

Strand Releasing presents

VALLEY OF LOVE

A FILM BY GUILLAUME NICLOUX

Starring Isabelle Huppert and Gérard Depardieu

*Official Selection:
Cannes Film Festival
Opening Night film, Rendez-Vous with French Cinema*

PRELIMINARY PRESS NOTES

Country of Origin: France
Format: DCP/Scope/Color
Sound Format: Dolby 5.1
Running Time: 92 minutes
Genre: Drama
Rating: Not Rated
In French with English Subtitles

National Press Contact:
Jenna Martin / Marcus Hu
Strand Releasing
Phone: 310.836.7500
jenna@strandreleasing.com
marcus@strandreleasing.com

Please download photos from our website:
<http://strandreleasing.com/films/valley-of-love/>

...Be in Death Valley on 12 November 2014. Both of you. Yes, you read right, you and dad. It might sound like a bad joke, but I swear it's the truth. I swear on your kids' lives, my half-brothers and sisters, and dad's kids. It's my only shot at coming back. That's the CONTRACT. You both have to be there. There's a schedule with the exact places, dates and times where you're to wait for me, because I will return. Only briefly, but I'll be there. And I'll see you both. I know you won't be there because you think I'm crazy, or to honor my memory. No, deep down inside you, you'll find another reason to do me this favor. Because it's really for yourselves that you'll be doing it. I died March 24th at 4pm. My boyfriend went out. I killed myself as planned. The week of November 12th, I promise we'll meet again. I'll be in one of the seven Death Valley landmarks. Wait for me there. Mom, I'll see you soon.

Your son, Michael,
who'll stay your son, now and forever

SYNOPSIS

In this mysterious and beautiful examination of a broken family, acclaimed actors, Isabelle Huppert and Gerard Depardieu play thinly disguised versions of themselves as a separated couple who journey to Death Valley after receiving a mysterious letter from their dead son in the expectations that he will appear to them at certain place and time in the desert. An official selection at the Cannes Film Festival, VALLEY OF LOVE opens this year's Rendez-Vous with French Cinema.

GUILLAUME NICLOUX - SHORT DIRECTOR'S STATEMENT

“The place” is the concrete element which has the most immediate effect on my imagination at the time when nothing is yet thought out, structured or planned.

I visited Death Valley at the end of 2012. My trip to one of the biggest national parks in the United States was like a waking dream. But a dream whose impressions and details never totally fade away. On the contrary, even; what remained of it became more precise over the months, like those childhood dreams of which one retains a strangely familiar, almost tactile flavor.

There, time is horizontal, like in Africa. A real trap. Death Valley is a trap for truth. It's your solitary brain, open to everything which evades you. And if you accept the idea that the essential is never what you decide, then the subject can come forth like a spring, and that spring can wash your naked heart.

I moved into the Furnace Creek ranch and I waited. I waited for myself. And the child came. The child I am talking about is the child that I have always carried with me and who will accompany me until death. The one who haunts you. The natural order of death must not be overturned, otherwise it is that of life which is thrown out of kilter. I kick in open doors, parents are supposed to die first.

Isabelle Huppert was in there from the start. Our work on THE NUN opened a passionate breach. Someone capable of not reproducing, someone to whom there is no point explaining, showing and telling.

So a place. A woman. A mother. The mother of the child.

Then the grief, that which roams from life to film and from film to life. That's how my mind works. A torrent of mud which never dries up and which flows into another torrent of mud which flows into me until asphyxia, not knowing if I'm going to drown before I've come to the end.

I can see myself again in that canyon, lost, totally free. I can make out my body, moving through this corridor of stone in search of the son. And it's the father who appears. The father of the child who approaches. I see him approaching me and immediately recognize him.

It's Ryan O'Neal, the lover in LOVE STORY, the man who kisses Marisa Berenson in one of the most beautiful scenes of silent cinema.

April 2013. Impossible. We run into a stone wall. The money is not enough. A film in English disqualifies us from all the usual options.

I'm in the street, on the phone with Sylvie Pialat, my producer. I tell her that I have to make this film. What about the English language? I don't care about the English language. Duly noted. Everything goes very quickly; with me, the stomach speaks first.

