



Laura Ann Tull

Mar 12, 2017 · 2 min read

I disagree on your view of the term actor. I think actor should be viewed as a term used for an artist just as the words sculptor and painter are used for types of artists. A performer wants audience approval and praise. An actor develops characters as extensions of herself to portray to the world humanity. An actor focuses on the material. A performer seeks audience approval. See this article by Carolyn Barry.

<https://www.backstage.com/advice-for-actors/backstage-experts/3-differences-between-actors-and-performers/>

I have not studied with the greats but that does not make me less of an actor. Ed Harris after theater in college did acting, he never studied it, or so he said at an event at AFI. I was given Stanislavski and a book on Acting styles in another class in college, but after that we did acting. Every play we read we were required to do a scene and either direct, act, or dramaturgy. I have stacks of programs from college for scenes we did, though I only list on my resume actual full performances I worked on. I've read almost every O'Neill play, many Williams, and my focus was in modern realism and Drama. Later I studied Uta Hagen and read Surtlieff, Chubbick, Del Close on comedy, and I have read Mamet and Meisner though I think Meisner's techniques are not as powerful as Hagen's Stanislavski. Your list also does not include Chekhov.

I do not see myself as a performer because I prefer the camera to a crowd. I prefer the subtlety and realism of acting for a medium that does not involve audience influence or interruption. I prefer cold readings to monologues. Cold readings are an adrenalin rush for me.

I like this little book by Sona Moore on Stanislavski.

[https://www.amazon.com/dp/B00AFWYG30/ref=dp-kindle-redirect?\\_encoding=UTF8&btcr=1](https://www.amazon.com/dp/B00AFWYG30/ref=dp-kindle-redirect?_encoding=UTF8&btcr=1)

Stanislavski was the first acting teacher to use the science of the mind to the art of acting. Moore explains it as a system for actors to play parts like a killer or murderer without losing oneself to it. Acting needs to be organic yet detached enough you do not forget your morality.

I do not like Mamet's style or Meisner because I think the repetitious technique lessens the vulnerability or depth of an actor's portrayal of a character. Yes film actors repeat things and must for continuity but I think that technique needs other techniques to add dimension. Meisner repetition techniques have their use, but psychology and objectives and needs and wants are imperative for an actor to truly connect to other characters in a scene.

I am though very biased against Mamet as his politics are very GOP and I had a teacher Will Wallace, who I can not stand, tell me Oleanna was an idiot. I saw her as a woman failing for the first time in her life and desperate.

I also hate that people misconstrue Stanislavski as this "method" where actors starve themselves or gain weight for roles without actually studying the method. They do not realize his method is the basis for all the methods out there that are any good.

