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Short Synopsis
Two couples in their thirties meet and fall madly in love.
They get involved, sleep together, spend their days together. They try to move forward - without rules and without lies.
Their shared passion becomes an addiction. They lose themselves completely, then struggle to escape the confusion, whatever it takes.

Long synopsis
Rachel works in a jewellery shop. When she meets Vincent in the workshop she is immediately seduced by his frankness and decides to arrange a dinner with their respective spouses, Franck and Teri. The two couples barely have time to become friends before they fall in love.

Without wanting it, spontaneously, the new lovers become inseparable. They grope their way along in their passion, without rules, without lies. They keep their secret from their children and life goes on, almost like before.

But what ties them to each other is so strong that confusion starts to settle in. Feelings are getting mixed up and the issues at stake grow crueller by the day.
The film opens with Rachel (Marina Foïs) saying: “In life, even if you are very happy you always hope something will happen, something that will create a diversion.” Does this imply an impossible quest for happiness?

This sentence is a way of saying that she’s happy, that everything’s fine and that what’s going to happen to her is not linked to the fact that something is missing in her life, or that there’s any particular problem in her relationship. It’s linked to something else.

The beginning of the film shows Rachel working, earning a living. Then “something happens”, as she says. She encounters Vincent (Nicolas Duvauchelle). They meet at work, in their social framework. They’re very different but early on Rachel tames Vincent’s wild side. Sure, he’s covered in tattoos but she sticks skulls and bones onto her jewellery.

There’s a complete frankness right from their first meeting, even on trivial matters: “Do you like my jewellery?” “No, not really.” No trying to please between them. and from that, an adult kind of love can take root.

Love between adults, that’s what this film is about. What to do with feelings of love? What to do with passion? When you’re a teenager, you can use love to liberate yourself. But when you are an adult?

So you can call this an impossible quest, but I call it a utopia.

**“Happy Few” is an expression meaning a small group of privileged people. Why this title?**

They are “the favourite friends”. At one given point the four of them live in self-sufficiency, it feels like they are never apart. In HAPPY FEW there is the notion that people are pulled upwards while falling in love. They try to be noble. But they are not at all part of the social elite; from this point of view the title is ironic.

During the shoot we thought there had to be an aspiration to vitality in the film, as in the novels of Stendhal - who coined this expression, “happy few”.

The film depicts two couples exploring - apparently without having given it much thought - partner swapping. What made you use this as a backdrop?

That appalling expression ‘partner swapping’ has never been what this film is about. It’s first and foremost a free market trade of bodies, and that doesn’t interest me at all. The characters in HAPPY FEW are not particularly debauched; they’ve reached this point in their lives where they don’t feel like spending a lot of their energy lying to themselves. They test how far they can go while staying truthful.

Let’s say that exchange interests me more than partner-swapping. Of course they are elated by this new sexuality but there is a momentum that takes them towards a more general exchange of identities and functions. Teri feels it right from the start: “We take each other’s clothes, books…” They exchange their paraphernalia before exchanging partners.

Frank (Roschdy Zem) practises feng-shui, he moves furniture around to allow energy to flow better. Consequently he wants to move people around, swap their places to see if things works better that way. That’s exactly what they do. And the result is total confusion. At the end, Franck’s mother doesn’t even recognize him; she thinks he’s the doctor, while his father is convinced he knows Teri when they’ve never even met. They’re in deep trouble….

**Scenes often start with a character talking to another who is off-screen so it can be difficult to guess who that person is, even when they're in bed.**

Yes. What is violent and dizzying for them is the discovery that they are interchangeable. “What if we had met when we were 20 years old?” Life would have been completely different. They are brought to a time where everything is possible when they would normally have passed the age where everything is possible!

After having filmed a love triangle you take on the erotic quartet. How does love between more than two characters feed your films?

