

ACAT FILMS & CIE AND ARTEMIS PRODUCTIONS
PRESENT

ÉMILIE DEQUENNE

LOÏC CORBERY
MEMBER OF THE COMMISSAIRE FRANÇAISE

NOT MY TYPE

A FILM BY LUCAS BELVAUX

AGAT FILMS & CIE and **ARTEMIS PRODUCTIONS**
present

EMILIE DEQUENNE

and

LOÏC CORBERY

Member of the Comédie Française

in

NOT MY TYPE

a film by

LUCAS BELVAUX

based on the novel by Philippe Vilain
published by Grasset and Fasquelle

111min – 2.35

Domestic Release: April 30TH 2014 (France)

International Sales

FILMS DISTRIBUTION

36, rue du Louvre, 75001 Paris - France

Ph : +33 1 53 10 33 99

www.filmsdistribution.com

SYNOPSIS

Clement, a young Parisian philosophy professor is transferred to Arras for a year.

Far from Paris and its nightlife, he doesn't quite know what to do with his free time. Then he meets Jennifer, a pretty hairdresser who becomes his lover.

While Clement's life revolves around Kant and Proust, Jennifer's is punctuated with chick lit, tabloids and karaoke evenings with her girlfriends.

Free love and free hearts, they could live a beautiful romance together, but is it enough to bridge the gaping social and cultural divide between them?

INTERVIEW WITH LUCAS BELVAUX (DIRECTOR & SCREENWRITER)

What about Philippe Vilain's novel inspired you to make it into a film?

I wasn't familiar with Philippe Vilain's work. Then one morning on the radio, the journalist Clémentine Autain spoke so enthusiastically about the book in her review that it immediately made me want to make it into a movie. I bought it the very same day. The novel wasn't easy to adapt because the story is told in the first person. I could have used a voice over to stay faithful to the novel's style, but using just the male character's point of view, and the comments he is constantly making about his female counterpart, would have created an imbalance in the relationship. Although in the novel this technique worked very powerfully from the very first page, I don't believe it would have had the same effect in the film. I decided to readjust the points of view in order to observe the two characters from the same distance and to treat them in the same way. In the end, despite their differences, I feel as close to her as I do to him. Flaubert said: "I am Madame Bovary!" As far as I'm concerned, sometimes I'm Clement and sometimes I'm Jennifer.

Philippe Vilain is a very adept autofiction author, who always writes in the first person in a cold, distant tone. His point of view can seem brutal at times.

I like his books very much. And his style; but a style can't be adapted. It's autofiction, an introspective exercise whose reflection on love continues from one book to the next. The autofiction side to the story got lost in my film. That said... inevitably, a part of yourself ends up slipping into the film or screenplay. Consciously or not. Hidden, more or less, in one character or another. Sometimes in several.

Is this why the filmmaker refrains from passing judgment?

Most probably. It's a general rule, almost a dogma. I never judge a character. I strive to be in everyone's truth, in harmony with everyone's nature, even with those who lie or worse. Renoir said that everyone has their reasons. It's true, no matter whether they are good or bad ones. The moment you start judging characters, they are finished. They become pure fictional characters that can be entirely instrumentalized, and thus no longer interesting. I try to share my point of view through the way I set up scenes and their direction.

For the audience, this philosophy professor who has been transferred to Arras has a handicap to begin with. We very quickly get a feeling for how unbending he is in his relationships with women from the break-up scene that starts the film and then the discussion he has with another one of his exes.

The novel made it immediately obvious: this man is emotionally dysfunctional. He is someone who cannot love, who can never commit because in his mind it means losing the possibility of being open to what life may offer him. He believes that loving one

woman means having to relinquish loving millions of others. He cannot give up the prospect of having tons of other romances for one love only. He is sincere in the present moment, but refuses to make promises for the future. When his relationship with Jennifer starts, he knows that at the end of the year he will leave Arras, and he cannot in any way imagine taking her back to Paris with him. As for living with a child, that is just impossible for him.

Does that make him a cynic?

