

A Cinema Guild Release

# EVERYONE ELSE

WRITTEN AND DIRECTED BY  
MAREN ADE

119 minutes / 35mm / 1:1.85 / Dolby Digital 5.1 / Germany / Not Rated  
In German with English Subtitles / Stills available at: [www.cinemaguild.com/downloads](http://www.cinemaguild.com/downloads)

The Cinema Guild, Inc.  
115 West 30<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 800  
New York, NY 10001-4061  
Tel: (212) 685-6242, Fax: (212) 685-4717  
[www.cinemaguild.com](http://www.cinemaguild.com)

## **Synopsis**

A young couple's relationship is pushed to the brink while vacationing in the Mediterranean. On the surface, Chris and Gitti are perfectly in love while enjoying their time in Sardinia. Beneath their playful romps, secret rituals and silly habits however lies an underlying tension. Full of verve, the idiosyncratic Gitti is fearless in expressing her love and devotion for Chris, while Chris is more reserved in his outlook on life. When they accidentally run into another, obviously happier and more successful couple their fragile relationship destabilizes. But as their fears and insecurities are brutally exposed, Chris and Gitti get a second chance to discover themselves and each other – and to be as happy as everyone else.

## **About the Director**

Maren Ade was born in 1976 in Karlsruhe, Germany. From 1998 until 2004 she studied producing and directing at the University of Television & Film in Munich. Her feature film debut, *The Forest for the Trees* (2003), which was also her graduation film, received invitations to numerous international film festivals, was nominated for the German Film Award, and won the Special Jury Award at the Sundance Film Festival in 2005. *Everyone Else* (2009), her second feature, premiered at the 2009 Berlin Film Festival where it won the Grand Jury Prize and the Best Actress Prize for Birgit Minichmayr. It was also an official selection of the 2009 New York Film Festival.

## **Director's Statement**

*Everyone Else* is about a new love relationship that hasn't endured much. The ground rules haven't been set and everyone is still afraid to completely reveal oneself. I was intrigued by this newly created intricate and unique entity that two people form when they enter into a relationship. It is such a chaotic meshwork of desires, secrets, demands, power structures and rituals.

## Biography

### Birgit Minichmayr

Birgit Minichmayr studied film at the Max Reinhard Seminar in Vienna. She celebrated her stage debut in 1999 at the Burgtheater in Vienna – where she is now a member of the ensemble – playing the prostitute in Arthur Schnitzler’s “La Ronde”. On the big screen she has appeared in such films as “falling” (2006) and “Cherry Blossoms – Hanami” (2007), and in the award-winning Bernd eichinger production “Downfall” (2004) under the direction of Oliver Hirschbiegel. Birgit Minichmayr received the NESTROY theatre Award in 2000 as Best newcomer for her performance in “der färber und sein Zwillingbruder” at the Burgtheater. In 2003 she received the Ulrich Wildgruber Award for young actors. In 2004 she received the NESTROY Award again, this time in the Best Actress category for her performance as Medea in Grillparzer’s “Das goldene vlies” at the Burgtheater.

## Select Filmography

2002	<b>Learning to Lie</b> Directed by: Hendrik Handloegten
2003	<b>Downfall</b> Directed by: Oliver Hirschbiegel
	<b>Hotel</b> Directed by: Jessica Hauser
2004	<b>You Bet Your Life</b> Directed by: Antonin Svoboda
2005	<b>Falling</b> Directed by: Barbara Albert
	<b>Perfume – The Story of a Murderer</b> Directed by: Tom Tykwer
2007	<b>Cherry Blossoms – Hanami</b> Directed by: Doris Dörrie
2009	<b>EVERYONE ELSE</b> Directed by: Maren Ade
	<b>The Bone Man</b> Directed by: Wolfgang Murnberger
	<b>The White Ribbon</b> Directed by: Michael Haneke

## Biography

### Lars Eidinger

Lars Eidinger, born in 1976, studied acting at the Ernst Busch Hochschule für Schauspielkunst in Berlin from 1995 to 1999. He appeared in productions of Schiller's "The Maid of Orleans" and Peter Handke's "Preparations for Immortality" at the Deutsche Theater in Berlin under the direction of Jürgen Gosch. In 1999 he became a member of the ensemble at the Schaubühne. Since 1998 he has stepped in front of the camera for numerous film and television productions, including Tamara Staudt's film "Nur ein Sommer" (2006) and Stephan Geene's film "After Effect" (2005).