I don’t think about it or else I’d tell myself “Oh no, I can’t do this now” and the film wouldn’t exist. There are never only two people in a couple anyway. There’s always a third or fourth: a child, a pet, an analyst, an ex… Frankly, I could make dozens of films talking about love in this way. Doillon or Blier have each made several films about love relationships between 3
You wrote the screenplay with Julie Peyr. Beyond the story did you ascribe yourself the characters’ point of view?

Definitely not. Julie and I worked together on the four characters. To define them we tried to stick to a logic favoured by a lot of American writers we like: occupation will determine psychology; not so easy but a lot of fun. “If Franck is writing a book on feng-shui he’ll want to move the bed around while he’s sleeping with Teri.” Then we tried to take them to a point of confusion. When we’ve defined the contradiction in one of the characters we consider we have plenty of material to work with.

There’s always a flow between logic and confusion that can be maintained right up until the shoot. For instance, in the scene when Rachel and Vincent are getting dressed while wondering what the others are doing, we inverted their lines at the last minute, just before shooting.

How did you decide which actor should play another’s partner?

Because the story is mainly built on the female characters, I started with them. Then we decided which other actors we should use according to my wants, the actresses’ wants, and taking into account the actors who had expressed an interest.

There’s always a bonus with novelty, as if it helps create fiction: it’s better if the actors have never acted together before. In this case, of the six ‘dual relationships’, everything was new except for Roschdy and Élodie who had already worked together in two films (films I like very much, by the way). Initially Roschdy was supposed to play Vincent and when Nicolas Duvauchelle joined us we decided Roschdy would play Franck – again, with that logic of confusion and exchange.

It also has to evoke something. Looking at Marina and Nicolas I could see couples in Téchiné films. I recognized the social disparity and the uncontrollable love between Deneuve and Dewaere in “Hotel Americana”, or Wadewek Stanczak in “Scene of the Crime”. So I added some violence in their relationship, culminating in the scene where he slaps her to give her pleasure. For Roschdy and Élodie there was some kind of nonchalance and easiness that recalled more the Nouvelle Vague, so I suggested the scene where Roschdy sings to Élodie, I was reminded of Anna Karina singing “I never told you I’d love you forever” to Belmondo. Élodie took Belmondo’s place in bed, stuck a fag in her mouth in the same way and we shot without rehearsing.

And Jean-François Stevenin?

A Beyond the actor, I have total admiration for the three films he has directed. They are about made-up families, families constructed on friendship, encounters. I felt an echo in HAPPY FEW, in these four characters who can’t live without each other once they’ve met.

Do you have to use a particular method when it comes to filming naked bodies?

Everything is agreed during casting. The actors have to want it, they have to tell themselves “Maybe I can go that far”, or else it cannot work. To force an actor to appear naked on camera is out of question.

My cinephilia developed in the 80s when nudity was common - in the films of Doillon, or Ferreri, or the Dutch films of Verhoeven. I’m interested in nudity, in the frame of intimacy of course, but also as a spectacle. And I don’t need to make excuses such as “it brings so much to the story”, as you sometimes hear.

During the shoot you go about it as if it’s like any other scene, but you can’t help acting differently: you rehearse on a closed set, you speak more quietly. And you try to film for longer periods. You can’t chop up a love scene; it would be impossible for the actors. Then there’s the need for some support at the heart of the scene, for “lieutenants”: Nicolas Duvauchelle for example is a dream come true, he loves to have a mission, he takes it upon himself. He’s funny, protective…

How did you come up with the love scene in the flour?

In the script it’s an act of kindness, a real gift from friends: the others decide to enact Teri’s childhood fantasy, the fantasy with the baker’s wife. Julie Peyr and I thought that when they go out into the garden, into the sunlight, there’d be some kind of tribal effect, they’d look like aborigines. It is as if they were playing “Quest For Fire”; we see they are more at peace with themselves because they return to something primitive.

