
Subject: When the Sequel for
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 16 Nov 2015 15:43:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: Gatuzo

When the Sequel for attlestar-galactica

Subject: Re: When the Sequel for
Posted by [Your Name](#) on Mon, 16 Nov 2015 20:09:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In article <5649f99a\$1_2@mccarragher.org>, Gatuzo
<Gatuzo@gallaxial.com> wrote:

>
> When the Sequel for attlestar-galactica

There's no such show to make a sequel for.

The real Battlestar Galactica had a sequel show way back in 1980, but thanks to meddling and silly changes, it was complete crap .. it was really "Space Scout Investigators Visit Earth" and had almost nothing to do with real "Battlestar Galactica".

Moore-Ron's abysmally silly garbagised "reimagining" was so bad they can't be bothered making a sequel show.

Various reports have about two or three different cinema movie versions supposedly coming, but they're all be just as ridiculously stupid as Moore-Ron's version and won't really be "Battlestar Galactica" in anything but name and core idea.

Subject: Re: When the Sequel for
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Tue, 17 Nov 2015 01:02:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: Gatuzo

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA256

On 11/16/2015 3:09 PM, Your Name wrote:
> In article <5649f99a\$1_2@mccarragher.org>, Gatuzo
> <Gatuzo@gallaxial.com> wrote:

>>
>> When the Sequel for attlestar-galactica
>
> There's no such show to make a sequel for.
>
>
> The real Battlestar Galactica had a sequel show way back in 1980,
> but thanks to meddling and silly changes, it was complete crap ..
> it was really "Space Scout Investigators Visit Earth" and had
> almost nothing to do with real "Battlestar Galactica".
>
> Moore-Ron's abysmally silly garbagised "reimagining" was so bad
> they can't be bothered making a sequel show.
>
> Various reports have about two or three different cinema movie
> versions supposedly coming, but they're all be just as ridiculously
> stupid as Moore-Ron's version and won't really be "Battlestar
> Galactica" in anything but name and core idea.
>

I thinks After the 80' , Hollywood have no more Imagination and all
the crap now a reply of old movies or garbige

I remember about that and do not See like a Sequel of it , it was BAD
BAD !!

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----

Version: GnuPG v2

iQEcBAEBCAAGBQJWSnyJAAoJEMxIIeUAWAmCLXUIAJJyiSOGcoO+5Lp91ReF t6e2
oH8QYn9x7PatCcD6TzSfjJJlJclJqSIE46uQLnF8AxSnapsd+9jfcO3gjd+ p/dA
tqOoD3SRRlwfBO7beZ+FYj2mwAKZuolzcGUEPLEgCrhUvSfMSTnkiXhGjwF 9TZT
A0VfVheWKWmp+I0qvR748HQ5qRe0vcQplyAumzCP3VTbdC49Y0e7RwW7yXFo emKa
q2DO0cArc59J8jWVzC3eoUmzsXr7/Owt36/MISp0ktSn4AWCtZHkAvl4fkqg NdV+
DhyWXOsQKmzaL7bx3s9ma/6a5ZkXTwVrWZGQbJ6NbRIyVjldrq21q+OzWk41 +ew=
=6Xj1

-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

Subject: Re: When the Sequel for
Posted by [Clu](#) on Tue, 15 Dec 2015 17:13:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 11/16/15 7:02 PM, Gatuzo wrote:

> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----

> I thinks After the 80' , Hollywood have no more Imagination and all

- > the crap now a reply of old movies or garbige
- >
- > I remember about that and do not See like a Sequel of it , it was BAD
- > BAD !!

G80 (Galactica 1980) is enjoyable enough to watch on it's own. It is like a comedy with Battlestar Galactica trappings. I think the cyclones would make good ground roving vehicles, but should never have flown.

Oh well. "In name only" is a term used a lot since the New Battlestar came out. Luckily Doctor Who learned from this mistake and did not ignore the past.

As for Star Trek, they started off saying "Ok the whole other universe happened, this is a new universe." That was excellent. However with the new trailer looking like "Star Trek the Fast and the Furious" well, it looks like the new Trek is Trek in name only as well.

Subject: Re: When the Sequel for
Posted by [Your Name](#) on Fri, 18 Dec 2015 01:46:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In article <n4phna\$6u8\$1@speranza.aioe.org>, Clu <drclu@swbell.net> wrote:

- > On 11/16/15 7:02 PM, Gatuzo wrote:
- >>
- >> I thinks After the 80' , Hollywood have no more Imagination and all
- >> the crap now a reply of old movies or garbige
- >>
- >> I remember about that and do not See like a Sequel of it , it was BAD
- >> BAD !!
- >
- > G80 (Galactica 1980) is enjoyable enough to watch on it's own. It is
- > like a comedy with Battlestar Galactica trappings. I think the
- > cyclones would make good ground roving vehicles, but should never have
- > flown.
- >
- > Oh well. "In name only" is a term used a lot since the New Battlestar
- > came out. Luckily Doctor Who learned from this mistake and did not
- > ignore the past.
- >
- > As for Star Trek, they started off saying "Ok the whole other universe
- > happened, this is a new universe." That was excellent. However with
- > the new trailer looking like "Star Trek the Fast and the Furious" well,
- > it looks like the new Trek is Trek in name only as well.

Nope, Jar Jar Abrams "Crap Trek" is just yet another "ignore the past, steal the name, and butcher the ideas" reboot that doesn't actually fit with anything that came before (despite the silly "alternate universe" nonsense).

I haven't seen the new Star Wars movie yet, but from the trailers and reviews I have seen for it so far, it looks like Jar Jar Abrams has also done an idiotic "reboot" with Star Wars too and again tried to claim it's part of the same franchise by calling it "Episode VII" and including original cast again ... but it appears all he's really done is remake the original, butchering it, and adding his own hopeless "fan-wank" ideas. :-(

The guy's a talentless cretin and everything he touches turns to over-hype, idiotic, ill-fitting crap. :-(