Never! In fact, he suffers from the breakups and he knows he makes the woman he is leaving behind suffer, but emotionally he is only in the present! Intellectually, he has his thoughts, his destiny under control, but when it comes to love, committing becomes a real problem for him.

That's where his refusal to have a child comes from and his strategies to avoid meeting Jennifer's child.

Of course, because that would be a step towards commitment. He knows that if he wants to leave Jennifer one day, he will also have to cut ties with her son: a double heartbreak, which will hurt two people. Jennifer, however, does everything she can so he can meet her son, because she knows it is a way to anchor their love. She is divorced and before meeting Clement, she and her son made a real couple. He's all she has; all of her attention is focused on him, at that moment he is the man of her life.

It's a little like Jacques Demy's *Lola*. We think of him when you show the strong bond between this mother and her son: they are bathed in a glowing, almost bouncing happiness.

Demy's filmmaking is all in lightness. Even when something serious rises to the surface, levity saves it. It is true that this film hints at musical comedy, the way she runs towards him and her taste for karaoke. Jennifer's dignity and elegance is found in her levity. Whatever her difficulties may be, she does everything she can to be happy, because despite everything, she's someone who has to build her own happiness; it's not something she can wait for. Her character always stays on her feet, always.

She's a woman who doesn't commit rashly. She doesn't trust men, and isn't easy to kiss.

She is generous and whole. When she loves, she really loves. No other man exists for her. She's had men in her life, love affairs with no future, no commitment. She doesn't mind talking about it. She's experienced. Yet she knows that with age, a 35-year-old hairdresser from Arras isn't on equal footing with a 38-year-old Parisian intellectual. He's still moving up, intellectually and socially speaking. While she lives her life as if she was already on the decline. She's no longer interested in a fleeting romance, she no longer wants to be a passing object of desire. She wants to be with someone with whom she can build something for life. She gets all dolled up, makes sure she always looks pretty, puts on a good show. It's her way of being, her good manners.

He, however, is going to be put to the test, gauged, and assessed. Does he love her, or does he not? That is the question during the whole film. Maybe she is more philosophical than he is, in daily life!

Her desire to show herself worthy of him by trying to understand Kant is very touching.

She understands that in spurning her education she has forfeited a possible future with him. She knows, or she understands, that if she loses this man, it is because of the impossibility of being his intellectual equal. She reexamines her life. If Clement ends up leaving her, it isn't because he's a jerk or a flirt. Nor is it a question of intelligence, because she is intelligent. It's a question of acquired knowledge, of a cultural gap. Apart from this cultural gap, nothing is stopping them from loving one another. They are both free, emotionally and financially. Everything is possible, and yet, that's not how it will be. They love each other, but they aren't able to love each other at the same time, with the same intensity and above all, there is nothing they can build together.

The theme of the social divide is recurrent in your films.

Yes, but here it is more of a cultural than social divide. There is always a bunch of things that motivate one's desire to make a film. An attraction to the characters, in particular. They both appealed to me. When I read the book, I wanted to see them, to make them speak to one another, love one another, confront each other.

The first time they make love is preceded by a beautiful scene where the image and sound are out of sync.

In my mind the love scene starts there. The transition from the first kiss to the first time their skin touches. As she goes through her day, finally deciding to open herself up to him, we hear a phone conversation where she announces that she is going to join him. I wanted this length of time to be part of the amorous encounter. And especially, I wanted this first night of lovemaking to be the fruit of a resolution made by her: it is not a moment of distraction. She is giving him a gift. Something she has reflected upon. It was important to show this decision, this well-thought-out choice, and the weight of it upon her. While he remains indecisive like a teenager, Jennifer is going to offer herself to him. Her giving of her body isn't insignificant. She offers herself to him "heart and soul," because for her, one doesn't go without the other.

How did you tackle the love scenes? The first is centered around breath, respiration, faces.

