
The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by dragonking - 2006/09/01 03:12

Come one guys what is the way of the book!
Or the movie???

=====

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by Nait_Boi - 2006/09/01 22:18

Books are good if you have the creativity to make them good. But I'm a movie person more than a book person.

Wither the movie is good or bad, it's done in usually an hour. It's easy on time, you get to see all the hot celebs (even the not so hot) and there is just some things you can only do while watching a movie. Who doesn't like the cool special effects :)

The one thing I hate thou is when a book is turned to a movie screen. Some books I have enjoyed that were made into movies totaly sucked. They leave out all the important details or skip parts you may like. Books are good for being able to make a connection to a character. That's what I always liked about them anyways.

But given the choice of a book or movie, I'll sit in the dark watching Umbrella's infectious monsters attacking people, or a crazy girl acting as her brother just to play soccer. Movies are the books of the future :)

=====

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by _m1k3_k3nn3dy_ - 2006/09/02 16:11

i agree wit nait_boi....books have alot to offer that movies cant, and vice versa. i have to say though, the movie form of the davinci code wasn't that terrible...they did a good job at the last scene anyway.

=====

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by paradigm - 2006/09/02 19:32

two different forms of media that aren't similar at all.
the only similarity is they have storyline.

=====

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by Nait_Boi - 2006/09/02 23:09

I don't agree that they are not alike. Books and movies share many things besides a storyline. A movie is just a book only in visable form.

As far as Divinci Code...the book was better as far as I see it.

=====

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by Morgan05 - 2006/09/08 18:54

I'd say its mainly about visualisation. Each one of us sees things differently. A novel is told in words, a film in images. But each meduim ends with a picture. Either on a screen, or in our minds eye. The difference is how we get there. And how we prefer to get there. Movies are very much more part of popular culture, as a novel takes a more developed eye to visualise the world that's given to us.

It's often said that a novel gives much more creative freedom in the imagination of the reader, where as film makers make a lot more of these decisions for a reader of the film. This suits some but not others, And as these art forms develop we are starting to see a shift in styles, as more post modern art house films make more room for choice, and certain writers become more specific in what they want the reader to envision.

We also have to bear in mind that some works are must more suited to a book than a screen, and vice versa. Pieces that explore motivations and characters are more generally written as novels, where as plot heavy works are written for the screen. As I said, we are seeing a change in that formula.

I think most consumers of media today prefer movies. They're quick, they're easy, they are a product of today. The novel however, for the reader who wants to take an active part in the story telling, and enjoys a 'higher' form of story telling, will always be rewarded. We should not assume however that novel readers are in anyway more advanced than movie readers. A films codes and conventions are highly complex, and often deeply symbolic in its efforts to express emotions and character arcs. Consumers of popular film today can read these symbols and codes in films just as fluently as others read a book.

Perhaps the most vital point is not how the story is told, but of the value and worth of the story in the first place. Its very hard to supress a good story. no matter what way its told. But like wise it is far more difficult to make a bad story good, whether told through words or through pictures.

=====

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by JonTheGreat - 2006/09/13 12:34

Perhaps the most vital point is not how the story is told, but of the value and worth of the story in the first place. Its very hard to supress a good story. no matter what way its told

I agree Morgan It is the story and the message hidden within that really matters it is just down to personal preference weather you prefeere to read or whatch the story, different people will find they can relate to the story more when it is presented in a different format.

Jon
xx

=====

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by eversweet - 2006/09/13 13:18

Once upon a time I'd have said books over movies.

However, since then I've decided that I'm ambitious, competitive and I don't want other writers stealing my thunder.

So, movies all the way. Please.

=====

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by theoneandonly - 2006/09/14 14:05

There are exceptions, but often I find books are more enjoyable and have a longer lasting effect than films on me. I guess I just enjoy visualizing in my mind about the characters and setting.

Oh, here's an question. Does anyone have examples of books they found better than the film? Or vice versa?

Derrick

=====

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by eversweet - 2006/09/15 01:16

^ Well, Harry Potter is the obvious one. So, the books aren't exactly wonderfully written but they are captivating and much more so than the movies. But, I think the movie for 48 Shades of Brown is going to be good. Maybe better than the book.