The flour is an idea in the screenplay which allows some exciting shooting. It diverts from the
problems of nudity, and it generated exciting technical challenges: How do you breath? How can we see the bodies? And how to capture the voluptuousness: the softness of the flour, the slightly dulled sound… The actors found out they were going to get a sack of flour poured on their heads at the last minute. You always have to surprise actors.

There was a real sense of expectation when it came to that scene. “Only three days to the flour.” Everybody waited for it and dreaded it at the same time. Then we shot. Later, a member of the crew said something I think is very true: “In fact, we were all very happy the day of the flour.” So there it is: what can we do so we emerge happy? The theme of the film, really.

Do you work a lot with the actors before shooting?

On the dialogue, hardly at all. But I do like to be hands-on when we do tests, including camera tests. It is a way of having the film “well in hand”. For the actors, there are techniques for tackling their roles. Élodie for instance had squash lessons, and I filmed her training. We noticed immediately that it was the attitude in between points that mattered, much more than the technical credibility of hitting the ball, so it was first and foremost a matter of game. We had coaches to teach us shiatsu or jewellery-making gestures. It’s more or less useful depending on the actors. Some like it because they like to begin with a studious approach; it infuriates others. I adapt myself to their needs, I respect who they are. I choose them for what they are, not for what they are not.

We feel that through its exploration of the fragility of feelings the film brings us to the precariousness of modern life…

When you write a script you always begin with narrow and incoherent elements, personal concepts you can hardly talk about. Then you put all these things together… If you like stories, you make one up. And at one point the question of ‘the world’ arises, what can be said about the world or ‘modern life,’ as you put it. Why a film and not a song? Why are we making this today and not yesterday or in ten years’ time?

We started to write the screenplay in 2007. At the time, we had the feeling that the main preoccupation, politically speaking, was to find and fabricate a guilty party to bring people up against one another, which is still true today. In reaction we had the feeling we were writing a film where the characters were impervious to feelings of guilt. They seemed normal and moral in an abnormal and immoral world. That’s why they are utopians. It’s hard for them sometimes but they try to resist the temptation of accusing each other. For me this is the difficulty of existence today: not to accuse others.

In BEAU COMME UN CAMION or COLD SHOWERS, the theme of anchorage in the social order was prevalent. Why is it absent from HAPPY FEW?

I don’t agree that it’s absent. It’s there but not at the heart of the story or voluntarily ineffective. In COLD SHOWERS it was the main theme. Here, the social impact always comes in a little late: when Teri visits Franck’s parents and finds out that he grew up on a council estate and was adopted, it’s a bit late to do anything about it because she already suspects that they are going to part. When Rachel says she’s not going to take over the jewellery shop but will stay at the head of the workshop “because of the banks,” she tells her sister, not her lover.

If you make a film about working-class characters, “social anchorage” is quite obvious because it’s dramatic. The first priority for these characters will be to survive. If you make a film about middle-class characters, like here, it’s subtler, buried.

When I had others read the screenplay I noticed that we look down on these people, that we are very quick to stick them in the bourgeois category. It’s true that the characters in HAPPY FEW don’t have exhausting jobs, but they do work, they don’t live on trust funds. They earn a decent living but not huge amounts. They own pleasant houses but only because they’ve chosen to live in the suburbs, on the edge of the city. One could envy them of course but the truth is that they are despised.

So it interests me to make these characters experience sexual adventures of great moral value: they want the truth at any price, the truth about love, about feelings. And to want to know the truth at any price is to be in opposition to bourgeois existence. For the bourgeois, appearances come first in order to protect patrimony, truth is irrelevant.

After rugby in BEAU COMME UN CAMION and judo in COLD SHOWERS, here you film gymnastics, squash, table tennis….

Ping pong is almost a play on words; I wanted them to start with a turn.

I was interested in gymnastics because in the 70s and 80s the champions were all little girls. So to see images of Teri as a champion was both moving and impressive, we imagine that she went through a form of torture to get there, that she had to abandon a part of her childhood and thus that her childhood was not fully lived. This rings true with Élodie Bouchez because she has kept a child-like note in her voice.