Shooting a hand on a body doesn't tell much of a story. And I wasn't interested in showing breasts, or either character's bodies. What is important, is what is expressed on their faces. In these types of scenes, just like violent scenes, you have to pay close attention to what you want to say, what message you want to give. You have to avoid making a show of it. I don't want the viewer to derive any form of enjoyment from a

violent scene, nor should they feel like a voyeur during a love scene. The scene you are referring to is the first time their bodies touch; it is a rare moment. I was interested in the emotional aspect of the first time. That is why the scene is so long, the faces, the duration. I wanted to recreate the impression of intimacy and a sort of moment of grace, when one is in absolute abandon.

It's the only time that Clement is about to say he loves her...and she stops him.

Words have great importance for her, they shouldn't be sullied. And it isn't the right time. Before perhaps, in the street, or later. But then, just afterwards, it isn't possible. She wants to be sure that he is sincere. It's a way of protecting herself.

And then there is the love scene in the hotel where she wants him to look at her as they make love.

But he keeps his eyes closed, focused on his own pleasure. At that moment she has already decided to go. She knows that this is the "last time," just like there was a "first time." She makes a last attempt to share something memorable with him. It's a love scene that makes her suffer. In fact, it is no longer a love scene! She tries to make him understand that he treats her like a prostitute. That's the way it is filmed. She has set it up like that.

Do you have specific references in mind when you shoot a film?

Never. It's afterwards that you can say, perhaps, there was a bit of Truffaut in *Just for Laughs*, if only for the presence of Jean-Pierre Léaud, which gives the film a post-Antoine Doinel side. *On the Run* may evoke the influence of Jean-Pierre Melville. This time, I don't know who it evokes. It's a film with two protagonists who talk that needed to be approached calmly. You had to trust in the characters, dialogues and the situation. At certain moments, in the karaoke scenes or the carnival, I could let go. But otherwise you couldn't be afraid of shot-countershots. I wanted to stay near them, move with them, be in their intimacy. I wanted to give the actors space, to let them play. The shot-countershot allows for that, we recorded long scenes with one take, and edited it afterwards, but the actor could go for 3 or 4 minutes without being interrupted. For those minutes, the time belonged to the actor. And the space too, the space inside the frame. But I also allowed myself to film sequence shots...I tried to be as free as possible.

Is it a satire of the intellectual milieu?

No. A character is only a reflection of himself, he isn't necessarily representative of an entire milieu. This said, I believe that culture neither saves nor protects people. We are at first driven by our unconscious, our impulses, neither culture nor intelligence can save us from certain behaviors. A human being's strength and beauty are beyond these "qualities." It is a question of generosity, consideration, free thinking and the ability to give and receive.

Jennifer is mistaken when she argues that the interest in the book she is reading by Emile Zola lies in the story it tells. Clement then explains that what is interesting about *The Ladies' Paradise* isn't the story that Zola is telling, but what the story says about society. Would you defend the same thesis for your own film?

It's my theory. It is an answer to Hitchcock's famous remark that you need three ingredients to make a good film: first a good story, then a good story, and finally a good story. It's obviously not true! That's simply not the way it works! You need a good story, it's a way to make a statement in a pleasant, easy-to-digest way. But what is interesting is what this story says about the world, the era, about us and others.

Jennifer projects herself into this story!

Naturally. Moreover, the passage that Clement reads, which is a portrait of Zola's heroine, Denise, is in fact a portrait of Jennifer!

The story takes place in Arras. That's your world!

I didn't have to cheat, it's really in the book! Arras' two main squares look like stage-sets to me, like painted backdrops. In fact, it is almost like scenery since all of the facades were entirely reconstructed after the First World War. Coming from Belgium, I feel at home there. The carnivals, the brass bands, the beer, the fries, the friendliness, these are cultural codes I'm familiar with. Clement doesn't come from this area. He thinks it is a punishment to live in this city, far from the world, his world, although it is only an hour and a half from Paris. So he is indifferent to all of this quaint folklore, the dressing in costume. It's a place where you can do what you want, where you can let go, drink and eat, talk loudly, laugh loudly, dance and sing in the street. He's there like an outside spectator to it all.

