
Subject: Re: Just got done watching original BSG on DVD.

Posted by [RT](#) on Thu, 01 Nov 2012 03:17:11 GMT

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

Your Name wrote:

> In article <507AF460.89488CDD@hotmail.com>, RT <traRvEskyMOVE@hotmail.com>

>> Your Name wrote:

>>>

>>> In article <506C55B2.565E634A@hotmail.com>, RT <traRvEskyMOVE@hotmail.com>

>>>> Your Name wrote:

>>>> > BillV2320@webtv.net (The Void Era Man) wrote:

>>>> > >

>>>> > > In hindsight with the new series someway behind us and all of its

>>>> > > offshoot options truncated, i think i can say i like the Original

>>>> > > better.

>>>> > > maybe it has nostalgia because i was only 14 when it debuted and scifi

>>>> > > of that magnitude was rare in theater OR TV in those days.

>>>> > > yeah, it had some corny stories and it didnt have the gritty

> 'real' feel

>>>> > > of the new, but i like it because it was more escapist fantasy and not

>>>> > > just a displaced post apocalypse set in space.

>>>> > > i kind of see that roland moore sold his premise clothed in BSG

>>>> > > because ...

>>>> >

>>>> > The revival of Battlestar Galactica wasn't even remotely Ron

> Moore's idea.

>>>> >

>>>> > It was started long before he was recruited to the job, but

> originally the

>>>> > new series was going to be a proper sequel to the original Glen Larson

>>>> > series, and at one stage it was helmed by Bryan Singer who unfortunately

>>>> > had to pull out due to commitments with the X-men movie and other

> things.

>>>> > He did much of the ground work, including getting many of the CGI models

>>>> > created that Ron Moore than later took over.

>>>> >

>>>> > I'm not even sure it was actually Ron Moore's idea to do a remake /

>>>> > reimagining, or whether that was (partly) forced by the idiots in studio

>>>>

>>>> See

>>>>

>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Battlestar_Galactica#Attempted_revivals

>>>>

>>>> and

>>>>

>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Battlestar_Galactica#2003_reimagining

>>>>

>>>> > management. It wouldn't surprise me if he wanted to make his own, likely

>>>> > hopeless, show and just like his mentors (Star Trek's Beavis & Butthead
 >>>> > twins: Berman and Braga) got pushed into doing something he didn't
 > really
 >>>> > want to do OR if he agreed to do it simply to get a big name on
 > his resume
 >>>> > so he could then do his own show.
 >>>> >
 >>>> > > it was much more likely to be picked up as a series if it had an
 >>>> > > established name on it already.
 >>>> >
 >>>> > The problem is that that makes no sense at all. If the original
 > Battlestar
 >>>> > Galactica was supposedly so bad, why would they reuse the name? Anyone
 >>>> > with a micro-milligram of common sense isn't going to watch something
 >>>> > called "Battlestar Galactica" if they didn't like the original
 > show called
 >>>> > Battlestar Galactica ... that would be like going into a restaurant to
 >>>> > order spinach soup when you know you don't like spinach soup, but are
 >>>> > stupidly hoping / expecting it's not actually spinach soup. :-\
 >>>> >
 >>>> > It would make FAR more sense to use a totally new name for their very
 >>>>
 >>>> Why would it make sense?
 >>>
 >>> If you don't know, then there's zero point even attempting to explain it
 >>> ... as I said, the vast majority of the human race are apparently lacking
 >>> in any "common" sense.
 >>
 >> This means you can't explain it.
 >>
 >> The story line is that Galactica is supposed to be the last battlestar. What
 >> else would you call the show????
 >
 > I've already explained it, and those too dumb to understand it will never
 > understand it.

No, you haven't, because otherwise you aren't following the storyline.

You want a last battlestar named, oh, Battlestar Fred? Or something about battlestars and no attack on the colonies???