## Select Filmography

1999	<b>Der Mantel</b> Directed by: Kathie Liers
2005	<b>After Effect</b> Directed by: Stephan Geene
	<b>American Widow</b> Directed by: Christian S. Leigh
2006	<b>Nur ein Sommer</b> Directed by: Tamara Staudt
2009	<b>EVERYONE ELSE</b> Directed by: Maren Ade

## Credits

<b>Cast</b>	Gitti : Birgit Minichmayr Chris : Lars Eidinger Sana : Nicole Marischka Hans : Hans-Jochen Wagner
<b>Director</b>	Maren Ade
<b>Producers</b>	Janine Jackowski, Dirk Engelhardt, Maren Ade
<b>Screenplay</b>	Maren Ade
<b>Photography</b>	Bernhard Keller
<b>Production Design</b>	Silke Fischer Volko Kamensky Jochen Dehn
<b>Costume Design</b>	Gitti Fuchs
<b>Make-up</b>	Monika Münnich
<b>Editor</b>	Heike Parplies
<b>Commissioning Editors</b>	Ulrich Herrmann (SWR) Andrea Hanke (WDR) Georg Steinert (ARTE )

A production of KOMPLIZEN FILM in co-production with SWR, WDR and ARTE, supported by FFA, BKM, DFFF, FFF BAYERN, MEDIENBOARD BERLIN-BRANDENBURG and KURATORIUM JUNGER DEUTSCHER FILM.



# ME, YOU, & EVERYONE THEY KNOW

A Conversation with Maren Ade

by Mark Peranson

An alternately loving and feuding couple vacation on Sardinia: he, Chris, a struggling, perhaps visionary architect (Lars Eidinger); she, Gitti, a music publicist (Birgit Minichmayr, winner of a Silver Bear in Berlin). As long as they exist in an hermetic sphere of their own creation, they are comfortable in their bodies. Theirs is a uniquely defined interaction where he is the more “feminine” partner—performing a dance to Willie Nelson and Julio Iglesias’ “To All the Girls I’ve Loved Before” under Gitti’s gaze and the feminine gaze of the camera—while she, first seen performing a rather vicious and pointed example of bad parenting, constantly struggles to put on a dress, generally emitting a confident air that we normally associate with masculinity. This binary way of defining what a person should be, however, only sets up the shell of a framework that German director Maren Ade uses to investigate deeper issues associated with a coupling. Aided by actors who are fearless in exploring their own bodies and minds, she transforms a familiar story into an emotional tour de force.

Though hinting at the type of relationship earlier dissected in Rossellini’s *Voyage to Italy* (1954), perhaps the film that has yielded the most fruitful points of overlap, Ade’s second film *Everyone Else*—also a winner of a Silver Bear—is a new kind of relationship drama about the things some do for love, and I don’t use the word “new” casually. It’s a film where constant shifts in point of view are subtle and never clearly indicated; just when you think you’ve grasped the film, it slips away, yet again, like grains of sand through your fingers. I’ve seen the film three times, and each viewing has left me even more uncertain of what I’m supposed to think at any one moment, or about Chris

and Gitti's relationship as a whole: this creates a different kind of experience than one posed by such a normally conventional type of cinema, a film at times psychological, at times theatrical and/or childish, at all times, realistic and honest. Perhaps the questions posed by *Everyone Else*, which digs a knife deep into the flesh of a nascent relationship without falling into dramatic conventions—and at the same time portrays a social class—are so challenging that the only way to deal with them is by, as *Variety's* Derek Elley did in his downright stupid Berlinale review, dispensing with them entirely. (“Simply fuzzy filmmaking of the worst sort.”)