How did you choose your actors?

It wasn't easy finding someone to play Clement. I had to find a good-looking actor who could act, be credible as a philosophy teacher and be immediately seductive. It took a long time and I'm very happy with Loïc Corbery, who is a member of the Comédie Française. I didn't know him. The casting director introduced us. The decisive test was the commentary on Emmanuel Kant.

As the days went by, I discovered what a wonderful actor he is. Someone who is very serious, very present and involved, but always in a type of cheerful happiness and lightness. The relationship between Loïc and Emilie was fascinating to watch. They were both happy, I believe, to work together. They were very generous with each other and there was also a great amount of trust.

I very much enjoyed working with them. For the role of Jennifer, I hesitated for a long time before seeing Emilie. She's a wonderful actress, never a false note, whose great quality is to be like a phoenix. She becomes a new actress with every new role.

She reinvents herself with each character she plays, and when she is in a part we can't imagine her any other way.

I was very impressed with her last role in *Our Children*, by Joaquim Lafosse, where she was tremendous, but not at all in line with what I wanted for this film. She imposes herself with such strength that I had a difficult time imagining her in another role. Yet then I told myself that it would be a shame not to try, that I had to see her, and then the moment we met it was obvious to me. Only Emilie could be Jennifer. She's an absolutely great actress who mixes talent, honed technique and generosity. She gives everything she has, abandoning herself completely yet with an absolute control of the scene that is incredible. She worked so hard in order to sing, she has the capacity to work tirelessly. She is a rare actress. She doesn't hold back anything. She just goes for it, fully sincere and trusting.

Why did you dye her hair blond?

I saw a photo of her like that on the Internet, from the Cannes Festival I believe. And she was the character: the bleached blond. An image invented to fulfill other's desires, or at least as she imagines them. For Jennifer "gentlemen prefer blonds," naturally. And also it brightens her face. It's a part of her will to always be up and on, her absolute refusal to give up, abandon things or let herself go.

LUCAS BELVAUX FILMOGRAPHY

Feature films

- 1992 **PARFOIS TROP D'AMOUR**
- 1996 **JUST FOR LAUGHS**
- 2001 Trilogy : **AN AMAZING COUPLE – ON THE RUN – AFTER LIFE**
- 2005 **THE LAW OF THE WEAKEST**
- 2009 **RAPT**
- 2011 **ONE NIGHT**
- 2013 **NOT MY TYPE**

He also directed for television:

- 2000 **MÈRE DE TOXICO** (M6)
- 2003 **NATURE CONTRE NATURE** (France 3)
- 2007 **LES PRÉDATEURS** (L'affaire Elf, 2 x 120 mn – Canal +)

In the movies, he can be seen playing roles in **ALLONS Z'ENFANTS** by Yves Boisset, **THE DEATH OF MARIO RICCI** by Claude Goretta, **CHICKEN WITH VINAGER** by Claude Chabrol, **WUTHERING HEIGHTS** by Jacques Rivette, **DISORDRE** by Olivier Assayas, **MADAME BOVARY** by Claude Chabrol, **GREAT HAPPINESS** and **THEY CALL THIS... SPRING** by Hervé Le Roux, **TOMORROW WE MOVE** by Chantal Akerman, **MERRY CHRISTMAS** by Christian Carion, **HAVE MERCY ON US ALL** by Régis Wargnie. As well as **AN AMAZING COUPLE – ON THE RUN – AFTER LIFE** and **THE LAW OF THE WEAKEST**.

INTERVIEW WITH EMILIE DEQUENNE (*JENNIFER*)

How would you describe Jennifer?

