

---

Subject: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?

Posted by [TMC](#) on Sat, 09 Mar 2013 09:38:16 GMT

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

---

<http://officialfan.proboards.com/index.cgi?board=offtopic&action=display&thread=467415>

I'm of the opinion that MST3K should have been liked Doctor Who and just had a revolving cast. The concept just seems too good to not keep going and the types of characters (a host, an evil scientist, her goons, the bots) seem flexible enough to cast a different actors into.

There would of course be downsides. For instance there are only so many and movies out there and even fewer that MST3K could show and would suit the format. However, taking into account they have the entire history of cinema to work with it would be quite a while before they ran out. Plus, time wouldn't just stand still and new bad movies would continue being made. Also, as a last resort they could always use the same movie twice. I'm sure a Manos riffing from 2013 with an all new cast would be quite different from the original.

Another downside could be that some replacements could be weak and thus entire years of the show could be lame. However, that's something every continuous series has to face.

---

---

Subject: Re: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?

Posted by [Professor Bubba](#) on Sat, 09 Mar 2013 11:23:14 GMT

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

---

In article

<dcbe948f-3c33-4b0b-881b-332bbf1ac455@i5g2000pbj.googlegroups.com>, TMC  
<tmc1982@gmail.com> wrote:

>  
> <http://officialfan.proboards.com/index.cgi?board=offtopic&action=display&thread=467415>  
>  
> I'm of the opinion that MST3K should have been liked Doctor Who and  
> just had a revolving cast. The concept just seems too good to not keep  
> going and the types of characters (a host, an evil scientist, her  
> goons, the bots) seem flexible enough to cast a different actors into.  
>  
> There would of course be downsides. For instance there are only so  
> many and movies out there and even fewer that MST3K could show and  
> would suit the format. However, taking into account they have the  
> entire history of cinema to work with it would be quite a while before  
> they ran out. Plus, time wouldn't just stand still and new bad movies  
> would continue being made. Also, as a last resort they could always

- > use the same movie twice. I'm sure a Manos riffing from 2013 with an
- > all new cast would be quite different from the original.
- >
- > Another downside could be that some replacements could be weak and
- > thus entire years of the show could be lame. However, that's something
- > every continuous series has to face.

MST3K was tapped out long before it went away. I loved it long time, but Joel left and, all of a sudden, everybody seemed to be trying too hard to be funny. The shark jumped for me when they did the 1952 flick Invasion U.S.A., and they missed all sorts of beats. The film "starred" Edward G. Robinson Jr., but there wasn't even a line about that. They did make a point of riffing on the two Lois Lanes (Phyllis Coates and Noel Neill both appear briefly, and separately, in the film), but they somehow misidentified another actress as Phyllis. How do you do something like MST3K and not know who Phyllis Coates is?

Joel and others later did a thing called Cinematic Titanic, which had the same flavor as MST3K with silhouettes and all, while Mike and crew did audio-only commentary tracks that you're supposed to sync with your copy of the movie. This neatly saved Mike all that licensing money and permission-seeking. Neither effort seemed to gain any traction, though.

---

Subject: Re: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Sat, 09 Mar 2013 16:31:06 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <090320130623148920%bubba@nowhere.edu.invalid>, Professor Bubba <bubba@nowhere.edu.invalid> wrote:

- > In article
- > <dcbe948f-3c33-4b0b-881b-332bbf1ac455@i5g2000pbj.googlegroups.com>, TMC
- > <tmc1982@gmail.com> wrote:
- >
- >>
- >> <http://officialfan.proboards.com/index.cgi?board=offtopic&am p;action=display&thr>
- >> ea
- >> d=467415
- >>
- >> I'm of the opinion that MST3K should have been liked Doctor Who and
- >> just had a revolving cast. The concept just seems too good to not keep
- >> going and the types of characters (a host, an evil scientist, her
- >> goons, the bots) seem flexible enough to cast a different actors into.
- >>
- >> There would of course be downsides. For instance there are only so

>> many and movies out there and even fewer that MST3K could show and  
>> would suit the format. However, taking into account they have the  
>> entire history of cinema to work with it would be quite a while before  
>> they ran out. Plus, time wouldn't just stand still and new bad movies  
>> would continue being made. Also, as a last resort they could always  
>> use the same movie twice. I'm sure a Manos riffing from 2013 with an  
>> all new cast would be quite different from the original.

>>

>> Another downside could be that some replacements could be weak and  
>> thus entire years of the show could be lame. However, that's something  
>> every continuous series has to face.

>

>

> MST3K was tapped out long before it went away. I loved it long time,  
> but Joel left and, all of a sudden, everybody seemed to be trying too  
> hard to be funny. The shark jumped for me when they did the 1952 flick  
> Invasion U.S.A., and they missed all sorts of beats. The film

For me it jumped with the movie and THIS ISLAND EARTH.

> "starred" Edward G. Robinson Jr., but there wasn't even a line about  
> that. They did make a point of riffing on the two Lois Lanes (Phyllis  
> Coates and Noel Neill both appear briefly, and separately, in the  
> film), but they somehow misidentified another actress as Phyllis. How  
> do you do something like MST3K and not know who Phyllis Coates is?

