

Ilaria Fraioli

Q1Q: How would you describe home movies to a person who has no familiarity with this concept?

Q1A: By home movies we generally understand those visual narratives, which refer to a private and intimate story. They possess a specific modality of narration and make use of materials of private origin. Either way, home movies take the form of experimental material; they possess specific syntaxes and use in a natural manner a researched language, above all when they go beyond a biographical story and become more complex narratives, which originate in a single story and then relates it to the broader context/contemporary environment.

Q1Q: Your vision is very interesting also given the context of a double interpretation of home movies: the artistic and creative one vs. the historical and social one. How do you perceive this double polarity of the home movie?

Q1A: When I talk about home movie, I refer to something that relates to my direct experience. Considering that I often worked on the editing of films of this nature, or which used private footage as a constructing element, I regard home movies as material that do not possess a meaning of their own. What I mean is that they are self-referential; they assume a descriptive form. It is not that they are meaning-less but in my opinion they assume a minor meaning. Instead, when this footage is able to build a bridge between a micro-story and something that is much more broader and universal, then they do not only acquire a major meaning, but acquire also a filmic meaning, which can contribute to fostering the reflection upon the cinematographic language. Therefore home movies need to have their own research space, in this case, because they assume the subjective singularity, the specificity of a specific person/story, in the attempt to communicate in a much broader and universal manner; therefore the work focuses on understanding how through the combination of various shots and the construction of single sequences and scenes and of the entire film, it is possible to talk to everybody by using the language of the single individual.

Q2Q: Do you think the public of films that reuse such footage has changed over the last years? If so, how?

Q2A: Obviously the biographic story has existed for a long time, especially in literature and other artistic fields. In the field of cinema, there is the more classic form of narrative of single stories. This formula that often appeared inside fiction cinema but also in documentary cinema, has always been expressed through the narration of single stories belonging to a person. When we talk instead about home movie or archive footage, that narrates a single story, and not necessarily of an important character, but single stories belonging to common people, at a certain point, thanks to some open-track films that were reusing archival footage (private and institutional), a different modality of narrating single stories and of constructing films emerged; these stories belonged to single people and their private lives. These types of films have a different kind of public than films of more classic nature. They are generally research-based movies; therefore a public who is interested in the experimental side of cinema watches them. I find that this public who watch documentaries using archive footage has extended a lot over the past years, providing that now we have also a different kind of narrative than the more classic, TV modality, which attracts a different kind of audience made of researchers, students and other people interested in this kind of material.

Q4Q: Do you see any difference in your work that did not contain archive footage compared to the films that reused archive footage? If so, how do you think they distinguish themselves?

Q4A: My work is very eclectic. I worked on different films, some were of private nature, as they told private and personal stories of their authors, others were of completely another nature. Nevertheless, the research-oriented work done in the frame of private and subjective nature - which are positioned outside of a formal frame and are therefore searching for their own form in the moment in which they are produced - needs a specific editing method, that has profoundly influenced the rest of my work; that part of the work that lies in institutional, more traditional contexts.

Q5Q: In the context of the editing method, which do you think are the difficult and which are the easy aspects in working with home movies or archives?

Q5A: When we talk about archives, we generally speak about images done in the past, but above all images which have been produced with a different aim than we generally assign them today when reusing this footage. I would not call them difficulties, but degrees of attention; the degree of attention needed to reuse this footage is obviously very high. Obviously this degree of attention needs to generate on the one hand certain 'gentleness' in handling them; on the other hand it can't become censorious. Let me explain: if on the one hand I have the right to confer a new semantic structure to the images that was used in another context; on the other hand I need to do it in a logic and thoughtful manner, we possible also elegantly. I need to do this while respecting its original nature- the carrier/medium on which it is impressed, the cultural context during which it was produced, but also to have the courage to put it in another context, where it doesn't remain necessarily a testimony anymore, but maybe becomes a different expressive sign; an expressive language that is connected to a contemporary gesture and context (for us who edit and produce this film) and proves that the contemporary is in dialogue with memory.