I read Lucas Belvaux's screenplay when Joachim Lafosse's *Our children* was released in theaters. I had just played the role of Muriel, a very intense character, and I hoped to quickly find another role with the same intensity. My wishes were granted. Yet, Jennifer is the opposite of Muriel. While one is somber, lost in darkness, Jennifer is the incarnation of light. It's the first time I've been offered a role like this, a dream role: that of a girl who only has bright, radiant areas of her personality instead of having gray zones like most people; she is entirely in the joie de vivre. She's optimistic, always moving ahead, modern and independent. In short: alive! A girl without problems! I have never felt so close to a character. She is positive, loves her son, her girlfriends, her job, singing, dancing, and taking care of herself. Of course she has been disappointed in life and in love. So she cautiously moves ahead in this romance, asserting her conditions, but despite it all, she has a naivety that is rather disconcerting. She isn't afraid to give love another chance, for she still believes in it. However, she walks on eggs with a very precise idea of what she wants, and especially of what she doesn't want anymore. But she still goes forward, she still believes!

Just the same, was it an easy role to play?

I saw the character as being so healthy, that I wanted her to be fresh as a daisy all of the time. Before and during the film shoot, I put myself on a strict daily routine. I kept myself disciplined and followed a strict diet: eat simply, only drink water and green tea, go to bed early, make sure to be full of energy. More than for other films I've worked on, I had to sleep long nights, so I wouldn't wake up in the morning with puffy eyes. I was very serious. I followed my husband's example, as he is very fond of tea, pollen and honey! Everything in this role appears in lightness and levity, so I strived to be light, all of the time. For me, lightness was the catchword.

You talk about her mindset, her way of being. And for her singing, her hair...?

For the singing, I thought I was going to have to take lessons, but Lucas was very relaxed about it: "You're not a singer, you're doing karaoke with your girlfriends! It would be better if you sing on key, but don't panic." So I worked on my own. I downloaded voice classes, learned how to warm up my voice. I've always enjoyed karaoke, so it was exhilarating. We recorded everything before the shoot: I wore headphones, it was a little girl's dream! As for being a hair dresser, a friend taught me how to hold the scissors, but I didn't really have to learn the technique. We always find a way to fake things in movies. Lucas worked with what I knew how to do. The hardest part was the dialogue. Jennifer has a way of speaking that has nothing to do with mine. The way she talks, her delivery, is quite particular. I worked on that in a very scholarly fashion, because although there are films where you can appropriate the text, give your own rendition this wasn't one of them. She has her own vocabulary, her own semantic field.

Once again you exude a great deal of emotion!

I believe that since a screenwriter or director has created a character and invited me to interpret it, it would be a crime to not make this character exist, to not transform it into a person. It's a question of life or death for me. As a result, I don't have any distance with the character. I see no other way of getting there but to obliterate myself, disappear in order to only be this character. So much so that when members of the press come during the shoot, I can't speak about the role I'm playing because I'm beyond that point, I've become the character. Afterwards, yes, I can talk about her, but not during.

How did the shoot go?

Loïc Corbery and I didn't know each other at all. We had never worked together and I had never had the pleasure of seeing him on stage. It was a real discovery! Not only did he play Clement as the role should be played, but on top of it he is the type of actor that I like. He is very generous and his rigor and discipline are admirable. Sometimes he would finish a day of shooting in Arras and return to Paris to play in the evening at the Comédie Française! Furthermore, he has an unadulterated personality at work and in life. The relationship between Jennifer and Clement could have made us uncomfortable with one another, but our relationship was clear and simple. It's a film in which the two protagonists share very private things. But Lucas Belvaux's cinema is very discreet, like Loïc and me. Lucas unites people around him. Everything happens seamlessly. This man is a joy! When I read a screenplay, I wonder how many times I'm going to have to get undressed. I don't lie about it; I immediately make it clear that there are things I can't do. I'm not comfortable with love scenes that show it all, especially when it isn't even justified. It's hard enough to kiss an actor, but to imagine that he's going to touch my body – no, I can't go there! Our first love scene in bed was very written, focused on the faces. It was essential for these scenes to communicate the feelings of a physical bond, but we cheated. Long live cinema!