Fuzzy, my ass. Yes, perhaps the first half of the film is more aligned with Chris, and the second with Gitti, but Ade, her actors, and Bernhard Keller's camerawork, provide more subtle distinctions within this structure, and, consequently, do away with traditional definitions of masculinity and femininity. Ade's more aggressively focused debut, *The Forest for the Trees* (2003), acts as a sly comment on the way women are often depicted and defined as unstable, and this unpacking continues here as Gitti's “female” emotions take more and more hold of her as the film develops, culminating in acts that can be read, in a traditional framework, as full-blown psychosis.

Though this instability keeps being hinted at—perhaps best symbolized in a scene where Chris bangs into a glass door and knocks himself bloody and senseless—the break in the film comes when Chris and Gitti are confronted by a more successful version of their coupling, in the form of freshly minted documenta artist Hans (Hans-Jochen Wagner) and his pregnant wife, Sana (Nicole Marishka); Hans' success has the impact of transforming Chris (by exacerbating his latent asshole tendencies), and, in reaction, Gitti.

This shift in the film has been criticized in places as going off the rails, a comment that only makes sense to me if one doesn't pay close attention to the first half (especially a discussion about Batman), or is trapped in classical forms (such as the art Ingrid Bergman surveys during her own fraught Italian vacation). Ade has said that the four characters combine in her mind to create a single person, and that makes some sense to me, because in a way the philosophical equivalent of the film is Plato's *Symposium*; perhaps the film leaves us with Socrates' ultimate plea that “love is beggarly, harsh, and a master of deception... but also delicately balanced and resourceful.” The magic of *Everyone Else*—and there is something magical about it—is hard to define or pin down. Watching it (and rewatching it) yields some ineffable sense that the complex emotions that are being created for the camera are themselves beyond the intentions of the actors and the director; this in no way is to slight

the two amazing performances, or Ade's direction, only to say that in the best art, the final product tends to be part conscious, part unconscious.

**CINEMA SCOPE:** I was wondering if you think there is a difference between the way *Everyone Else* is perceived inside and outside of Germany. On the surface its universal quality is as a “relationship movie,” for lack of a better term. But some Germans I know who've seen the film see it as a generational portrait.

**MAREN ADE:** Yeah. That's the way a lot of people see it. They're allowed to see it like that. The way people react to the film is very different—everybody sees something else. From my perspective, I didn't intend to make a portrait of a generation. For me a generational portrait comes naturally because I'm part of—unfortunately—that generation and because I wrote things like the way they talk, the way their relationships are. That came out of me, and I'm part of a certain age. I'm close to the way they live. In the beginning when I was writing the film I told myself, “I don't want people to think it's a generational portrait,” because that's something limited—people being around 30 making films for other people around 30.

**SCOPE:** But the characters are very conscious of trying not to behave like the previous generation, and the setting accentuates these attempts, with all of the material evidence of their parents' way of living, the bric a brac of the prior generation, the kitsch that one doesn't want to recognize exists but can't avoid confronting.

**ADE:** For me Chris and Gitti are starting to think about their roles, both in terms of their roles in their relationships, and the roles of a man and a woman. And for that reason, the house becomes important for them because they are imitating their parents' roles in certain ways. He's sitting in the room of the father; she's sitting in the room of the mother. The house does something to them.

**SCOPE:** One way of seeing the whole film is to observe how they react to their environments, or how their relationship interacts with their environments—both natural and social. When you say that everyone sees something different in the film, I agree, but it's odd, because when I tried to even think about or summarize or give a simple description of the film, I found it very hard. The film changes within the film itself. Were you trying to avoid something that could be described simply, in other words, something entirely situated in the fictional realm? At the same time the film is psychological, and it's also theatrical and it's also naturalistic. And these things work together. They don't actually clash. They all seem to exist in the same place.