An almost-inexistent barrier of censorship, such that I could pass through it and find myself in Mosaic Canyon. And there, I look and I listen. It's not me who is speaking in the corridor of stone; it's another Guillaume. And with him, his father's name.

I can distinctly see Gérard Depardieu. When I say I see him, he is "the film". He is the one for whom the meaning of the film appears definitively. So this kind of cinema could exist for him, the main element arriving in last place. I see him alongside Isabelle; that's all I do, see them.

I see them both and I realize that this dead child is also me, and that we are perhaps going to resuscitate him together.

Guillaume Nicloux

GUILLAUME NICLOUX – FILMOGRAPHY

- 2015 VALLEY OF LOVE
- 2014 THE KIDNAPPING
OF MICHEL HOUELLEBECQ
Berlin Film Festival - Forum
- 2013 THE NUN
Berlin Film Festival - Competition
- 2012 THE GORDJI AFFAIR (Canal +)
- 2010 HOLIDAY
- 2009 LA REINE DES CONNES (Arte)
- 2007 THE KEY
- 2006 THE STONE COUNCIL
- 2003 HANGING OFFENSE
- 2002 A PRIVATE AFFAIR
- 1998 LE POULPE
- 1994 HAPPYNESS IS NO JOKE
Cannes Film Festival – Directors' Fortnight
- 1992 LA VIE CREVÉE (Arte)
Locarno Film Festival - Competition
- 1990 LES ENFANTS VOLANTS
Berlin Film Festival - Forum

GUILLAUME NICLOUX – BIOGRAPHY

Guillaume Nicloux's output has spanned experimental cinema (LES ENFANTS VOLANTS, LA VIE CREVÉE), a noir triptych (A PRIVATE AFFAIR, HANGING OFFENSE, THE KEY), offbeat comedy (LE POULPE, HOLIDAY), political film (THE GORDJI AFFAIR), and drama (HAPPYNESS IS NO JOKE, LA REINE DES CONNES), together forming a dense and personal body of work. THE NUN and THE KIDNAPPING OF MICHEL HOUELLEBECQ, which both screened at the Berlin Film Festival, were no exceptions. VALLEY OF LOVE, filmed in the United States with Gérard Depardieu and Isabelle Huppert, is his fifteenth film. Guillaume Nicloux is a novelist and has taught at the Fémis film school for the past 10 years.

ISABELLE HUPPERT – INTERVIEW

When did Guillaume Nicloux offer you the role in VALLEY OF LOVE?

He talked to me about it during the filming of THE NUN. In fact, he soon talked to me about various projects, including this one. In a fairly constant, not to say obsessional way! I could tell it was something he really wanted to do. At the time, the idea was to film it in English with Ryan O’Neal. I don’t exactly know why; he’s clearly an actor that he likes, but with Guillaume, you’d better not try too hard to understand his choices or his decisions. You just take it or leave it. He had his mind set on Ryan, he liked the idea he was an actor who’d been somewhat forgotten. Fundamentally, it’s the same notion with the couple that Gérard and I form in the film, since we haven’t worked together since LOULOU.

What is it like working with Guillaume Nicloux?

As soon as I started filming with him, I felt close to him. There is something raw about his way of working, a little arid even, which I thought was interesting for THE NUN. In costume movies, you can sometimes be wary of a sort of preciousness, of affectation, and I saw right away that he was a long way from this. He was more about capturing something very alive, stripped of any decorative mood. I liked it. I also appreciate the way he directs actors: he works fast, and the faster it goes, the freer you are. There’s nothing conventional in his approach to a working day: he doesn’t say much, you do few takes, the shoot moves forward swiftly. He has an almost documentary way of filming, all the more so in VALLEY OF LOVE, which gives a great deal of freedom, and therefore veracity. What counts is not what he says, it’s what he is, and above all what he doesn’t say: you can always hear it, if you know how to listen. In relationships with directors, the important thing is never what they say; it’s always what they don’t say.

What was your reaction when you learned that Gérard Depardieu would be your partner?

I was pleased. Nothing against Ryan O’Neal, of course, but with him, the reunion would have been pure fiction. With Gérard, I could only look forward to being reunited with him and sharing this film with him. I don’t know why we went our separate ways, it was not our choice. We have worked together twice before, in GOING PLACES and in LOULOU. At the time of GOING PLACES, I was very young, and I hadn’t met many actors. It’s a good memory, even if the trio of leading actors were very close, which was a bit intimidating for a young actress like I was at the time. I was a little withdrawn as a person, and I didn’t have a central role either. But it turned out that my scene left a lasting impression. The film embodied a sort of generational rebellion, and my character crystallized this: a young girl who insulted her parents.