Filmography (selected films)

NOT MY TYPE by Lucas BELVAUX / **DIVIN ENFANT** by Olivier DORAN / **MÖBIUS** by Eric ROCHANT / **THE CROSSING** by Jérôme CORNUAU / **OUR CHILDREN** by Joachim LAFOSSE / **THE GIRL ON THE TRAIN** by André TECHINÉ / **I FORGOT TO TELL YOU** by Laurent VINAS-RAYMOND / **LA VIE D'ARTISTE** by Marc FITOUSSI / **FISSURES** by Alanté KAVAÏTÉ / **LE GRAND MEAULNES** by Jean-Daniel VERHAEGHE / **LA RAVISSEUSE** by Antoine SANTANA / **AVANT QU'IL NE SOIT TROP TARD** by Laurent DUSSAUX / **THE BRIDGE OF SAN LUIS REY** by Mary MCGUCKIAN / **THE LIGHT** by Philippe LIORET / **THE VERY MERRY WIDOWS** by Catherine CORSINI / **THE HOUSEKEEPER** by Claude BERRI / **YES, BUT...** by Yves LAVANDIER / **ROSETTA** by Luc and Jean-Pierre DARDENNE.

INTERVIEW WITH LOIC CORBERY (*CLEMENT*)

Who is Clement in *Not my type*?

Lucas introduced Clement to me as a young bourgeois intellectual, a philosophy teacher and successful writer who loves getting lost in his work and in the whirlwind of Parisian social life where he is in his own element. A brilliant young man who is alone and happy to be so, he masks his inability to love with his numerous female conquests. He needs his solitude to live, to feel free and meet new women, to write, to do what he wants. In short, you could speak of a ruthless and uncompromising young man when it comes to his freedom in every sense of the word. He is driven by a fierce will to never feel trapped, to always do as he pleases with his time, his choices and his feelings.

How did you slip into this character?

There were several stages. First, Lucas Belvaux spoke to me about the character. Then he gave me the screenplay to read. Next, I read Philippe Vilain's novel, and although the screenplay is true to the novel, I was inspired by all that Lucas hadn't put into the screenplay, the literary digressions that dissected Clement's introspection, and which at times made a few specific scenes much more violent. So there is a bit of Philippe Vilain in Clement, of course, but also Lucas Belvaux and naturally Loïc Corbery, for in the end, Lucas projected the character onto what I could be, what I can express in my relationship with people, literature, the intellect and emotions. Truthfully, Clement's way of approaching life is not entirely unfamiliar to me! The moment he feels he is at odds with someone, he'd rather stop everything... But he isn't cynical, there isn't a strategy there. He's neither a wolf nor a Don Juan; seducing someone isn't an objective itself, and hurting someone even less. Before Arras, he's had a succession of relationships, in fact he couldn't do otherwise, for he inevitably feels hemmed in, trapped. He's adopted this *modus operandi* as a result.

Nevertheless, he arrives in Arras with the certainty that everything, the city and his encounters will only be an interlude in his life!

He arrives feeling disenchanted with love. When he meets Jennifer, he tells himself, just like a sailor: "a woman in every port," so this woman from Arras will be this port's woman. He's a boy who has always met the same women from the same intellectual and social milieu. He is surprised by Jennifer's exotic and sometimes naive behavior, and also by what he is feeling inside. He is taken. The more time passes, the more he feels that something could possibly happen, that something is beginning and that is the problem. These are two worlds that weren't meant to meet, but something happens... There is the cultural gap, and at the same time he feels so happy in her arms, in her eyes, and little by little this feeling grows. The irreparable springs up suddenly at the carnival, there is that silence, like an instinctive and atrocious reflex that he immediately regrets. He could have behaved differently but the blow had been dealt and Jennifer's scar will not heal. Yet this man and this woman had made such progress, both on their own and together. Lucas Belvaux wanted to tell the story through the eyes of both characters, and from that

perspective, the film is filled with more love than the book. As a result, the violence is that much more cruel when it shatters to pieces a love that in the end could have been possible.

What did you bring to the role in terms of interpretation?

I think that I softened Clement, I made him lighter, more innocent, less cynical. Perhaps more human. I've often had the instinct to suggest that he is caught in his own trap rather than wanting to harm others. And then there is something that escapes me, which hinges upon my physical appearance – my readily smiling face, I think. Undoubtedly I smoothed a few things over.

