Creative Approach to White Liars and Black Comedy

To draw a comparison between the two plays is somewhat impossible, but both have quite a few memorable moments that do stick out in my mind. In White Liars, I enjoyed the constant idea of going around in circles. The story rings very true to the title in the idea that it is based off of lies. It was very clever for the playwright to follow that idea. I never would have actually expected the fortuneteller to confess to the true lies of her story. If you think about the idea of a fortuneteller, they tell you lies just to make money. Not only was Sophie lying to her customers about not really being a good fortuneteller, she was also lying about her private history to the audience. Also, the same thing goes for Frank. Instead of really wanting the girl, he goes for the total other extreme and wants Tom… honestly, that one threw me for a major loop.

In Black Comedy, I was very amused. Not only was the creative idea behind the storyline genius when it came to the technical aspect, but the humor behind it was great. I chose my two characters Black Comedy because I felt that I could understand and discuss them better. I was amused and intrigued by Harold and Clea. I think they were both played to very good extremes.

Harold, good old Harold, is a very interesting individual. The way that the character was designed is interesting because at points he should be horribly raving mad at the fact that Brindsley and Carol “borrowed” his furniture. The way that Charley played it was interesting. He did in a sense play the stereotypical homosexual male. By that, I mean, he used a feminine
inflection with his voice as well as his movements, too. I believe that with his reaction to the stealing of the furniture could have been stronger. It seemed as if he was playing it a little too secure. I know that when something of mine is taken from me without my permission, I can tend to get a little a head of myself and blow a lot of it out of proportion. I just would have pictured that sort of flamboyant gentleman to really blow it out of proportion. I would have imagined him using more force when throwing the Buda back to let it crash on the floor. When I saw the break, the only thing that had separated from it was the head. I would have hoped to seen a huge shatter to disguise at times a woman’s anger. My other intriguing discovery about the acting that was the key to Harold was the way he had disguised the appropriateness of the touching towards Brindsley. I felt that he had done an excellent job to make Brindsley uncomfortable. That, in my mind, was accomplished very well.

Clea was a very intricate part to the play, but only appeared on for a short moment. She was like an omnipresent force before she appeared. We all knew that she would be coming and I started to see how much control she had over Brindsley’s character. He soon began to decay and was no longer careful. In the end, he allowed himself to get caught. I really enjoyed Clea’s entrance. She was quite creative. She came in, like the Diva she tries to be, and was like “hello, I am here… Where is my attention!” I also found her able to see in the dark quite well. For example, when she was tossing the drink off the side of the stairs, She had a perfect aim on who she was dropping it onto. For me, that seems to be a little too ironic. Over all though, I found the impact that she made on the play to be very immense. She also had a great sense of what was going on while she was upstairs by constantly reacting to what she was hearing due to her facial reactions. That in my opinion is a key thing in acting because it shows the audience that you are not focused on the fact of acting and showing off for the audience but instead focused on the
“life” that the character has created. I always find it more interesting to watch the reacting instead of the actual action.

All in all, I liked them both. I give two thumbs up. All shows, can have changes done to them, but live theatre is in no sense ever perfect, but that makes it live theatre.