>

> Joel and others later did a thing called Cinematic Titanic, which had  
> the same flavor as MST3K with silhouettes and all, while Mike and crew  
> did audio-only commentary tracks that you're supposed to sync with your  
> copy of the movie. This neatly saved Mike all that licensing money and  
> permission-seeking. Neither effort seemed to gain any traction,  
> though.

I think Cinema Titanic is dead, but Rifftrax is still going, and pretty  
funny (Birdemic is a riot).

--

"Every time a Kardashian gets a TV show, an angel dies."

---

Subject: Re: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?  
Posted by [Mason Barge](#) on Sat, 09 Mar 2013 17:23:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Sat, 09 Mar 2013 06:23:14 -0500, Professor Bubba  
<bubba@nowhere.edu.invalid> wrote:

> In article

> <dcbe948f-3c33-4b0b-881b-332bbf1ac455@i5g2000pbj.googlegroups.com>, TMC  
> <tmc1982@gmail.com> wrote:  
>  
>>  
>> [http://officialfan.proboards.com/index.cgi?board=offtopic&am p;action=display&threa  
>> d=467415](http://officialfan.proboards.com/index.cgi?board=offtopic&am p;action=display&threa d=467415)  
>>  
>> I'm of the opinion that MST3K should have been liked Doctor Who and  
>> just had a revolving cast. The concept just seems too good to not keep  
>> going and the types of characters (a host, an evil scientist, her  
>> goons, the bots) seem flexible enough to cast a different actors into.  
>>  
>> There would of course be downsides. For instance there are only so  
>> many and movies out there and even fewer that MST3K could show and  
>> would suit the format. However, taking into account they have the  
>> entire history of cinema to work with it would be quite a while before  
>> they ran out. Plus, time wouldn't just stand still and new bad movies  
>> would continue being made. Also, as a last resort they could always  
>> use the same movie twice. I'm sure a Manos riffing from 2013 with an  
>> all new cast would be quite different from the original.  
>>  
>> Another downside could be that some replacements could be weak and  
>> thus entire years of the show could be lame. However, that's something  
>> every continuous series has to face.  
>  
>  
> MST3K was tapped out long before it went away. I loved it long time,  
> but Joel left and, all of a sudden, everybody seemed to be trying too  
> hard to be funny. The shark jumped for me when they did the 1952 flick  
> Invasion U.S.A., and they missed all sorts of beats.

It was indeed a shame. It could have "theoretically" gone on for decades -- wouldn't you love to hear them do an episode from Revolution, or Last Resort, or some similar? Walking Dead?

---

**Subject: Re: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?**  
Posted by [Michael OConnor](#) on Sun, 10 Mar 2013 02:55:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Mar 9, 11:31 am, anim8rFSK <anim8r...@cox.net> wrote:  
> In article <090320130623148920%bu...@nowhere.edu.invalid>,  
> Professor Bubba <bu...@nowhere.edu.invalid> wrote:  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>

>  
>  
>  
>  
>> In article  
>> <dcbe948f-3c33-4b0b-881b-332bbf1ac...@i5g2000pbj.googlegroups.com>, TMC  
>> <tmc1...@gmail.com> wrote:  
>  
>>> <http://officialfan.proboards.com/index.cgi?board=offtopic&am p;action=disp...>  
>>> ea  
>>> d=467415  
>  
>>> I'm of the opinion that MST3K should have been liked Doctor Who and  
>>> just had a revolving cast. The concept just seems too good to not keep  
>>> going and the types of characters (a host, an evil scientist, her  
>>> goons, the bots) seem flexible enough to cast a different actors into..  
>  
>>> There would of course be downsides. For instance there are only so  
>>> many and movies out there and even fewer that MST3K could show and  
>>> would suit the format. However, taking into account they have the  
>>> entire history of cinema to work with it would be quite a while before  
>>> they ran out. Plus, time wouldn't just stand still and new bad movies  
>>> would continue being made. Also, as a last resort they could always  
>>> use the same movie twice. I'm sure a Manos riffing from 2013 with an  
>>> all new cast would be quite different from the original.  
>  
>>> Another downside could be that some replacements could be weak and  
>>> thus entire years of the show could be lame. However, that's something  
>>> every continuous series has to face.  
>  
>> MST3K was tapped out long before it went away. I loved it long time,  
>> but Joel left and, all of a sudden, everybody seemed to be trying too  
>> hard to be funny. The shark jumped for me when they did the 1952 flick  
>> Invasion U.S.A., and they missed all sorts of beats. The film  
>  
> For me it jumped with the movie and THIS ISLAND EARTH.  
>  
>> "starred" Edward G. Robinson Jr., but there wasn't even a line about  
>> that. They did make a point of riffing on the two Lois Lanes (Phyllis  
>> Coates and Noel Neill both appear briefly, and separately, in the  
>> film), but they somehow misidentified another actress as Phyllis. How  
>> do you do something like MST3K and not know who Phyllis Coates is?  
>  
>> Joel and others later did a thing called Cinematic Titanic, which had  
>> the same flavor as MST3K with silhouettes and all, while Mike and crew  
>> did audio-only commentary tracks that you're supposed to sync with your  
>> copy of the movie. This neatly saved Mike all that licensing money and  
>> permission-seeking. Neither effort seemed to gain any traction,

>> though.

>

> I think Cinema Titanic is dead, but Rifftrax is still going, and pretty  
> funny (Birdemic is a riot).