**ADE:** That sounds good to me.

**SCOPE:** When you wanted to make the film, what did you want to do? Did you want to get psychological?

**ADE:** I wanted something psychological and I wanted something with a lot of talking. In the beginning, I only wrote dialogues, and out of those dialogues the main figures emerged. It was not that I thought, “Yeah, what did they do before? What was their relationship before?” Everyone had a different opinion about how long they were together before. I did not talk to the actors about that.

**SCOPE:** Did you have that in the back of your mind?

**ADE:** I had an idea that they were together for a year. For Lars it was a bit longer. For Birgit it was only for a few months. And I didn’t say anything. We didn’t agree on that, and we didn’t talk about it. Not at all. It would have been boring. During the writing of the script, the process was different—for example, for Gitti, I just wrote down a lot of dialogue, what she would say to her boyfriend or what she thinks. Just talking.

**SCOPE:** Did the script start more with her then?

**ADE:** Yeah, I started more with her. But I wanted to make a film about a couple, and after a while I realized I was taking more care of her, at which point I really started to write his position separately. I don’t know why, but it wasn’t possible to work on both characters at the same time. I really had half a year with her, then half a year with him, then half a year with her. And I had the feeling that I wasn’t writing Chris accurately. So I often gave what I wrote to Ulrich [Köhler, Ade’s partner] and to Lars, because I didn’t have the feeling that I knew *everything* about men. There are a lot of male filmmakers who write very freely about women.

**SCOPE:** So the actors had a lot of input into the characters? Lars more so?

**ADE:** I had to ask them if they thought their characters would behave as I wrote. I also had to ask Birgit a lot if her character would do this or that. During the shooting there was a point when they were so much into their characters that I could do “interviews” with them where they were in character, or they would both complain that Gitti would never act like this. When I gave them the script, it wasn’t finished. But many of the dialogues are very, very similar. There was no improvisation.

**SCOPE:** Were they cast before you finished writing the script? Or did you have them in mind early on?

**ADE:** It was a very long process, writing the script. The shooting had to be delayed so I could have more time. We went into a house half a year before the shooting and took a small holiday together. For one week with the cameraman, Bernhard Keller, my assistant, and the two of them. We watched films and read the script and also did some rehearsals.

**SCOPE:** You went to Sardinia?

**ADE:** No, no. I thought about doing that, but I thought it would be too much. The effect of being in Sardinia could wait until we shot there.

**SCOPE:** What kinds of movies did you watch?

**ADE:** We watched *Scenes from a Marriage* (1973), and it was very nice because they did not know the film and Birgit was sitting like a child in front of the television, very close. And both of them liked the film very much. But it was not meant to tell them how to do something. I wanted them to see how much fun or exciting it could be to play a couple. And then we saw *Blue Movie* (1969), the Andy Warhol film, because I thought we had to see some sex scenes so we could discuss them in preparation, for the sex scenes in the film. But this was a mistake I think, because they were too realistic. After one hour Lars asked, “Can I go to bed?” Soon after, Birgit also went off. And the cameraman and I, we watched the film, because we like it. But it wasn’t a good example to show them about how to play a sex scene. It was much more important to talk about how to do it, and it was better to see something like *Don’t Look Now* (1973). It’s realistic, but it’s nice. The actors look very nice, it’s about love, and so on.

**SCOPE:** And they both come from the theatre? They hadn’t done many movies before?

**ADE:** She’s had a lot of film experience. For Lars it was his first big role. He’s just made some shorts, but mostly does theatre with the one company in Berlin, at the Schaubrune. And they all agreed when they began the theatre that the actors would only do theatre.

**SCOPE:** The way they move and interact and their physicality is very important to the film. Do you think the theatre background was important to the film’s success? Especially when the two of them play together.

