fascinated me but I never saw one. My concern with modern day film portraying torture is that it makes the sight of images from Abu Ghraib less forceful and so, preventing any adequate outcry. The hardening of the psyche in this way can do us no good as a people. As the ground breaking goes on from one plateau of violence to the next, the artist has to take some responsibility for those images. And so does the viewer.

---

---

Subject: Re: Sin City

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Thu, 03 Nov 2005 22:21:49 GMT

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

---

Lot of tricks borrowed from the Film Noir' directors. Dim; misty outlines suddenly brought into sharp relief against unfocused backdrops. Alienation; bleakness; disillusionment. "Touch of Evil", with Orson Welles does that real well. Samuel Fuller brought some to the table also; regarding this Sin City. All rooted in turn of the century German Expressionism. Good Stuff. Ever see the restored version of Touch of Evil?

---

---

Subject: Re: Sin City and Omar The Tentmaker

Posted by [lon](#) on Fri, 04 Nov 2005 04:42:58 GMT

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

---

I remember seeing ToE in a professor's conference room one afternoon and I had seen it other times as well. Dennis Weaver before he was Chester or McCloud. Mercedes McCambridge playing a butch. Heston in his pre-gun nut hero days. The story is, after time, pretty vague. Orson Wells as Omar The Tentmaker: a bad cop covering up evidence or something. What's different about the restored version? As to Noir, I can actually point you to noir swing music made in the late 90's. The band is called Blue Plate Special. The name of the tune is "A Message For Paul Drake": Perry Mason from Paul Drake's point of view. A great song. If you want it, let me know.

---

---

Subject: Re: Sin City and Omar The Tentmaker

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Fri, 04 Nov 2005 14:10:20 GMT

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

---

The restored version has added plot pieces and dialogue. It is also computer enhanced to the point that it reminds me of the Sin City look. I like Orson Welles; he is never boring or trite and insipid. Loco maybe but if that was a criteria for judgement we would all be gone. Sure; I'll take anything of interest but you must let me reciprocate.

---

---

Subject: Re: Sin City

Posted by [mollecon](#) on Sun, 19 Feb 2006 00:19:01 GMT

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

---

I liked it, thought it made good in the cartoon-to-movie department - pretty facinating. I didn't expect the characters to be in-dept psycological studies - it's not that type of movie

---