

The trouble is that we don't really appreciate Harryhausen's movies archivally, any more than we appreciate Georges Méliès's silent magic archivally; we appreciate them poetically, not for what they did given what they didn't have, but for what they did with what they did have. We genuinely like them more than things we know are better at doing what they seemed to set out to do.

Adam Gopnick said exactly what I tried to convey earlier, in my recent post on the death of Ray Harryhausen, that his work was only appreciated *poetically*. It turned out, from the dozen of you who wrote me afterwards, that a number of you felt the same way. Gopnick also loops in RH's predecessors Willis O'Brien (who created the original King Kong) and Georges Méliès (so lovingly portrayed by Ben Kingsley and Martin Scorsese in the wonderful 2011 movie, **Hugo**). IMHO, Gopnick gilds the lily a bit and is way too wordy, which gets in the way, but he captured this ineffable point exactly right.

From Posse member Brian Pusser: <http://www.tcm.com/this-month/article/28068/0/The-Harryhausen-Chronicles.html>

Also, from Posse member Barry Currier:
http://www.laobserved.com/archive/2013/05/ray_harryhausen_special_e.php

Adam Gopnik, Harryhausen and the Expressively Imperfect World, New Yorker, May 10, 2013,
[http://www.newyorker.com/online/blogs/comment/2013/05/harryhausen-and-the-expressively-imperfect-world.html?mbid=nl_Daily%20\(240\)](http://www.newyorker.com/online/blogs/comment/2013/05/harryhausen-and-the-expressively-imperfect-world.html?mbid=nl_Daily%20(240))