I went to see Cinematic Titanic a year ago, and they did some crappy low budget 70's movie about this serial killer who could travel via his astral form from prison and his ghost or whatever was going around murdering women in the small town he came from. I thought it was very funny, and I don't understand why they can't adapt CT to television.

---

---

Subject: Re: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?  
Posted by [Remysun](#) on Sun, 10 Mar 2013 03:44:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Mar 9, 12:23 pm, Mason Barge <masonba...@gmail.com> wrote:

> It was indeed a shame. It could have "theoretically" gone on for  
> decades -- wouldn't you love to hear them do an episode from  
> Revolution, or Last Resort, or some similar? Walking Dead?

Dave Barry kind of did that blogging about 24. It was awesome.

---

---

Subject: Re: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?  
Posted by [Obveeus](#) on Sun, 10 Mar 2013 03:58:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"Remysun" <remysun2000@yahoo.com> wrote:

> On Mar 9, 12:23 pm, Mason Barge <masonba...@gmail.com> wrote:

>

>> It was indeed a shame. It could have "theoretically" gone on for  
>> decades -- wouldn't you love to hear them do an episode from  
>> Revolution, or Last Resort, or some similar? Walking Dead?

>

> Dave Barry kind of did that blogging about 24. It was awesome.

For people that like to watch bad movies, one option is a subscription with:  
<http://www.cultmovienetwork.com/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?  
Posted by [Mason Barge](#) on Sun, 10 Mar 2013 17:06:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Sat, 9 Mar 2013 19:44:12 -0800 (PST), Remysun

<remysun2000@yahoo.com> wrote:

> On Mar 9, 12:23 pm, Mason Barge <masonba...@gmail.com> wrote:  
>  
>> It was indeed a shame. It could have "theoretically" gone on for  
>> decades -- wouldn't you love to hear them do an episode from  
>> Revolution, or Last Resort, or some similar? Walking Dead?  
>  
> Dave Barry kind of did that blogging about 24. It was awesome.

Now that HAD to be funny. I might have to look it up :)

---

---

Subject: Re: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?  
Posted by [Remysun](#) on Mon, 11 Mar 2013 02:46:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Mar 10, 1:06 pm, Mason Barge <masonba...@gmail.com> wrote:  
> On Sat, 9 Mar 2013 19:44:12 -0800 (PST), Remysun  
>  
> <remysun2...@yahoo.com> wrote:  
>> On Mar 9, 12:23 pm, Mason Barge <masonba...@gmail.com> wrote:  
>  
>>> It was indeed a shame. It could have "theoretically" gone on for  
>>> decades -- wouldn't you love to hear them do an episode from  
>>> Revolution, or Last Resort, or some similar? Walking Dead?  
>  
>> Dave Barry kind of did that blogging about 24. It was awesome.  
>  
> Now that HAD to be funny. I might have to look it up :)

Be sure to check out the other fan comments alongside. Take a season set. Read along as you press play, it's sublime.

---

---

Subject: Re: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?  
Posted by [George Johnson](#) on Mon, 11 Mar 2013 10:48:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"TMC" <tmc1982@gmail.com> wrote in message  
news:dcbe948f-3c33-4b0b-881b-332bbf1ac455@i5g2000pbj.googlegroups.com...  
> <http://officialfan.proboards.com/index.cgi?board=offtopic&amp;p;action=display&thread=467415>  
>  
> I'm of the opinion that MST3K should have been liked Doctor Who and  
> just had a revolving cast. The concept just seems too good to not keep  
> going and the types of characters (a host, an evil scientist, her  
> goons, the bots) seem flexible enough to cast a different actors into.



- >
- > There would of course be downsides. For instance there are only so
- > many and movies out there and even fewer that MST3K could show and
- > would suit the format. However, taking into account they have the
- > entire history of cinema to work with it would be quite a while before
- > they ran out. Plus, time wouldn't just stand still and new bad movies
- > would continue being made. Also, as a last resort they could always
- > use the same movie twice. I'm sure a Manos riffing from 2013 with an
- > all new cast would be quite different from the original.
- >
- > Another downside could be that some replacements could be weak and
- > thus entire years of the show could be lame. However, that's something
- > every continuous series has to face.

Ah, the classic dilemma of success.

Retire while in strength & optimism or fade into obscurity as your fanbase grows bored?

Take "The Simpsons", many folks felt it should've ended within the first decade, others prefer the current version.

You can continue altering your new fan's perceptions by shaking up the cast or try to remain the same through decades.

Popular success can be just as much a burden as an obscure mediocre-but-useful day job.