What was Gérard Depardieu like back then? A mad dog?

Gérard still is a mad dog. Well, mad and not mad. Mad in the way everyone knows, but when it comes to work, which is the center of my relationship with him, his madness brings us ever closer to life and authenticity. VALLEY OF LOVE plays on an effect of veracity in fiction: the veracity of our reunion, the fact that the characters are called Gérard and Isabelle, that they are both actors. But the film goes beyond that.

What is involved in playing someone with your name, who is a version of yourself? Is there a requirement to act less?

I always want to be less than just a character. For a long time I have thought that in cinema, we don't play characters, we are people. That's an idea that Jacques Doillon and I formulated together, happy to have put words on our vision of the dramatic art. It is also possible to start from the opposite end, and to totally explore the idea of the character. But that's not what I do. During the shoot for VALLEY OF LOVE, the person to whom I lent my body was a bit closer to me than is usually the case. I also reconnected with the moments I experienced on the shoot of LOULOU. Without comparing himself to Pialat, Guillaume Nicloux has some guiding figures who haunt him more than others, and I think Maurice is one of them. On the set of LOULOU, Pialat abolished all the rituals, notably the order "Action!", which sets everything in motion, and is already a little too much. Gérard and I slipped seamlessly from reality into fiction. We used to talk, sitting in a café, and suddenly we realized that the camera was running and we were imperceptibly entering a form of improvisation which corresponded to the scene. We tried to capture that atmosphere, although Guillaume Nicloux did say "Action!", and his dialog was very precisely written. His writing allowed us that: because his words convey ideas and images, those elements which provide the narrative substance of a film, but his phrases authorize simplicity and authenticity. Like a conversation in the desert, against a backdrop of the drama of that grief which serves to give depth, anxiety, mystery. There's also the fantasy quality that comes with the landscape, which acts as an invisible and at the same time disturbing presence. This spiritual landscape is unfathomable and gives us a feeling of the sacred.

Gérard Depardieu has experienced this grieving in real life. How did this personal tragedy resonate on set?

We didn't really talk about. That tragedy was evoked at times, but it was never a source of awkwardness, nor of inspiration. It was there, but very much in the background. Of course, it was present for Gérard, but in such a secret place inside him that I didn't have access to it. Or at least he didn't do anything to give me access.

Death Valley is yet another stop on your cinematic journey. Does working abroad change the way you act?

Not necessarily. I look for this change of scenery above all as a way of life; it makes things a little more varied. But here, it was special; the setting added something. Especially the heat. Although in the end, I don't feel we suffered that much. We knew that it would be a quick shoot and you can get used to anything, even an insane 50-degree temperature which never drops: it's 50 degrees Celsius at night, it's 50 degrees in the pool, it's very weird. Except the last day, when it was a bit cooler in the morning. It was a sensation we'd forgotten. And it was very disturbing. But more than the heat, it was the light that struck me. I had already experienced it somewhat on HEAVEN'S GATE. That light is part of the identity of American cinema. It is powerful, it lights up vast landscapes that lend themselves to Cinemascope. In Europe, you can have nice light but it's more diffracted, and in more confined spaces. There, there is a breadth which renders it quite particular – even more so in Death Valley with its incredible whiteness.

In the film, why does Isabelle believe more than Gérard in the message left by their son?

She's his mother. She is more disposed to believe in it. Perhaps because belief is more feminine, there's a sort of masculine rationality, without attributing a hierarchy to the two attitudes. In any case, she wants to believe in it; he doesn't. Perhaps she also feels more guilt. And a taste for the romantic, which she wants to believe in to ease her suffering. But in the end, it's he who believes he saw their son. She wanted to believe in it, and she brought him along with her on that path. That transmission is lovely, the way Isabelle forces Gérard to enter into her desire to believe. The roles were nicely divided up and the son, in a way, achieved his ends. He reestablished a sort of link between them. Personally, I don't think the son could have materialized, but I imagine that in those situations, you're ready to believe anything. And on a more simple level, how could one not believe in what was recreated between that man and that woman?