I chose squash from the start because it’s all about hitting like crazy against a wall and I wanted to begin the film like that, with a wall, and finish with a horizon.
What role does sport play in your films?

Evidently it comes from a desire to film bodies in motion. It seems to me that there are two ways to direct a scene: you either sit the characters at a table and film the whole scene this way or you feel the need for the character who is talking to get up and get something as he talks. I like it when actors do that sort of thing, when they move. I have neither the talent nor the will to film statically.

Then there is the sportsman as a character. I’ve spent time with a lot of sportsmen and find them fascinating because they’re full of contradictions: they are inexhaustible yet very sensitive to pain, they have what is considered a healthy occupation when in fact they are trapped in their addiction to physical exhaustion, to me they’re crazy.

Teri is nuts but we can’t see it right away because she’s an athlete so she appears well balanced and harmless. And along the way Rachel says to herself: “But this girl is really threatening!”

Finally there are the visual figures that come with sports. Sport invariably ends up being a metaphor for something else, without having the need to write it, without foreseeing it. I knew we would discover visual symbols of the quartet’s story during the edit: dangerous somersaults, the gigantic steps the gymnasts take at the end… very useful to me.

What are we supposed to make of the lack of moral judgement of your film?

Sexuality is a domain where you can put moral life aside, where you can play at being another.

The only moral of the film is what Vincent tells Franck, a Renoir-esque moral: “Everybody does what he can.” Rachel, who is the most tormented character, looks for a moral for herself in the parable of the prodigal son, and finds it all absurd and quite disgusting in the end. But she still hears the interpretation of her sister, who has immediately guessed she has a lover: “When you’ve spent it all you’ll have to come home.”

It’s a pragmatic moral. In the end, they stop. Why do they stop? Because they are exhausted, they’ve run out of energy, that’s all.

The voiceover of three of the four main characters punctuates the film. What does this technique of writing bring to the direction?

It is the actor who speaks to the ear of the audience; it’s the physical sensation of his/her voice. What Nicolas Duvauchelle says in voiceover is not terribly important, but to hear his voice speaking softly, rather smooth, allows us to understand a lot: “Ah, yes, I understand why Rachel becomes attached to him…”

Otherwise to me, voiceover is a way to deviate a bit from realism and temporarily inhabit the novel. It is not a question of style; it is linked to the feeling of the characters: they like what is happening to them because they feel they are becoming the hero of something. So they tell themselves their story. Everyone experiences this feeling in life, you’re walking in the street, you feel good and you become the hero of something, you have a voice in your head…
The film wasn’t at all written with specific actors in mind but when I write a scene I do sometimes “look for an actor’s voice”. When writing Rachel’s part that’s what I did every so often, with Marina in mind. It made things easier, the lines became more biting, more subtle; I realized there was no need to emphasise that tone.

I sincerely admire comediennes. There is a quirky charm about them which is very modern. What is so precious about Marina is her iconoclastic temperament, her ‘vandal’ aspect.

As an actor she has a real ability to change her style: she can be neutral, almost atonal one moment, then possess an almost unbridled velocity the next. She can be the snail and the gazelle in one same scene. It’s a very dynamic style of acting, slightly crazy, that rests on one precious quality: the ability to forget. In other words, she doesn’t watch or listen to herself act. If needed, she’ll fall asleep for real during a shoot.

I love the shot that follows the love scene with Nicolas Duvauchelle the most. It’s like Belle de Jour in Bunuel’s film: she is hiding her face; we think she’s ashamed and deeply moved. She gets up and you see she’s immensely happy and it’s slightly scandalous.
As I’m always afraid that actors will get bored I give them out of the ordinary scenes regularly.

We all know that Roschdy is excellent when he plays “clammed up”, when he has his armour on. When it was decided he would play Franck I added the scene where he smashes the ping pong table, with the idea that he would be holding an evermore threatening succession of weapons: a cigarette, a table tennis bat, an axe....