---

Subject: Re: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Mon, 11 Mar 2013 13:13:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <ODi%5Cs.55332\$sl3.11813@newsfe22.iad>,  
"George Johnson" <matrix29@charter.net> wrote:

- > "TMC" <tmc1982@gmail.com> wrote in message
- > news:dcbe948f-3c33-4b0b-881b-332bbf1ac455@i5g2000pbj.googlegroups.com...
- >> <http://officialfan.proboards.com/index.cgi?board=offtopic&amp;p;action=display&thead=467415>
- >>
- >> I'm of the opinion that MST3K should have been liked Doctor Who and
- >> just had a revolving cast. The concept just seems too good to not keep
- >> going and the types of characters (a host, an evil scientist, her
- >> goons, the bots) seem flexible enough to cast a different actors into.
- >>
- >> There would of course be downsides. For instance there are only so
- >> many and movies out there and even fewer that MST3K could show and
- >> would suit the format. However, taking into account they have the
- >> entire history of cinema to work with it would be quite a while before



- >> they ran out. Plus, time wouldn't just stand still and new bad movies
- >> would continue being made. Also, as a last resort they could always
- >> use the same movie twice. I'm sure a Manos riffing from 2013 with an
- >> all new cast would be quite different from the original.
- >>
- >> Another downside could be that some replacements could be weak and
- >> thus entire years of the show could be lame. However, that's something
- >> every continuous series has to face.
- >
- > Ah, the classic dilemma of success.
- > Retire while in strength & optimism or fade into obscurity as your
- > fanbase grows bored?
- >
- > Take "The Simpsons", many folks felt it should've ended within the first
- > decade, others prefer the current version.
- > You can continue altering your new fan's perceptions by shaking up the
- > cast or try to remain the same through decades.
- >
- > Popular success can be just as much a burden as an obscure
- > mediocre-but-useful day job.

One big problem is that the creators kept leaving (and new ones came in) and everybody got a piece of the pie. They usually cite this as the reason they can't bring the show back; too many controlling interests.

--

"Every time a Kardashian gets a TV show, an angel dies."

---

---

Subject: Re: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?  
Posted by [moviePig](#) on Mon, 11 Mar 2013 14:15:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Mar 11, 6:48 am, "George Johnson" <matri...@charter.net> wrote:

- > "TMC" <tmc1...@gmail.com> wrote in message
- >
- > news:dcbe948f-3c33-4b0b-881b-332bbf1ac455@i5g2000pbj.googlegroups.com...
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >> <http://officialfan.proboards.com/index.cgi?board=offtopic&am p;action=disp...>
- >

>> I'm of the opinion that MST3K should have been liked Doctor Who and  
>> just had a revolving cast. The concept just seems too good to not keep  
>> going and the types of characters (a host, an evil scientist, her  
>> goons, the bots) seem flexible enough to cast a different actors into.  
>  
>> There would of course be downsides. For instance there are only so  
>> many and movies out there and even fewer that MST3K could show and  
>> would suit the format. However, taking into account they have the  
>> entire history of cinema to work with it would be quite a while before  
>> they ran out. Plus, time wouldn't just stand still and new bad movies  
>> would continue being made. Also, as a last resort they could always  
>> use the same movie twice. I'm sure a Manos riffing from 2013 with an  
>> all new cast would be quite different from the original.  
>  
>> Another downside could be that some replacements could be weak and  
>> thus entire years of the show could be lame. However, that's something  
>> every continuous series has to face.  
>  
> Ah, the classic dilemma of success.  
> Retire while in strength & optimism or fade into obscurity as your  
> fanbase grows bored?  
>  
> Take "The Simpsons", many folks felt it should've ended within the first  
> decade, others prefer the current version.  
> You can continue altering your new fan's perceptions by shaking up the  
> cast or try to remain the same through decades.  
>  
> Popular success can be just as much a burden as an obscure  
> mediocre-but-useful day job.

Admittedly, 'The Simpsons' is a living miracle. Nevertheless, if you  
want to start a petition that all series should be mini-series, I'll  
sign.

--

-----

YOUR taste at work...

<http://www.moviepig.com>

---

Subject: Re: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?  
Posted by [Ken McElhaney](#) on Mon, 11 Mar 2013 18:41:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Mar 9, 6:23 am, Professor Bubba <bu...@nowhere.edu.invalid> wrote:  
> In article  
> <dcbe948f-3c33-4b0b-881b-332bbf1ac...@i5g2000pbj.googlegroups.com>, TMC

>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> <tmc1...@gmail.com> wrote:  
>  
>> <http://officialfan.proboards.com/index.cgi?board=offtopic&am p;action=disp...>  
>> d=467415  
>  
>> I'm of the opinion that MST3K should have been liked Doctor Who and  
>> just had a revolving cast. The concept just seems too good to not keep  
>> going and the types of characters (a host, an evil scientist, her  
>> goons, the bots) seem flexible enough to cast a different actors into.  
>  
>> There would of course be downsides. For instance there are only so  
>> many and movies out there and even fewer that MST3K could show and  
>> would suit the format. However, taking into account they have the  
>> entire history of cinema to work with it would be quite a while before  
>> they ran out. Plus, time wouldn't just stand still and new bad movies  
>> would continue being made. Also, as a last resort they could always  
>> use the same movie twice. I'm sure a Manos riffing from 2013 with an  
>> all new cast would be quite different from the original.  
>  
>> Another downside could be that some replacements could be weak and  
>> thus entire years of the show could be lame. However, that's something  
>> every continuous series has to face.  
>  
> MST3K was tapped out long before it went away. I loved it long time,  
> but Joel left and, all of a sudden, everybody seemed to be trying too  
> hard to be funny. The shark jumped for me when they did the 1952 flick  
> Invasion U.S.A., and they missed all sorts of beats. The film  
> "starred" Edward G. Robinson Jr., but there wasn't even a line about  
> that. They did make a point of riffing on the two Lois Lanes (Phyllis  
> Coates and Noel Neill both appear briefly, and separately, in the  
> film), but they somehow misidentified another actress as Phyllis. How  
> do you do something like MST3K and not know who Phyllis Coates is?  
>  
> Joel and others later did a thing called Cinematic Titanic, which had  
> the same flavor as MST3K with silhouettes and all, while Mike and crew  
> did audio-only commentary tracks that you're supposed to sync with your  
> copy of the movie. This neatly saved Mike all that licensing money and  
> permission-seeking. Neither effort seemed to gain any traction,  
> though.