**ADE:** Yes, I think for the physical scenes it’s important that they have a certain place that they can meet because they’re both theatre actors and they’re both used to using their bodies. With the sex scenes this was definitely something that helped them. But for the quiet dialogues and the very intimate conversations they had to go very far away from what they normally do. If you see Lars, and he’s playing Hamlet, it’s a completely different person. It’s really interesting because he’s very powerful, very physical.

**SCOPE:** I was also thinking about the scene where he does the dance number.

**ADE:** It was very difficult to get that scene the way I wanted it. I shot about 25 takes—because he was too good a dancer! He’d just finished a play where he danced a lot. He was too professional, and I was like, “Oh no, you can’t dance like that!” The whole struggle for the dancing scene was to make him a bad dancer.

**SCOPE:** Do you find that men and women have different reactions to the film?

**ADE:** I think maybe women like the film more.

**SCOPE:** I'm just guessing, but I can see women reacting to where Gitti gets more hysterical. And that's the point where I can see the strongest connection to *The Forest for the Trees*.

**ADE:** In the end, now I see that the female characters from both films step over social borders, but they do it in different ways. Melanie Pröschle, the character from the first film, doesn't realize it as she's more desperate. And Gitti does it out of a will to break something down or to change things. They both get into a situation where they change themselves a lot in order to please somebody, and maybe in that way they're similar.

**SCOPE:** But Gitti, maybe she's more self-conscious of what she's doing.

**ADE:** Superficially.

**SCOPE:** It leads back to the generational thing. They're conscious of the fact that they don't want to be like their parents, yet sometimes they lack the self-awareness that their reactions are, in a way, superficial as well, which is what happens when they meet the other couple. They think they're superior to "everybody else," but they realize that the other couple is a more ideal version of themselves. That's what they long to be, but if they become that, then they're lost...

**ADE:** The problem with the other couple is that, well, they don't like them.

**SCOPE:** They don't like them, but, for example, Chris' goal is to be like Hans. Well, like Hans without compromising anything.

**ADE:** Chris and Gitti think Hans and Sana have something they don't have or lack, and they see something there. But for me, though, there is something more about that moment when they meet. I think that on another day it would have led to a whole other evening, and the results would be completely different. They would be like, "Ah, stupid Sana and Hans," and then go home and agree on that and never meet them again.

**SCOPE:** You mean Chris reacts the way he does because he doesn't get the project?

**ADE:** Yeah, because he didn't get the project.

**SCOPE:** And they had a bit of a fight before...

**ADE:** Yeah, they get into a bit of a fight before...I mean, Gitti also talked about being different before, and he asked her if he was too boring or male enough or whatever.

**SCOPE:** And the rest of the film is him trying to assert his masculinity, essentially?

**ADE:** For him, he's trying to make himself free of Gitti and her opinion and the relationship. He's not that much focused on the relationship at that moment;

he's more concerned with his work. I think he doesn't really have that big of a problem with the relationship.

**SCOPE:** But she definitely tries to become more feminine.

**ADE:** She wants to please him and to a certain point they're similar in this desire. They're both insecure about whether the other one loves them as they are. At this point they are very unselfconscious. Chris thinks that Gitti wants maybe a more male guy, or whatever, and in that way they are similar.

**SCOPE:** But of course it doesn't work.

**ADE:** Of course not. Because it's fake. Because it's a lie. Because they start to play roles and they have to move very far away from who they really are. They lose each other, but in the end most viewers ask me, "What's after the film for them?" And in the end I think Chris and Gitti realize the lie that has come between them and *because* of that maybe they have a chance, but they have to invent themselves again as a couple.

**SCOPE:** The ending—which harkens back to the games they are playing at the beginning—sort of implies that the simplest time, the time when people are most free, is when they are children, or try and recapture childhood being.

**ADE:** But they can't go back to that.

**SCOPE:** Right. It's impossible to go back to that. So in a way it's almost a doomed scenario, though within the film, options are, indeed, presented for how they can exist as a stable couple.

**ADE:** And there are no options left.

**SCOPE:** Well, I don't know. I mean they can't really go back can they, to the beginning? And if they do, they're just playing roles again.