Reading the son's letter is a powerful moment in the film. How did you prepare for it, and how did you experience it?

I liked reading out that letter. We did one take. No, two. I took the letter, I read it out; I'd hardly read it before, we hadn't rehearsed. It was very strange. I remember that I started to cry on reading it, and that was down to the power of the camera, which acted as an extraordinarily powerful lever on the emotions. At that moment, I'm not sure that I was literally moved by the meaning of what I was reading. But the way the camera moved in, the power of its gaze brought out our emotion. Afterwards I was blown away. It's hard to explain the power of an emotion which comes over you when you're acting, or to describe what goes through you in those moments. It's something you can't control. It's beyond acting.

How did you approach the ruptures in tone, the comedy scenes?

That's what I call the documentary side, capturing that great intimacy between Gérard and me. For that to work, I didn't want too many people on set, so that one could sense the solitude of the couple. With Gérard, the intimacy came right away. We act well together, and he was 1,000 percent in the film. For me, the voice was very important. I felt I was spot on when my voice was at a very precise point, when it found a tone of intimacy. It was a question of the sound level, requiring very fine tuning, and I could hear it. I had to find a particular timbre, which was that of the truth of what we really were at the moment we were talking to each other, and not acting scenes. In a couple, people speak at a certain sound level. That's also why I speak more loudly on the phone, in a voice that is suddenly rather too sonorous, because Isabelle wants to signal a change, because the relationship with Gérard is once again on the verge of the illicit.

Do you know what the source of the film was for Guillaume Nicloux? Whether he is referencing a specific biographical moment?

No, but what's interesting is the power of the imaginary. The origin of the story, the place where it connects for each of us, that's of no interest to anyone else. It's not what it means to us which will fuel a dialog. I could tell that it meant something for Guillaume. It was clear, I could smell it like a fragrance, but I didn't know what. And I still don't. If Guillaume could have put it into words, there would have been no need to make the film. The film's origins are in a black hole, and above all, they should not be illuminated.

ISABELLE HUPPERT – SELECT FILMOGRAPHY

- 2015 VALLEY OF LOVE
by Guillaume Nicloux
- 2015 LOUDER THAN BOMBS
by Joachim Trier
- 2013 THE NUN
by Guillaume Nicloux
- 2010 WHITE MATERIAL
by Claire Denis
- 2010 COPACABANA
by Marc Fitoussi
- 2005 GABRIELLE
by Patrice Chéreau
- 2002 8 WOMEN
by François Ozon
- 2001 THE PIANO TEACHER
by Michael Haneke
- 1998 THE SCHOOL OF FLESH
by Benoît Jacquot
- 1995 A JUDGEMENT IN STONE
by Claude Chabrol
- 1994 THE SEPARATION
by Christian Vincent
- 1991 MADAME BOVARY
by Claude Chabrol
- 1988 STORY OF WOMEN
by Claude Chabrol
- 1981 COUP DE TORCHON
by Bertrand Tavernier
- 1980 LOULOU
by Maurice Pialat
- 1978 VIOLETTE NOZIERE
by Claude Chabrol
- 1976 THE LACEMAKER
by Claude Goretta

GÉRARD DEPARDIEU – INTERVIEW

How did you come to be in this film?

Thanks to Sylvie Pialat. She told me she was working on something she thought I'd like. She didn't tell me any more. Usually, people tell you the story right away, and it's so bad from the start that you don't want it to go on. Without revealing much about the film, Sylvie simply told me it was the story of two people who had been together, who could have been Isabelle Huppert and me in LOULOU 35 years ago, and who would have had a child. That seemed plausible to me. I did nonetheless ask her to tell me the end, but she refused and said I'd have to read. And so I read it. I thought it had great emotion.

Thanks to the writing?

Yes. It was a powerful text, but what I experienced on the set was 10 times more powerful. And on viewing the film, it's even more powerful and remarkable since all the things I had detected in the text on reading it become not obvious, but take on a great cinematographic intelligence. In Nicloux's filmmaking, it's more than just a matter of levels. In this case, it's the child, the mystery of those two letters, and that improbable meeting in an improbable landscape. A landscape that is only ever visited by tourists from all over – Russians, Belgians, Italians, French; there are very few Americans. There are some old Native Americans, very few dwellings, very few people. You can't live there. There's the border with Nevada. There's this sort of vast supermarket with really wide aisles because inevitably, the people pushing the carts are twice the volume of the carts.