Lucas Belvaux wanted an actor who would be a believable philosophy teacher. Do you think that being used to great literature through your creations at the Comédie Française helped you?

I think that my link with this profession, through words and language, illustrates in particular the encounter between Clement and Jennifer's worlds. It's the encounter of a stage actor, whose incarnation is well-thought-out, deliberate, cold-blooded, and a marvelous movie actress who functions on instinct. And yet for me, it was the first time that a movie director entrusted me with this type of role. Although I feel at home on a stage, working in film is still a mystery to me. Emilie Dequenne impressed me and I was overwhelmed by her talent, her humanity, her simplicity, and paradoxically, the nobility with which she masters her work. She is entirely conscious of all the constraints on a set, whether technical, human or other. She knows who does what, how, at what moment, hears everything, understands everything, in order to be available to totally abandon herself when it is time to shoot a scene. I'm in such admiration of that. And on top of it she does it with great generosity, for she came to my rescue more than once. She is a marvelous comrade-in-arms. We stuck together while maintaining a very discreet relationship off the set. In order to play what Jennifer and Clement needed to tell each other, we were very considerate towards one another.

Filmography (selected films)

NOT MY TYPE by Lucas BELVAUX / **A COUP SUR** by Delphine DE VIGAN / **A DAY AT THE MUSEUM** by Jean-Michel RIBES / **FRAGILE** by Martin VALENTE / **THE AMATEURS** by Martin VALENTE / **BLUE AWAY TO AMERICA** by Sarah LEVY / **TERMINALE** by Francis GIROD / **MARTHE** by Jean-Loup HUBERT

CAST

Jennifer	Emilie Dequenne
Clement	Loïc Corbery from the Comédie Française
Cathy	Sandra Nkaké
Nolwenn	Charlotte Talpaert
Hélène Pasquier-Legrand	Anne Coesens
Madame Bortolin	Daniela Bisconti
Clement's Father	Didier Sandre
Clement's mother	Martine Chevallier from the Comédie Française
Isabelle	Annelise Hesme
Marie	Amira Casar
Johan Bortolin	Florian Thiriet
Dylan	Tom Burgeat
Antoine	Kamel Zidouri
The Principal	Christophe Moyer
The Moderator	Philippe Le Guay
Doctor Stenmark	Orjan Wikström
Monologue Man	Michel Masiero
The Babysitter	Tiffany Coulombel

CREW

Director	Lucas Belvaux
Screenplay, dialogue and adaptation	Lucas Belvaux Adapted from the novel <i>Not My Type</i> by Philippe Vilain © Editions Grasset and Fasquelle
Cinematography	Pierric Gantelmi d'Ille
Production design	Frédérique Belvaux
Sound	Henri Morelle
Costume design	Nathalie Raoul
Editor	Ludo Troch
Sound (re-recording) mixer	Luc Thomas
Sound editor	Béatrice Wick
Original score	Frédéric Vercheval
Production manager	Marie-Frédérique Lauriot-dit-Prévost
First Assistant Director:	Alexandra Denni
Script supervisor	Bénédicte Darblay
Makeup artist	Sylvie Aïd Denisot
Hair stylist	Franck Van Wolleghem
Unit production manager	Claire Langmann

A film produced by
Patrick Sobelman and Patrick Quinet

An
AGAT Films & Cie
Artémis Productions
France 3 Cinéma
RTBF (Belgian Television)
Belgacom Coproduction

With the participation of
Canal +
Ciné +
France Télévisions
Tax Shelter Films Funding
Casa Kafka Pictures Movie Tax Shelter empowered by Belfius
Cinémage 8
Sofitvciné

With support from
Centre du Cinéma et de l'Audiovisuel de la Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles and Voo

In association with
Pictanovo
with help from the Nord-Pas de Calais region
and in partnership with the CNC

With support from
La Procirep

International Sales
Films Distribution