**ADE:** Yes, that's what they lost.

**SCOPE:** To get back to the generational dilemma, it seems that layered on top of that is also the issue of class. Is that something you were thinking about when you were making the film? Class-consciousness?

**ADE:** Maybe, because for me Gitti is a bit from another world. One viewer recently explained to me that the film is about a woman from a different class who wants to marry an architect, but she can't behave in that world. And I said, "Ah, okay, interesting." We thought about that, that Gitti is not an intellectual woman.

**SCOPE:** And there's a reason why Chris would choose to have a non-intellectual partner, because then it makes him feel intellectually superior.

**ADE:** For me they fit together in a certain way, because they are so different. He lacks something she has and vice versa.

**SCOPE:** Why did you make Chris an architect? Is it because it's a creative profession, like filmmaking?

**ADE:** I think I chose it because it's kind of like filmmaking, but I must admit I don't know much about architects. I kind of abused this profession, I must admit. There's a lot of money involved and you have the conflict between idealism and earning money, so there are similarities.

**SCOPE:** But to make it with filmmakers...

**ADE:** It could have been possible, but no. Chris, I don't know if he's a filmmaker. Could you imagine him as a filmmaker?

**SCOPE:** No comment. Another reason I like the film is because, in films about psychological relationships, there's always the temptation to make people identify with the characters. And even though you can relate to them here, that identification isn't there. It's a fine line.

**ADE:** I mean, you can see yourself in the situations, maybe, and meeting another couple. But some people do identify. I also meet people who identify with Hans. I didn't want that you would identify with one of them, like she's good and he's bad or something like that. When I show the movie, sometimes I feel there are more people on Gitti's side, seeing her as the hero of the story. I didn't intend that. I can understand both. I find it interesting that this happened. For example, at the Berlinale premiere the audience clapped when she pulled out the knife, and I realized then that in cinema, the audience judges things very rapidly. It happens very fast.

**SCOPE:** Especially when you're caught up in the film. The way the film works is that in the second half, it moves more towards her perspective. So the structure of the film leads you to see her as the centre of it. And also he's been sort of an asshole to her.

**ADE:** That's true.

**SCOPE:** So it's not really just identification—the events in the film lead you more to feel sympathy for her.

**ADE:** But it's her own fault.

**SCOPE:** Why do you say it's her own fault?

**ADE:** I think she's a modern woman. I agree that he doesn't treat her very nicely in every situation, but I feel that she also has her reasons. In a lot of scenes she doesn't have the feelings for him anymore or for his situation. She can talk more clearly about her feelings but that doesn't mean that she's right.

**SCOPE:** That makes me think of the scene near the beginning when Chris sits her down and says he wants to say something and she gives this long speech and he didn't want to talk about that at all. So she thinks she knows what's good for him, but you're saying that's wrong.

**ADE:** Some people say she's right in what she's saying. Birgit has a certain power to play things so that you really believe that she's right.

**SCOPE:** It seems like you have more sympathy for him.

**ADE:** A bit more. Maybe because I can see myself in her in some scenes, so I'm a bit more...I don't know what the word is, I don't like her in every scene. For me she's also egocentric in a certain way.

**SCOPE:** Well, if things aren't going the way she wants, she behaves like a child.

**ADE:** I can see myself in all the characters. All four. In that case it's also about this class or thing with the three couples, actually. I wanted to say that sometimes you can be Sana and Hans, sometimes you can be Gitti and Chris and sometimes you can be the regular people on holiday with their boat. How you are in a way just depends on who you meet.

**SCOPE:** Though I am tempted, I shouldn't ask if you've drawn on your own relationships or not for the film. I guess I just asked it though.

**ADE:** No. Uli and I didn't have a holiday like that. When I write, my daily life or what I see or what I experience goes into the script, but I transform them. It's not just a copy, it's always just inspiration and also the film is not about copying reality or anything like that.