=====

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by Drew_0186 - 2006/09/21 04:36

Books are almost allways better. I like to generate the characters and setting in my head. They also affect me much more than a movi, i guess cuz i feel like i know the characters, since i sort of created them.....

=====

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by Gumdropster - 2006/09/21 21:51

I like movies best, because I have an overactive fantasy, and when reading books I hardly catch anything of it because I imagine too much... Plus I think I might be dyslectic to headlines! :laugh:

=====

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by voidofinsanity - 2006/09/23 15:39

Alright well I have to say im both in opinion.

I love to see movies because im an artist, and colors and stuff drive me crazy. And I love a good dark mysterious plot.

There are some things though.. that you can do in books that you really cant do in the movies. So alot of the times books are more fun because you get all the imagination in them. I mean sure there are special effects and such nowadays, but you never truely get the same feeling out of it.

I like cartoons the most, because you get both sides of the story. You get the intense feeling that the author wanted to show and all the crazy action that came with it. so yeah. Ima cartoon nerd. :)

=====

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by Red - 2006/09/29 18:11

Books are good, i was book person, now not so much. However i am a real music person, and movies have music which can really alter how u see the event. i much prefer movies because it is easier to have your emotions effected by movies then it is by books. Think about how many movies have/almost made you cry with happiness or sadness and then compare that to the books. Ultimately i believe that movies better capture your emotions and that is y i prefer them to books. Of course thats just one opinion...

=====

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by Masochist - 2006/10/09 01:55

Personally I'd say books 'cause you it's easier than putting a movie on; if you fall asleep you won't miss then ending; you can take a book anywhere with you and you can listen to music while reading. Say for example you need the toilet you can take your book with you. Or if you're on the train/bus and there's an annoying little brat screaming you can put some music on, read and drift off to your own little world. Plus, I love being able to excercise my imagination and conjure up the images for myself. That and reading is a lot better for your vocabulary.

Sorry I got carried away, but I just LOVE reading...

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by balby_lad - 2006/10/09 19:49

I cant read lol, only thing i ever read was Final Destination 2, i started Final Destination 3 but its got boring, the films are awsome but so are the books, things like Harry Pothead and Lord of the Rings i gotta say films, the films were sh*t but i wouldnt be able to sit and read crap like that!

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by Artiste - 2006/10/18 16:53

I used to love reading, but since I started seriously writing and with the as yet unfulfilled hope of getting money out of it I find that I can't anything that hasn't been written by me. Of course there are exceptions, but they are few and far between and take so long to get into!

But yeah, I love both. Except for SHITE films like... you know that thing with the guy... bad Hollywood ones. And I detest JK Rowling and Dan Browne with every creative fibre of my being. They may have good character development (from what I know of Rowling's popularity) and tell a suspenseful tale of mystery and mayhem, but CHRIST they offer less to Literature than Agatha Christie did.

Oh and they neeeeeeed to make Huxley's Brave New World into a film. That would kick. ass. (Although it'd probably end up being X-rated)

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by an_human_equation - 2007/03/30 15:51

I always find the book is better. Even in the few movies that stick close to the books their based on the books just get you more into the charecters and i can always understand the plot better. Thats why i love to read when i have the time.

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by chemical_flare - 2007/03/30 22:27

Same here a_human_equation, I always find the book more interesting, especially with thrillers like Patriot Games and The Hunt for Red October.

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by borto - 2007/03/31 05:08

I agree as well. I enjoy books because it's a much more personal experience... The story unfolds in your head, and you get to choose everything from how the characters look to what the setting is like.

I don't like how movies often mutilate the books they're based on. The only book --> movie transition I've really been happy with recently is Contact by Carl Sagan. The book was absolutely extraordinary -- I love Carl Sagan's work, especially Cosmos, and reading Contact was like having a fictionalized version of him (the main character of the book) act out the story in my mind. I still prefer the book, because it is more true to Carl's original intentions than the movie was (he wrote it, after all), it's also a lot more detailed -- however, regardless of what it may have taken away, the movie did add certain plot elements that I enjoyed (I won't spoil it for you, you'll just have to watch it!), and the music was especially haunting.

I highly recommend watching or reading Contact if you've never seen it.

