

Part 1 - The Humorist Analysis and Reflection

Analysis

It's kind of hard to really pinpoint where exactly this type of humor really comes from, since it mostly stems from a miscellaneous set of clips. However if I were forced to try to think about something, it would probably boil down to *Scott Pilgrim* (The Movie and the comic kinda) and *Sam and Max*.

Scott Pilgrim and its movie adaptation *Scott Pilgrim Vs the World* by Bryan Lee O'malley (and directed by Edger Wright) are very quick and nonchalant when it comes to jokes. It's not only funny because of the world itself, but because of everything surrounding it as well. In order for certain things to pay off the way that it does, they don't explain the rules of the world. What they do is they have the joke be the establishment of it and kind of abandon it. They don't really explore all that much beyond it because it's funny to us but isn't to them. This creates this layer of understatement for the whole series. For example when Scott beats the first evil ex, they blow up into coins. Instead of shock or some kind of "Oh my god!!", he instead is disappointed because it isn't even enough for the bus ride home. Even then when we think we know what to expect, it brings out a new element and ingrains it into the story.

The film adaptation doesn't necessarily add on to this, but rather increases the spectacle. It increases the gap between reality and fiction that it forces you to kind of take the fiction for what it is. On another note, it takes some of the dialogue that's in the comics and the actors really nail the delivery (A great example is when Scott is ordering coffee).

Sam and Max by Steve Purcell are characters that have origins in comics, but have also starred in Video games and TV shows. What I think makes Sam and Max stand out so well is both due to its angle on absurd humor and its great understanding of character dynamic when it comes to humor. It all shines in various Repartees, Banter, and Wisecracks done by the duo. Both the character work and the absurdity harmoniously with each other.

The titular *Sam and Max* are just goofy and off the walls bonkers. They are Freelance Police, so they aren't qualified. They only take the job because it allows them to commit unspeakable acts of violence (Cartoon Violence that is). Max is portrayed as this crazed lagomorph with a gun, baring his sharp toothed smile and a mind of vices. He's always quick to violence, recommending the worst possible option, and is "a symbol of end times". His partner, Sam, is a very clear parody of Mcgruff the Crime Dog. He constantly makes long long nonsense phrases ("Great gouts of steaming magma on a beeline for the orphanage!", "Sweet mother of double jeopardy backstroking in butterscotch!", "Holyoke, Massachusetts!") and is seen as the more reasonable of the two. Often seen as the brains and the character you play as in the point in click adventures he usually stars in. Out of the two, He's the "Straight man". Sam and Max, though they react in a very clear template, always manage to surprise with just how much they manage to say (and in some instances get away with).

Reflection

What I think is important that I took away is how to make absurd humor work. When I was a young boy, I found random things funny. You know, "Dank memes". Of course as time moves on, it gets out of style and random isn't funny anymore. So how do you make random funny? You juxtapose and that's what makes *Scott Pilgrim* and *Sam and Max* work. In different ways they create a juxtaposition.

In *Scott Pilgrim*, everybody in the world is in on the joke and the reader is left out. When that is the norm, a new aspect is introduced to throw the viewer back out there. So in order to make absurd humor work in the case in which it works for me, I have to be funny fast. I have to avoid letting the magic of the joke settle.

In *Sam and Max* having crazy is good, but it works better in a pair. You could have both people be crazy and insane, but have one be even less so. This creates a weird justification of insane reasoning. You agree with the crazy person, because they are arguing against an even crazier person. To apply this to my project, I need to insert a straight man. Someone who the audience has to agree with out of pure necessity. Once the audience agrees with the straight man, have them be absolutely crazy.

So let's explore this in the context of an interview, what my group plans to have my project be.

We have an interviewer who's just some joe schmo, interviewing people for some nondescript job. Then in comes some people who are total nut cases, some who achieve things that are downright impossible. Out of respect, the interviewer accepts the weirdness, of course they wouldn't be hired. Slowly but surely, it starts to have some kind of effect on them. They start to get more irritated, they start acting out in odd ways: Hitting people, Yelling, doing strange things. Eventually it all kind of devolves into just raw disorder, it's all just nothing.

We can then have normalcy creep back in as the final interview is just fine. It's all normal except the interiver is just a disheveled mess, with them just bursting into tears in the middle of the interview as it's cut short.

I think that's the best way to handle absurdity. Give it some kind of purpose.

Part 2 – Description of Proposed Project

1.) Are you collaborating with others? **Yes*** or No

**If Yes, list the names of your collaborators :* Amanda Jernigan , Lucy Good, and Maybe one more but it's kind of tricky.

2.) Which form of humor are you planning to develop? (See [menu](#).)

Comedic Narrative. A video skit if you want to be specific.

3.) What is the subject (or, in the case of satire, the target)? Why did you choose this subject?

It's focused on an interview with a bunch of inept candidates (or "candidate"). As it goes on, the absurdity also kind of gets to the interviewee. This was mostly so we could fit some quick gags in it without it feeling out of place. We also have some Humoristic influences that act as a really great foundation for this kind of stuff

4.) Which comedic [tools/techniques](#) do you plan to use, and why? (List at least 3 main ones and explain briefly how you plan to use them):

The whole thing is probably a big farce with unemployable interviewees committing buffoonery and the like. Situational Humor as most of the funny kinda stems from this odd situation. Slapstick or some kind of physical humor, Though not as extreme because it has to be in the realm of "No one hurt".

5.) Why do you think this is the right humor project for you? (If you have a group, can you assure me that everyone is invested in this idea and you won't have trouble getting everyone to contribute meaningfully?) What makes you excited about this idea? What are some potential pitfalls you wish to avoid?

As we were pitching this idea, we did a "practice run" which at least passed the first round (made each other laugh). So I think that with enough backbone, we could make something that could make others laugh. At this stage it's still pretty loose, so we would definitely have to solidify things. Personally (Aramis), I'm afraid that we might do a lot of things that were funny in the moment, but might turn out to be unfunny later. Or maybe we might turn to a more improv type of thing, but I think that would be fixed if we had a script.

6.) If you get approval, what's your next step?

Definity scripting stuff out and really choosing a location (Can we use the English room maybe?). I think the first first thing is write down all of the different characters that we have in mind, then we can start organizing and putting things together.