**SCOPE:** No, but to stay close to reality sometimes you have to abstract it.

**ADE:** Yes, but not to my reality.

**SCOPE:** But it's a compliment. I mean you can't summarize the film because they feel like real people.

**ADE:** Right. You can't summarize people.

**SCOPE:** In this sense, what were you trying to avoid?

**ADE:** Avoid? Well in some ways it's risky to have this relationship talk, to say these things that for the rest of the world are not all that important.

**SCOPE:** You know, many psychological relationship films come across as some copy of Bergman, who you mentioned, and yours isn't. People think this is how people talk about relationships. I mean, they're not just talking about their problems all the time.

**ADE:** Another one I was thinking of was *La Maman et la putain* (1973), because this was one of the first ideas, that I just wanted people talking. Talking everything. I was afraid that it wasn't enough for a film, or that it was too banal. But this is also what I was interested in, whether it would work. The problems are banal, but not the feelings that are involved with them. And also with the generational aspect, I was a bit insecure as to whether I could choose to make a film about people who are close to me and not make a stupid film. It was a high risk, because I wanted to show it to my friends.

**SCOPE:** Talking about banality and lack of action and psychology, these are traits of most of the films that are being made in Berlin now. In terms of making something typically, you know, Berlin School—for lack of another term—was that on your mind when you made the film?

**ADE:** Maybe. I mean, I like those films a lot and I'm



definitely influenced by those films. I also like dialogues and a lot of talking, so I mixed everything up. Do you think the film is similar to those films?

**SCOPE:** Well I can think of it as kind of like *Longing* (2006), I guess.

**ADE:** With Uli's films, what I found interesting is how you start with the women and you move to the men. And I liked this and I copied this, I guess.

**SCOPE:** People have been making movies about relationships for a hundred years. It's an endless fountain of inspiration.

**ADE:** Do you think I could do another film about relationships? Nothing else comes to mind. I feel now that I understand more about the film, as I've read more about it, that I can do a real film!

**SCOPE:** You mentioned to me earlier that the film ended up in a place that you didn't think it would. I have a way of interpreting that statement, but I'm wondering what that meant to you exactly. When you're making something and it comes together in the end...

**ADE:** Well, it's always that you astonish yourself. I mean not necessarily in a positive way. I forgot what the film was that I wanted to make because that original film was erased by this film. But I feel like it's better now because of Birgit and Lars.

**SCOPE:** What was the film you had in mind then? I mean a read an interview where you said you're not interested in the camerawork. The framing is somebody else's.

**ADE:** Well, yes, but camerawork is not just about framing. Bernhard and I spent every second together from the beginning of the film. We did rehearsals together; we videotaped them. We talked a lot about the content

of the scenes. We were in a lot of the locations. But in the end, he's a very good cameraman, and he's better at choosing the framing than I am. After one or two weeks, we were in a good flow together. Sometimes he was like a third actor, but he's not shooting documentary style. He had to react a lot to what they were doing.

**SCOPE:** The camera doesn't really draw attention to itself either.

**ADE:** Yeah, unfortunately, because I think it's very nice what he did. Critics never really write about the camera, but everything is chosen very, very carefully to tell this story.

**SCOPE:** And also to structure this indeterminate point of view. The last shot for example, it's her face and she's looking up at him. But even though the gaze is towards her, you're still identifying more with her, but you can't see her face. It's a subtle ambiguity. It's her point of view and not her point of view.

**ADE:** That's all Bernhard's intuition.

**SCOPE:** But scenes like that, do you shoot them in different ways? You said you shoot takes sometimes 20 times, does that include the camera too? Or are you just trying to get the perfect performance?

**ADE:** When we're doing it ten or 20 times, sometimes also five times, before that we did a lot of rehearsals and in that way we changed things, but if it doesn't work out...it's more about finding the perfect flow or rhythm together with the camera. It's more about details. If we do something ten times the camera is always *nearly* the same. It's not about making something completely different every time, it's about making it perfect 🍷