The first words you utter in the film are, "Goddam heat!" The heat is an essential part of the film, then?

Yes, it was a relatively dry heat. "Goddam heat!" is what you say when you come out of an air-conditioned space and there's a pretty tough moment of adaptation. But other than that, you get used to it. Once your body has adjusted to the temperature of the space, it's OK. Anyway, "Goddam heat" is something I say very often, even when it's cold.

Does the fact that shoot was harsh, but not too long, also explain your desire to be a part of it?

No. For me, it's not how long a shoot lasts that influences my desire to be involved. It's about whether there's a slimmed-down crew, and about working with intelligent people. You can't work with idiots. Especially not in the desert, where you'd want to kill them. You'd tie them to a post in the blazing sun. But the people who were there were very exacting, extremely rigorous. There wasn't a word on set. No one was cracking jokes. And all that comes from Guillaume, from this script which is always omnipresent, and also from the choice of lenses, the choice of locations. There's no stalling in deciding where to put the camera. None. Then there is Isabelle Huppert, who is a woman and actress who works with what she is, meaning that unbelievable career, and at the same time that fear. Fear of what? Of no longer working, or of acting less well?

What's more, in the son's letter, when he talks about the mother he uses the word "anxious"; "You are an anxious mother." What he says is very beautiful: he went to a festival, he saw her from a distance, he didn't want to approach her. He saw her both as his mother and as an actress, when he came out of her belly. He describes you as "alcoholic and irascible".

Irascible, like all alcoholics. Though in fact, not all irascible people are alcoholics. An alcoholic is someone who, at five o'clock, starts on a little gin, and waits for eight o'clock to convince himself that he's at ease. Then after that, he carries on. But I'm the opposite of an alcoholic. I am wrathful, booming, alive, annoying, but innocent. Completely innocent and interested in life.

And interested in love, their love...

Yes. Because you can't live with someone, or stay with someone whom you didn't love.

She expresses this very well. At the end, she has a beauty, her face is washed, and once she starts to smile, it's extraordinary. That's also Isabelle. But that Isabelle only exists if she is really trusting the situation, and more than just trusting – she has to be in a state of grace with herself.

Some will say: it's LOULOU 35 years on. Perhaps also (Maurice Pialat's) WE WON'T GROW OLD TOGETHER, but reworked as "We will grow old together". In fact, you do grow old together in the film. What we see in the film is a couple.

That's what you say. But that's not what I see. I don't see LOULOU, I don't see any other references.

Does the fact that shoot was harsh, but not too long, also explain your desire to be a part of it?

No. For me, it's not how long a shoot lasts that influences my desire to be involved. It's about whether there's a slimmed-down crew, and about working with intelligent people. You can't work with idiots. Especially not in the desert, where you'd want to kill them. You'd tie them to a post in the blazing sun. But the people who were there were very exacting, extremely rigorous. There wasn't a word on set. No one was cracking jokes. And all that comes from Guillaume, from this script which is always omnipresent, and also from the choice of lenses, the choice of locations. There's no stalling in deciding where to put the camera. None. Then there is Isabelle Huppert, who is a woman and actress who works with what she is, meaning that unbelievable career, and at the same time that fear. Fear of what? Of no longer working, or of acting less well?

What's more, in the son's letter, when he talks about the mother he uses the word "anxious"; "You are an anxious mother." What he says is very beautiful: he went to a festival, he saw her from a distance, he didn't want to approach her. He saw her both as his mother and as an actress, when he came out of her belly. He describes you as "alcoholic and irascible".

Irascible, like all alcoholics. Though in fact, not all irascible people are alcoholics. An alcoholic is someone who, at five o'clock, starts on a little gin, and waits for eight o'clock to convince himself that he's at ease. Then after that, he carries on. But I'm the opposite of an alcoholic. I am wrathful, booming, alive, annoying, but innocent. Completely innocent and interested in life.

And interested in love, their love...