I guess it depends on what you mean by "traction". While the demise of Cinematic Titanic is one thing, Rifftrax has done quite well for itself. In fact, a Kickstarter campaign to raise money to live riff "Twilight" is now four times past its goal. No traction? Well, it was never the intention of Rifftrax to go on cable TV, but they regularly produce new riffs on full length movies, have VOD that can be downloaded and shorts as well.

I think "successful" would more accurately describe Rifftrax whether you care for the humor or not anymore, they have succeeded in creating a profitable business venture for several years now and show little sign of letting up.

Ken

---

---

Subject: Re: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?  
Posted by [Barb May](#) on Mon, 11 Mar 2013 20:14:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ken McElhaney wrote:

> I think "successful" would more accurately describe Rifftrax whether  
> you care for the humor or not anymore, they have succeeded in creating  
> a profitable business venture for several years now and show little  
> sign of letting up.  
>  
> Ken

Love those guys...

I prefer downloading the movies with the Rifftrax already included (via torrents), so I've donated some money to them via the PayPal "donate" link on their web site.

--  
Barb

---

---

Subject: Re: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?  
Posted by [Professor Bubba](#) on Mon, 11 Mar 2013 20:24:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article  
<05b27dde-3ab7-47e1-9907-abb284bfa107@i5g2000pbj.googlegroups.com>, Ken  
McElhaney <mcelhaney@hotmail.com> wrote:

> On Mar 9, 6:23 am, Professor Bubba <bu...@nowhere.edu.invalid> wrote:

>> Joel and others later did a thing called Cinematic Titanic, which had  
>> the same flavor as MST3K with silhouettes and all, while Mike and crew  
>> did audio-only commentary tracks that you're supposed to sync with your  
>> copy of the movie. This neatly saved Mike all that licensing money and  
>> permission-seeking. Neither effort seemed to gain any traction,  
>> though.

>

> I guess it depends on what you mean by "traction". While the demise of  
> Cinematic Titanic is one thing, Rifftrax has done quite well for  
> itself. In fact, a Kickstarter campaign to raise money to live riff  
> "Twilight" is now four times past its goal. No traction? Well, it was  
> never the intention of Rifftrax to go on cable TV, but they regularly  
> produce new riffs on full length movies, have VOD that can be  
> downloaded and shorts as well.

>

> I think "successful" would more accurately describe Rifftrax whether  
> you care for the humor or not anymore, they have succeeded in creating  
> a profitable business venture for several years now and show little  
> sign of letting up.

I'm happy for Mike et al. that Rifftrax is still going, but it's never  
become a "thing." I know that what I meant by "traction" wasn't clear.

I didn't know that Cinematic Titanic had flatlined. I did know that no  
one was talking about it, though, the same way nobody talks about  
Rifftrax (where "nobody" may also mean "hardly anybody").

---

Subject: Re: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?  
Posted by [Ken McElhaney](#) on Mon, 11 Mar 2013 21:56:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Mar 11, 3:24 pm, Professor Bubba <bu...@nowhere.edu.invalid> wrote:

> In article  
> <05b27dde-3ab7-47e1-9907-abb284bfa...@i5g2000pbj.googlegroups.com>, Ken

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

> McElhaney <mcelha...@hotmail.com> wrote:

>> On Mar 9, 6:23 am, Professor Bubba <bu...@nowhere.edu.invalid> wrote:  
>>> Joel and others later did a thing called Cinematic Titanic, which had  
>>> the same flavor as MST3K with silhouettes and all, while Mike and crew  
>>> did audio-only commentary tracks that you're supposed to sync with your  
>>> copy of the movie. This neatly saved Mike all that licensing money and  
>>> permission-seeking. Neither effort seemed to gain any traction,  
>>> though.

>

>> I guess it depends on what you mean by "traction". While the demise of  
>> Cinematic Titanic is one thing, Rifftrax has done quite well for  
>> itself. In fact, a Kickstarter campaign to raise money to live riff  
>> "Twilight" is now four times past its goal. No traction? Well, it was  
>> never the intention of Rifftrax to go on cable TV, but they regularly  
>> produce new riffs on full length movies, have VOD that can be  
>> downloaded and shorts as well.

>

>> I think "successful" would more accurately describe Rifftrax whether  
>> you care for the humor or not anymore, they have succeeded in creating  
>> a profitable business venture for several years now and show little  
>> sign of letting up.

>

> I'm happy for Mike et al. that Rifftrax is still going, but it's never  
> become a "thing." I know that what I meant by "traction" wasn't clear.

>

> I didn't know that Cinematic Titanic had flatlined. I did know that no  
> one was talking about it, though, the same way nobody talks about  
> Rifftrax (where "nobody" may also mean "hardly anybody").

