



WOLVERINE (left) played by Hugh Jackman, confronts the metamorph Mystique (Rebecca Romijn-Stamos) in the film adaptation of the comic book classic, *X-Men*. Courtesy photo

Adaptations dazzle on big screens

MOVIES from page 7

Jensen, Hugh Jackman, Halle Berry

Rating: PG-13

Mass destruction and chaos will ensue in the movie "X-Men," that's a given. What is not given, is the sheer coolness of the characters and, simply, what powers they possess.

Aside from their coolness, however, one has no choice but to watch "X-Men" and notice, as I did, the blatant underlying connotation of the mutants' "coming out" paralleled with the struggle of gays coming out. If the mutants were gay, then they'd have double worry.

I'm trying to be funny, so please, read on.

The mutants, or X-Men as they call themselves, in the movie just wanna be loved. Is that so wrong? I think not... or do I?

The plight of the mutants stems from the fact that they were ostracized as adolescent teens.

Well boo-hoo. So you were teased because you can walk through walls or shoot lasers out of your eyes. Or we should weep for you because we humans don't know what it feels like to be able to say "Oh if you touch my skin you will die!" Quit whinin' freaks — gays and mutants alike.

Like there's nothing you can do about your situation.

I know! Where gays should rent tanks from the army and blast the homophobes back to

1872, the mutants could use their powers and rebel. Oh wait, that's already what the bad guys do in this movie based on the well-known comic book series "X-Men" created by Stan Lee and Jack Kirby. Lee was an executive producer for the movie that starred his "pets of ink".

The idea to make the comic into a movie was a good one. Although I was not an X-Men reader, this movie made me quite curious about Lee's cultural revolution in the comic book world. There are many comic book fans out there and I hope they weren't disappointed with the movie version.

This movie has many standard, Hollywood-style traits but none of them are used poorly. The dark "Batman"-esque lighting was perfect for mutants in a big city and the special effects were sharp. What sort of gave the director, Bryan Singer, an edge up on most other comic-style movies ("The Shadow", "The Phantom") is his odd finesse with the camera and close-ups.

With these wonderful close-ups, Singer gives the X-Men a chance to show the pain that is entailed with being a mutant and living life in fear. Singer doesn't need dialogue to explain this, but simply a facial expression that isn't quite heroic and isn't quite evil.

The musical score, done by Michael Kamen, is not overdone like most Hollywood action flicks. It was apparent in the right places and more subtle or entirely nonexistent as needed.

The music enhanced, without conscious knowledge, the movements of the mutants as they battle one another.

The makeup of one of the evil X-Men, Mystique, was quite amazing — and it wasn't a suit, it was makeup. The one comparison my mind kept wanting to make was to that of Darth Maul's makeup in Star Wars. His was shoddy and didn't work well (wasn't scary!); Mystique's was rather impressive.

Speaking of Darth Maul, the man who played him, Ray Park, also had a role as the evil mutant, Toad, in the movie. Watch for his little stint swinging a metal rod as if it were a light saber.

The end of the movie leaves off with hard-core sequel potential that I'm sure will come to fruition in a couple of years. If "X-men" doesn't get a sequel in this day and age when atrocities like "The Nutty Professor" can, I think I'll die.

Even the love interest was downplayed just enough after being introduced that it could work in the sequel without seeming reshaped.

This is a good movie to take your kids to as well. It's fantasy enough to let them know they can't walk through walls, but yet it's got some good, old-fashioned family values to be learned. Namely, don't tease other kids when you're young because those teased kids may kill you later in life due to the fact that they were mutants. ★★ ★ —

Karen Brown

Brown ■ Nebraska bucks tolerant trend

BROWN from page 5

nized in Nebraska. The uniting of two persons of the same sex in a civil union, domestic partnership, or other similar same-sex relationship, shall not be valid or recognized in Nebraska." Well, phooey! Nebraska already only recognizes marriage as that of a male and a female, so why the extra assurance?

To double-check their first crusade for holes? Nah, it's just something to do, I suppose. It could (and would) deny GLBT their civil rights for all time, but come on queer folks, do you think an amendment like this will stay for long? If it passes, don't sweat it, a lot can happen in ten years.

If this amendment passes, which it will, don't lose all hope. Perhaps we can start planning early to write up a new petition and be vague with the community like the Committee for the Defense of Marriage has been. Why do we (the GLBT folks) want to be allowed into an institution that has a 57 percent failure rate anyway?

I mean, more people are finding that this marriage thing isn't the cat's meow. 57 percent divorce rate. Sheesh. It's sorta cool, however, to think that gays have no part in the decline of the American family, which is what straights are worried about in the first place. I believe that they're just scared that with factoring homos, the divorce rate would

Karen Brown is senior english major and a Daily Nebraskan columnist

Glazeski ■ Reasoning of same-sex ban flawed

GLAZESKI from page 5

explicitly grant favor to any particular religious establishment.

The homophobic movement, however, claims none other than the Bible as its chief guide. By trying to instill the constitution with morals drawn from a subjectively interpreted religious text, ban-supporters are not establishing their religion. But they are granting preference to their religious views.

Ban-supporters may claim the right to legislate moral behavior — but this should not

drop, leaving the scientists to scratch their chins.

What I want to fight for is the legal aspect of marriage regardless of how I personally feel about marriage. I want to fight for those who want to and can't get hitched. I will fight for the cause because it's simply unfair for the married to get tax breaks, insurance benefits, and societal approval. I want all those things and my MTV!

If marriage were a religious thing (which many claim as the source for the proposal in the first place), then it wouldn't have the ties to insurance and tax breaks. People no longer get married "for God". Just look at the facts: **THE DIVORCE RATE IS 57%!** Marriage isn't "sacred" and "holy," it's a drive-through window in Vegas with a hung-over minister of love churning out couples faster than you can say, "How in the hell did George W. Bush make it this far?"

Are we hurting straight people? Do we threaten them if we were to be equal? Why? These hate mongers are the ones who can't answer, because they have no valid answers. I say "Screw 'em", though not literally because then someone would get upset. Let what happens, happens. We'll fight, but if we can't stop the white, privileged hate mongers from bigotry and close-mindedness, so be it. We will find the loopholes, and then, straightly, we're coming after ya.

be misidentified by voters as a valid claim. Whatever your moral views are, the proper protector of those views, and the proper forum for their debate, is not in state law, much less in the constitution. The proper place is the church.

The day we allow the government to enforce the moral beliefs of a majority over a minority, moral beliefs that have nothing to do with rights of person or property, but with one or two quotations of a religious text — that is the day we slip tragically toward theocracy.

Jacob Glazeski is a math major and a Daily Nebraskan columnist.