Yes. Because you can't live with someone, or stay with someone whom you didn't love. She expresses this very well. At the end, she has a beauty, her face is washed, and once she starts to smile, it's extraordinary. That's also Isabelle. But that Isabelle only exists if she is really trusting the situation, and more than just trusting – she has to be in a state of grace with herself.

Some will say: it's LOULOU 35 years on. Perhaps also (Maurice Pialat's) WE WON'T GROW OLD TOGETHER, but reworked as "We will grow old together". In fact, you do grow old together in the film. What we see in the film is a couple.

That's what you say. But that's not what I see. I don't see LOULOU, I don't see any other references.

When you ask her in the film, "Do you remember the first time, when we went up to the hotel?" That's exactly what we see in LOULOU.

No.

Has Guillaume Nicloux seen LOULOU?

I'm not saying he hasn't seen it, I don't know. But the film did not set out like that. What's more, another actor was initially supposed to be in it.

An American?

Who was an actor, moreover, which is not the case for me. I'm off the map. As I have been for a long time. Even when I was doing films, even with Maurice. Perhaps I started to drift off when we made UNDER THE SUN OF SATAN, both of us did, for that matter. If he were alive, Toscan – may he rest in peace – would know.

VALLEY OF LOVE is a film about a couple that has separated...

They're not a couple, they are two people who get back together 30 years later. There's nothing of a couple about them, there's 30 years that separates them. This film becomes flesh thanks to a letter from a child they had together and who died. That's all, but they're not a couple. They are two being in a space who are linked by a piece of paper and by what people said about them, and who, by going through this event, get back together. One doesn't believe what the other does, but he goes along with her. And that's all. There's no other explanation apart from what you feel on reading it. It's like a piece of music the first time you hear it. You can see the film 10 times, you will be moved 10 times in totally different places. So I can't explain this film. All I can say is that it's authentic, and it's the kind of cinema I like to make.

In the film, you and Isabelle are manipulated by the dead. It is he who sets up your meeting, it's he who says you have to go there and stay for seven days. There's a sort of contract.

For my character, the only thing that counts is to be there for this letter; to be there for seven days, to be reunited. For Isabelle's character, guilt is in some way more to the fore. You can sense that the grieving is more problematic. But thanks to those letters, there is another meeting, a reunion, even a carnal one, and in the end he walks away from his life and goes back to her. There are some unexpected mechanisms which are utterly simple but of dazzling humanity that one rarely sees in cinema.

Upon seeing this film, a lot of people are bound to think of the coincidence: You, a filmmaker named Guillaume, the storyline...

It's fortuitous and at the same time, as Guillaume said, it's not fortuitous because it happened.

It is nonetheless a son who reaches out to his father from beyond the grave. There's something spiritual about that, to put it simply.

I only do spiritual things. The only thing which is not spiritual is what I see in my daily life, and which I sometimes comment on, not clumsily, but deliberately, because I want to be deliberately uncouth. Today's humanity is ill-mannered. So there's nothing to add, that's all I'm interested in.

One has the feeling that you have returned to cinema, afresh. It is quite exceptional, everyone can feel it. I've only seen the film once, and there's something about your presence: simply being there.

That's what takes the least acting: being there. Quite simply being there. Directors today try to justify your presence through situations which become artifice.

And for you, in this film, everything was there – Sylvie Pialat, Guillaume Nicloux, Isabelle Huppert – so that you simply had to “be”?

Yes, and there was also that wonderful Death Valley landscape. And then it gradually became obvious, even before the five or six meetings I had with Guillaume. It was obvious.

And the script...

That's it. You read the script and it takes your breath away. It's not even taken away by the content, but by a nothing, the same as I've seen in other films that he's written. I'd like to go to his screenwriting class at the Fémis film school, because it's really exceptional.

Another very beautiful thing in the film is you, almost naked. It's your skin, your weight. Isabelle says you look in good shape, you reply that you are too fat and you say to her “How can you think for one second that I can be fine?” And the film gives a feeling of your physique that we've never seen before. Everyone knows you are a handsome man, but everything about you is beautiful, even your skin, and your sweat because of the heat. It's good, it's there, it's not cumbersome.