I guess it depends on what "hardly anybody" means. I would not count  
this newsgroup, but if you just look at the Kickstarter project they  
are currently doing right now, I think that it does qualify as a  
"thing" or "something" at least. Raising over \$200,000 for a live riff  
has to involve quite a few people who think Rifftrax is a "thing".  
<http://tinyurl.com/adcsq5t>

Perhaps the conversation has simply moved somewhere else?

Ken

---

Subject: Re: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?  
Posted by [Professor Bubba](#) on Mon, 11 Mar 2013 22:21:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In article

<8c2839d6-1253-48b2-954f-e141be21f8a6@w2g2000pbw.googlegroups.com>,  
<"mcelhaney@hotmail.com"> wrote:

> On Mar 11, 3:24 pm, Professor Bubba <bu...@nowhere.edu.invalid> wrote:  
>> In article  
>> <05b27dde-3ab7-47e1-9907-abb284bfa...@i5g2000pbj.googlegroups.com>, Ken  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>> McElhaney <mcelha...@hotmail.com> wrote:  
>>> On Mar 9, 6:23 am, Professor Bubba <bu...@nowhere.edu.invalid> wrote:  
>>>> Joel and others later did a thing called Cinematic Titanic, which had  
>>>> the same flavor as MST3K with silhouettes and all, while Mike and crew  
>>>> did audio-only commentary tracks that you're supposed to sync with your  
>>>> copy of the movie. This neatly saved Mike all that licensing money and  
>>>> permission-seeking. Neither effort seemed to gain any traction,  
>>>> though.  
>>  
>>> I guess it depends on what you mean by "traction". While the demise of  
>>> Cinematic Titanic is one thing, Rifftrax has done quite well for  
>>> itself. In fact, a Kickstarter campaign to raise money to live riff  
>>> "Twilight" is now four times past its goal. No traction? Well, it was  
>>> never the intention of Rifftrax to go on cable TV, but they regularly  
>>> produce new riffs on full length movies, have VOD that can be  
>>> downloaded and shorts as well.  
>>  
>>> I think "successful" would more accurately describe Rifftrax whether  
>>> you care for the humor or not anymore, they have succeeded in creating  
>>> a profitable business venture for several years now and show little  
>>> sign of letting up.  
>>  
>> I'm happy for Mike et al. that Rifftrax is still going, but it's never  
>> become a "thing." I know that what I meant by "traction" wasn't clear.  
>>  
>> I didn't know that Cinematic Titanic had flatlined. I did know that no  
>> one was talking about it, though, the same way nobody talks about  
>> Rifftrax (where "nobody" may also mean "hardly anybody").  
>  
> I guess it depends on what "hardly anybody" means. I would not count  
> this newsgroup, but if you just look at the Kickstarter project they  
> are currently doing right now, I think that it does qualify as a  
> "thing" or "something" at least. Raising over \$200,000 for a live riff  
> has to involve quite a few people who think Rifftrax is a "thing".  
> <http://tinyurl.com/adcsq5t>  
>



> Perhaps the conversation has simply moved somewhere else?

Maybe so, because I hadn't heard a thing about it since the startup until now. I agree that money talks, but in this case I guess it's not talking to me. Thing is, the apparent success of Rifftrax is exactly the kind of deal I should have been hearing about, going where I go and talking who I talk to. One of us seems to be doing something wrong.

---

---

Subject: Re: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?  
Posted by [Ken McElhaney](#) on Mon, 11 Mar 2013 22:46:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Mar 11, 5:21 pm, Professor Bubba <bu...@nowhere.edu.invalid> wrote:

> In article

> <8c2839d6-1253-48b2-954f-e141be21f...@w2g2000pbw.googlegroups.com>,  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>

> <"mcelha...@hotmail.com"> wrote:

>> On Mar 11, 3:24 pm, Professor Bubba <bu...@nowhere.edu.invalid> wrote:

>>> In article

>>> <05b27dde-3ab7-47e1-9907-abb284bfa...@i5g2000pbj.googlegroups.com>, Ken  
>  
>>> McElhaney <mcelha...@hotmail.com> wrote:

>>>> On Mar 9, 6:23 am, Professor Bubba <bu...@nowhere.edu.invalid> wrote:

>>>> > Joel and others later did a thing called Cinematic Titanic, which had

>>>> > the same flavor as MST3K with silhouettes and all, while Mike and crew

>>>> > did audio-only commentary tracks that you're supposed to sync with your

>>>> > copy of the movie. This neatly saved Mike all that licensing money and

>>>> > permission-seeking. Neither effort seemed to gain any traction,

>>>> > though.

>  
>>>> I guess it depends on what you mean by "traction". While the demise of

>>>> Cinematic Titanic is one thing, Rifftrax has done quite well for

>>>> itself. In fact, a Kickstarter campaign to raise money to live riff

>>>> "Twilight" is now four times past its goal. No traction? Well, it was

>>>> never the intention of Rifftrax to go on cable TV, but they regularly

>>>> produce new riffs on full length movies, have VOD that can be

>>>> downloaded and shorts as well.