=====

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by chemical_flare - 2007/03/31 14:24

I agree completely,

In the Da Vinci Code, I read it a year before most people even heard about it, and I always imagined Robert Langdon looking like Harrison Ford for some reason lol.

=====

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by Kev1n - 2007/03/31 15:08

chemical_flare wrote:

I agree completely,

In the Da Vinci Code, I read it a year before most people even heard about it, and I always imagined Robert Langdon looking like Harrison Ford for some reason lol.

Yeah because in the book, he is being described as resembling Harrison Ford ... no clue why they didn't get Harrison Ford to star as Robert Langdon, perhaps they asked him but he turned it down.

However, I think books are usually better than films as well. They provide a deeper insight into characters, make you understand their moves / behaviour, allow you to identify with / feel for these characters, enable you to imagine what the characters and the surroundings look like rather than being "dictated" a clear image and provide you with much more detailed information on why things happen and let you see the connections / events that lead up to certain occurrences. If you watch a film, it's a clipped version of the book that can't feature/provide characters as developed and subtle as a book can. For instance, in the Lord of the Rings, Denethor was portrayed as a madman rather than the much more subtle character he really was, which I think was a shame.

Films are nice, but compared with the books they are based on they usually fail to please or at least disappoint you at some points where they leave out important stuff that is in the book or sort of distort the facts.

Post edited by: Kev1n, at: 2007/03/31 15:10

=====

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by C_Dude - 2007/03/31 18:09

they both rock! im a bookamovieholic! WOOOO!!!

=====

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by Heraldofl - 2007/04/04 05:42

Kev1n wrote:

Films are nice, but compared with the books they are based on they usually fail to please or at least disappoint you at some points where they leave out important stuff that is in the book or sort of distort the facts.

Post edited by: Kev1n, at: 2007/03/31 15:10

This is my real problem with book movie transitions. Otherwise, the movie format is actually better at expressing action and scenery. If books didn't have the story tortured out of them before being placed on screen, movies would be so much more enjoyable. Books have the advantage in character development and personality. Movies have no real way of expressing character thoughts, and are harder pressed to maintain symbols and motifs.

=====

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by boligraf23 - 2007/04/05 11:41

I love books and films equally, but I've never seen a good adaptation from one to the other. What's more is that, I can really only enjoy books that are atmospherically and sincerely "bookish," and I can only enjoy movies that are atmospherically and sincerely "movieish." I can't stand books about actors and directors and I can't stand movies about writers or writing. You take a movie like "Mulholland Dr.": it's a movieish movie to the core; about actors, directors, and movies in general, but beautiful and devastating in equal measure. Then you take a book like "A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man": it's about a writer, the process of writing, and once again, it's simply beautiful.

Sometimes movies try to be slow, plodding and personal, like books--forsaking the only thing that keeps it from being a book in the first place: heard dialogue and seen action. Then there're times when you get books that try to be flashy and jumpy--in which the author seems to be ignorant of the fact that we can't see what they see, and that what's important instead is interior monologue and weighty thought.

I'm sure, in time, the mediums will fold and mix more freely, smoothly; but for right now the transitions are always kistchy and cheap, all failures through and through.

=====

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by samh004 - 2008/05/17 20:58

OK this is an old thread but I'm going to revive it.

I'll take audiobooks for the win! :P

=====

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by BravoLima - 2008/05/19 04:05

Both have their flaws. Books are mere words, and require imagination to get them to do anything. Imagination is generally foggy, at best, unclear and confusing, particularly when dealing with large, complicated stories like Lord of the Rings. Movies are flawed in that they are short, you might spend days with a book, and only an hour and a half with a movie. With the example of Lord of the Rings, much clarity was provided, but the time constraints of a movie meant a great deal had to be diminished.

I believe video games will be the next great era of story-telling. Think about it, a good RPG will have a fantastic story, you'll spend maybe 50+hrs with it, maybe 30+ excluding fighting gameplay, and you also have the visual/audio sensations like in movies.

Then again, if I said movies would be used for complex and rich story-telling back when Charlie Chapman was silently jumping about, up to his old antics, perhaps you would have laughed.

=====

Re:The Classic Debate: Movies Vs Books

Posted by radio addict - 2008/05/21 04:09

Films for entertainment, books for smarts

=====