But I also wanted to give him challenges during improvised scenes. For instance when he dances hip hop with his daughter, whereas Roschdy never listen to rap music.

There’s also the scene where he sings a Fréhel song. During shooting, Roschdy reminded me of Gabin, there’s a gruff side to him that demands to be used light heartedly. There’s a scene in PEPE LE MOKO where Fréhel sings «Où est-il donc ?» to Gabin. This song talks about those who have gone to America, and that Élodie’s character is half-American. It’s about two people who set out to conquer their El Dorado but end up regretting it. It’s like the story of the film really. The way Roschdy plays that scene makes you aware of a kind of heroism in him, because he does everything he can to conquer Élodie and at the same time, he has the humility of the man who is not scared of belittling himself in front of the woman he loves.
I’ve always been a huge fan of Élodie Bouchez, of the films she’s appeared in and her ability to transcend her onscreen partners. She’s one of my favourite actresses.

Élodie succeeds in imposing an earthy style of acting, sublimated immediately by a very pure cinegenic quality. To play Teri, with whom the three others fall in love one after the other, you need to have what it takes.

As an actor, Élodie behaves like Teri: with an extravagance that dazzles everybody. On set, she was my front line soldier, my infantryman: I asked her to get in the water and when the camera was ready for her she’d already reached the middle of the lake. I think she’s a truly intrepid actress…

Her style of acting gives numerous focal points on camera and during the editing. It is pure cinematic material. In fact you just have to follow Élodie because she creates movement, on screen and in life.
I think it took Nicolas and me about five seconds to hit it off. Of course his working-class quality put me at ease and made me trust him immediately.

I hadn’t thought about him at first because I was looking for an older actor. Then I realized he had never been a father on screen when in fact he’s a father in real life and it occupies his entire life.

His character is the most secretive, the one whose psychology was least developed during writing. You could imagine him being the one who will detach himself first but in fact it’s he who hangs on at the end, literally: he holds on to the kitchen furniture in order not to leave the other couple.

Nicolas has great subtlety as an actor, and as he is very modest he hides this finesse in a naturalistic acting style. His relationship with his body is very modern; he’s able to be sensual without being narcissistic.
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<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Film</th>
<th>Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>HAPPY FEW</td>
<td>Antony Cordier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>IN MEMORY OF DAYS TO COME</td>
<td>Jean Christian Boucart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>SEULS TWO</td>
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<td>Bruno Merle</td>
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<td>I HATE MY BEST FRIENDS’ KIDS</td>
<td>Anne Fassio</td>
</tr>
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<td>MY PLACE IN THE SUN</td>
<td>Éric de Montalier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>BRICE DE NICE</td>
<td>James Huth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>AMERICA BROWN</td>
<td>Paul Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Roman Coppola</td>
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<td>2007</td>
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<td>SHOOTING VEGETARIANS</td>
<td>Mickey Jackson</td>
</tr>
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<td>1998</td>
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<td>Didier Le Pêcheur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>LES KIDNAPPERS</td>
<td>Graham Guit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>LOVERS</td>
<td>Jean-Marc Barr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>THE DREAMLIFE OF ANGELS</td>
<td>Erick Zonca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>LOUISE (TAKE 2)</td>
<td>Siegfried Zonzon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>SHOOTING STARS</td>
<td>Didier Le Pêcheur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>CLUBBED TO DEATH</td>
<td>Yolande Zauberman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>FULL SPEED</td>
<td>Gaël Morel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>LES RAISONS DU CŒUR</td>
<td>Markus Imhoof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>LE PLUS BEL AGE</td>
<td>Didier Haudepin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>GOOD OLD DAYS</td>
<td>Cédric Klapisch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>WILD REEDS</td>
<td>André Téchiné</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>LE CAHIER VOLÉ</td>
<td>Christine Lipinska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>STAN THE FLASHER</td>
<td>Serge Gainsbourg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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