>>>>  
>

>>>> I think "successful" would more accurately describe Rifftrax whether  
>>>> you care for the humor or not anymore, they have succeeded in creating  
>>>> a profitable business venture for several years now and show little  
>>>> sign of letting up.  
>  
>>> I'm happy for Mike et al. that Rifftrax is still going, but it's never  
>>> become a "thing." I know that what I meant by "traction" wasn't clear..  
>  
>>> I didn't know that Cinematic Titanic had flatlined. I did know that no  
>>> one was talking about it, though, the same way nobody talks about  
>>> Rifftrax (where "nobody" may also mean "hardly anybody").  
>  
>> I guess it depends on what "hardly anybody" means. I would not count  
>> this newsgroup, but if you just look at the Kickstarter project they  
>> are currently doing right now, I think that it does qualify as a  
>> "thing" or "something" at least. Raising over \$200,000 for a live riff  
>> has to involve quite a few people who think Rifftrax is a "thing".  
>> <http://tinyurl.com/adcsq5t>  
>  
>> Perhaps the conversation has simply moved somewhere else?  
>  
> Maybe so, because I hadn't heard a thing about it since the startup  
> until now. I agree that money talks, but in this case I guess it's not  
> talking to me. Thing is, the apparent success of Rifftrax is exactly  
> the kind of deal I should have been hearing about, going where I go and  
> talking who I talk to. One of us seems to be doing something wrong.

If you follow the "Satellite News", the unofficial MST3K website, they post Rifftrax stuff all the time and it generally gets plenty of comments.

<http://www.mst3kinfo.com/>

I usually download the short films (99 cents each) and they have one or two live shows which are broadcast across the country in selected movie theaters. The "Twilight" effort represents a big change for them as they usually do public domain stuff (Plan 9 for example).

Cinematic Titanic started out as DVD or download-only and then adding live performances. Joel just announced that this would be the last year for Cinematic Titanic, at least in terms of performing live.

Rifftrax is part of a larger corporation, but they have a staff of writers and even guests who do commentary on their voice-overs from time to time. One of their latest coups was getting "Cool as Ice", the disastrous Vanilla Ice film from the early 90's as a VOD...not just a commentary track, but the video itself can be downloaded with the commentary track.

Ken

---

---

Subject: Re: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Mon, 11 Mar 2013 23:09:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <110320131624145880%bubba@nowhere.edu.invalid>, Professor Bubba <bubba@nowhere.edu.invalid> wrote:

> In article  
> <05b27dde-3ab7-47e1-9907-abb284bfa107@i5g2000pbj.googlegroups.com>, Ken  
> McElhaney <mcelhaney@hotmail.com> wrote:  
>

>  
>>> Joel and others later did a thing called Cinematic Titanic, which had  
>>> the same flavor as MST3K with silhouettes and all, while Mike and crew  
>>> did audio-only commentary tracks that you're supposed to sync with your

>>> though.

>>

>> I guess it depends on what you mean by "traction". While the demise of  
>> Cinematic Titanic is one thing, Rifftrax has done quite well for  
>> itself. In fact, a Kickstarter campaign to raise money to live riff  
>> "Twilight" is now four times past its goal. No traction? Well, it was  
>> never the intention of Rifftrax to go on cable TV, but they regularly  
>> produce new riffs on full length movies, have VOD that can be  
>> downloaded and shorts as well.

>>

>> I think "successful" would more accurately describe Rifftrax whether  
>> you care for the humor or not anymore, they have succeeded in creating  
>> a profitable business venture for several years now and show little  
>> sign of letting up.

>

>

> I'm happy for Mike et al. that Rifftrax is still going, but it's never  
> become a "thing." I know that what I meant by "traction" wasn't clear.

>

> I didn't know that Cinematic Titanic had flatlined. I did know that no  
> one was talking about it, though, the same way nobody talks about  
> Rifftrax (where "nobody" may also mean "hardly anybody").

<http://www.cinematictitanic.com>

Looks like they're still around, just 'cloaked' :)

--

"Every time a Kardashian gets a TV show, an angel dies."

---

---

Subject: Re: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?

Posted by [Dimensional Traveler](#) on Mon, 11 Mar 2013 23:52:26 GMT

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

---

On 3/11/2013 6:13 AM, anim8rFSK wrote:

>

> One big problem is that the creators kept leaving (and new ones came in)

> and everybody got a piece of the pie. They usually cite this as the

> reason they can't bring the show back; too many controlling interests.

>

So many people in control that no one is in control?

--

The 'Enterprise' crew in the 2009 Star Trek are adrenaline addicted, hyper-active teenagers with ADD whose Ritalin got replaced with methamphetamine, displaying a level of discipline that a Somali pirate wouldn't tolerate.

---

---

Subject: Re: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?

Posted by [Professor Bubba](#) on Tue, 12 Mar 2013 03:00:17 GMT

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

---

In article

<45e03556-1b82-4a6c-8eb4-c53525055465@kk9g2000pbc.googlegroups.com>,

<"mcelhaney@hotmail.com"> wrote:

> If you follow the "Satellite News", the unofficial MST3K website, they

> post Rifftrax stuff all the time and it generally gets plenty of

> comments.

> <http://www.mst3kinfo.com/>

> I usually download the short films (99 cents each) and they have one

> or two live shows which are broadcast across the country in selected

> movie theaters. The "Twilight" effort represents a big change for them

> as they usually do public domain stuff (Plan 9 for example).

>

> Cinematic Titanic started out as DVD or download-only and then adding

> live performances. Joel just announced that this would be the last

> year for Cinematic Titanic, at least in terms of performing live.