That's also something I really liked about the way the script was written. There's no prudishness, but at the same time there is great modesty. There's no dieting going on, there's nothing slim. When she tells him, “Stop, you're going to upset the ecosystem” when he's feeding the lizard: you see the dude sitting on a stool, who looks like he might explode any minute, or go barreling down the ravine like a bowling ball. There won't be any more bread for the lizards, but a big lump of flesh. He's fit to be pecked at. The same for her, lying on the bed, and there's an underlying suggestion that she chews her lips to try and peck at some skin. She's clearly underfed. It's the same thing, that's Isabelle. When she walks, the earth under her heels is doomed. It's like people who eat really quickly to not see what they're eating, because the food is doomed too. But I think all that is written down. That's why it's majestic, it's elephantine. With her, there is an absolutism which is very powerful. Despite everything, she's in a bit of a spin, between that divorce and her children, the communication that she cannot muster. There's something extremely disturbing about her. He can see it. The only thing holding him back is him saying to himself, “What am I doing? When do I tell her?” He doesn't choose

the moment, he doesn't think about it too much. He tells her that he can't stay all the time, then he ends up telling her that it's because he has cancer and that he wants to go and see another doctor because he wants to cut it all out, right away. After, it's no longer interesting. After, there are signs.

Yes, it's a film about signs.

It's a spiritual film. That's all.

Do you like fantasy?

Yes, a great deal. I like science fiction, too. Guillaume is very familiar with Van Vogt, Theodore Sturgeon, Richard Matheson, I AM LEGEND and MORE THAN HUMANS, Lovecraft and Bradbury. I told him that this was what was amazing in his film, because there are these tiny little things which lead us along, which open the door to the fantastic. Dumas wrote ONE THOUSAND AND ONE GHOSTS. There were a lot of all-night parties in the literary salons where people would explore in great detail a fantastical idea. That's exactly what Guillaume Nicloux does in most of his scripts, or those I've read, those which are yet to come.

There is one scene which I found very moving: it's the scene filmed in a single take, in which you hear the screams, and the way he films you, turning, at once quickly and slowly because you're running but you're not running fast. That scene is in the realm of the fantastic.

Yes. That comes from a great knowledge of fantastic cinema, and above all literature. What's surprising is that you are fixated by a sort of ballet which is not of this world, which belongs to the world of the fantastic. This film makes you think of things, of situations you find in dreams. It's oneiric and it's fantastic.

The desert lends itself to this, since there are no borders.

That desert is nothing like any of the other deserts I've seen. It's not the desert, it truly is the valley of death.

Thanks to Serge Toubiana.

GÉRARD DEPARDIEU – SELECT FILMOGRAPHY

- 2012 RASPOUTINE
by Josée Dayan
- 2010 MY AFTERNOONS WITH MARGUERITTE
by Jean Becker
- 2010 POTICHE
by François Ozon
- 2010 MAMMUTH
by Benoît Delépine and Gustave Kervern
- 2009 INSPECTOR BELLAMY
by Claude Chabrol
- 2005 LET'S BE FRIENDS
by Eric Toledano and Olivier Nakache

2001 THE CLOSET
by Francis Veber

2001 VIDOCQ
by Pitof

2001 ASTERIX AND OBELIX : MISSION CLEOPATRA
by Alain Chabat

2000 VATEL
by Roland Joffé

1999 THE BRIDGE
by Gérard Depardieu & Frédéric Auburtin

1996 THE BEST JOB IN THE WORLD
by Gérard Lauzier

1995 LE GARÇU
by Maurice Pialat

1994 LE COLONEL CHABERT
by Yves Angelo

1991 ALL THE MORNINGS OF THE WORLD
by Alain Corneau

1990 CYRANO DE BERGERAC
by Jean-Paul Rappeneau

1987 UNDER THE SUN OF SATAN
by Maurice Pialat

1980 LOULOU
by Maurice Pialat

CAST

Isabelle	Isabelle Huppert
Gérard	Gérard Depardieu
The couple, the man	Dan Warner
The couple, the woman	Aurelia Thierrée

CREW

Director	Guillaume Nicloux
Screenplay	Guillaume Nicloux
Director of Photography	Christophe Offenstein
Artistic Direction	Olivier Dô-Hùu
Editing	Guy Lecorne
Music	Charles Ives
Costumes	Anaïs Romand
Producers	LES FILMS DU WORSO Sylvie Pialat and Benoît Quainon LGM cinema Jean Baptiste Dupont and Cyril Colbeau-Justin