>

> Rifftrax is part of a larger corporation, but they have a staff of

> writers and even guests who do commentary on their voice-overs from

> time to time. One of their latest coups was getting "Cool as Ice", the

- > disastrous Vanilla Ice film from the early 90's as a VOD...not just a
- > commentary track, but the video itself can be downloaded with the
- > commentary track.
- >
- > Ken

Thanks for all the information in your two posts. I really appreciate it.

---

Subject: Re: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?  
Posted by [anim8rFSK](#) on Tue, 12 Mar 2013 03:04:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <513e6e3b\$0\$52767\$742ec2ed@news.sonic.net>, Dimensional Traveler <dtravel@sonic.net> wrote:

- > On 3/11/2013 6:13 AM, anim8rFSK wrote:
- >>
- >> One big problem is that the creators kept leaving (and new ones came in)
- >> and everybody got a piece of the pie. They usually cite this as the
- >> reason they can't bring the show back; too many controlling interests.
- >>
- > So many people in control that no one is in control?

Yeah. And you get stuff like, Joel owns Gizmonic, so the Mads had to operate out of somewhere else (enter Deep 13) and oopsie that means a new theme song and now you have to keep track of who came up with Deep 13 and if you lose that when \*they\* leave and it quickly spirals out of control.

--

"Every time a Kardashian gets a TV show, an angel dies."

---

Subject: Re: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?  
Posted by [Dano](#) on Tue, 12 Mar 2013 04:04:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Forever is a very long time.

---

Subject: Re: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?  
Posted by [Chris \&quot;Sampo\&amp;q](#) on Tue, 12 Mar 2013 09:24:32 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In article <khm9ec\$dkk\$1@dont-email.me>, "Dano" <janeanddano@yahoo.com> wrote:

> Forever is a very long time.

It's a ridiculous question. All TV shows end. But its final cancellation had nothing to do with a decline in quality (some individual opinions to the contrary). MST3K never jumped the shark. Joel's brilliant concept simply became too expensive for network TV. That's why it will never return to TV. (For more info on why MST3K will never return to network TV, visit <http://www.mst3kinfo.com/mstfaq/syfy.html>.)

As for it never becoming a "thing" -- I beg to differ. For proof, I only need to point out that the show was cancelled 14 YEARS AGO and here we are talking about it. Go to Twitter and search for "MST3K." You'll find HUNDREDS of conversations about it daily. How many other TV shows that have been off the air for 14 YEARS can you say THAT about?

The right people still get it.

Sampo (who never crossposts...doh!)

---

Subject: Re: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?  
Posted by [Professor Bubba](#) on Tue, 12 Mar 2013 09:50:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <msampo-CC0F52.05242812032013@news.individual.net>, Cornell <msampo@aol.com> wrote:

> In article <khm9ec\$dkk\$1@dont-email.me>, "Dano" <janeanddano@yahoo.com>  
> wrote:

>

>> Forever is a very long time.

>

> It's a ridiculous question. All TV shows end. But its final cancellation  
> had nothing to do with a decline in quality (some individual opinions to  
> the contrary). MST3K never jumped the shark. Joel's brilliant concept  
> simply became too expensive for network TV.

I have to point out here that your own contrarian opinion to the contrary is an opinion, not a fact. The show jumped the shark when the work got sloppy; I picked Invasion U.S.A. as the jump point because that's when the problems became too large for me to ignore. I know that many stuck it out to the end without much if any problem.

MST3K was never on network TV. I remember they tried a syndicated version of their library on broadcast stations, but it didn't do well.

Maybe cutting it to an hour (and running the films in two parts) hurt it. Maybe the larger audience just wasn't interested. I don't know. They went to the effort of making new wraparounds, which was impressive.

- > That's why it will never return to TV. (For more info on why MST3K
- > will never return to network TV, visit
- > <http://www.mst3kinfo.com/mstfaq/syfy.html>.)
- >
- > As for it never becoming a "thing" -- I beg to differ.

Who said it hadn't? I think you're conflating the comments on MST3K with the ones about Cinematic Titanic and Rifftrax.

- > For proof, I only need to point out that the show was cancelled 14
- > YEARS AGO and here we are talking about it. Go to Twitter and search
- > for "MST3K." You'll find HUNDREDS of conversations about it daily.
- > How many other TV shows that have been off the air for 14 YEARS can
- > you say THAT about?

Many, and some of them have been off the air for much longer, but no one was saying that MST3K didn't belong in the pantheon of "past shows people still talk about a lot."

- > The right people still get it.
- >
- > Sampo (who never crossposts...doh!)

---

Subject: Re: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?  
Posted by [Doug Elrod](#) on Tue, 12 Mar 2013 20:12:24 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's inevitable that people will want to move on at some point. But even if "Mystery Science Theater 3000" doesn't survive, itself, it's amazing comedy-amplification ought to find a home, in some way, in future media. (I'm thinking of the way that the movie itself becomes like a "straight man" to the jokesters, or, occasionally, vice-versa.... It's just an amazing way to deliver a HUGE number of jokes to the viewing public!)

I just hope there never is \*too\* long a gap without this sort of comedy!

-Doug Elrod (dre1@cornell.edu)

---

Subject: Re: Should MST3K Have Continued Forever?  
Posted by [Barb May](#) on Sun, 03 Aug 2014 17:28:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)



Yes

--

Barb

---