Q6Q: Where do you position in this unique relationship created between the images, the author of the new film and yourself, the author of the archive footage?

Q6A: I see a sort of triangle where I position this figure of the author. The work of the editor that is introduced as a dialectic interlocutor on a creative level is that of one of the three points. Obviously the role of the editor is also to become a sort of transversal figure, an intermediary between the material of the author and the final film.

Q6Q: It is the vision of the film director.

Q6A: Yes, we generally say that the film editor is the first audience, a more detached one and therefore more objective. I believe the contrary that it is good to loose objectivity in the construction of this kind of films, I mean not in general, but in this case. Because the relational formula works because there is a feeling involved, you put your heart in it. One time it happened that I edited a film that talked about the mother of the film director. That woman became in some sense also my mother. This is not because she resembled my mother, but because in an unconscious way I performed a process such as - how do you call the process that actors use to get into the skin of their characters? - the Stanislavski method, where actors search inside the story of the film certain character traits that enable them to interpret that specific role. This relation that is created in this type of private or family film, or film that uses highly emotional images, requires something in order to interpret them, in becoming the mediator of this material; by becoming authors you need to put

inside a piece of yourself. You need somehow to make resound the images you see with something that is profoundly also yours. Like this, the mechanism of profound subjectivism generates meaning, ideas, proposes and builds a creative dialectic, a way in between objectivity and neutrality.

Q7Q: Are there any archives that remained closer to you than other ones? If so, what rendered them so special?

Q7A: These are movies that are all special, as I said before. Each of them has specific traits and cannot be fitted into a given model/frame. They represent novel adventures, like different sons. They are all different. I cannot say I am closer to some more than to other. There is a research of a personal language and of a personal development path connected to each specific footage, to each single specific relation to the author(s), that special relationship which forms a triangle between the material, myself and the author, which is different in each case and therefore creates uniqueness, renders it impossible for me to make a difference. What I can say is that each of this films has taught me something, that I carried with me along my work.

Q8Q: Can you think about home movie scenes that you perceived as ambiguous, subversive and non-conventional, that are outside the frame of the traditional home movie scenes?

Q8A: Well yes. It happened with the footage shot by the grandfather of Alina Marazzi. This is material that left me with the impression of being produced with another scope, that of representation, but a performance-kind of representation, that is not in line with the casual truthfulness of common home movie scenes. This was special kind of material.

Q8Q: I would like to ask you how much you agree with the following statement: 'family films are doodles of the soul, invisible writing, that contain such magmatic, germinal and radical material, that they contribute to the renewal of the moving image'.

Q8A: Yes, it is beautiful. This is what I have been talking about up to now. Yes, I am totally agreeing. Can I ask you who wrote this?

Q8Q: It is a statement inspired by Nino Frasca's research, an Italian artist who worked with the doodle as an expressive instrument of the artist and people in general. During my artistic path I have been influenced by this intentionality of an author. Personally I found in home movies which I have seen this kind of invisible writing, that represents the essence, the germinal and radical material, similar to the doodle. I find this parallelism that inspires my own vision of the home movie.

Q9Q: If you had to define your editing style how would you do it? Would you see it closer to the definition of proximity editing belonging to Eisenstein or rather to the distance editing method defined by Pelesjan?

Q9A: I used in my work both approaches, because thanks to these two great theoreticians and filmmakers, who transformed their own work into theory, nowadays we have at our disposal more cultural instruments. In reality we can enrich our approach thanks to their research. If on the one hand sometimes we used the connection between images (archive scenes between them or archive footage and contemporary scenes) to produce symbolic short circuits or generate meaning, following a more intellectual model of editing, on the other hand we sometimes worked for example in the field of memory and we had the need to create those fractures of space, that non-place, through a distance-editing method where a deeper meaning is nested.

Q9Q: As a last question on your work I wanted to ask you which of the three works: Circle, We also want roses, This story here, you perceived closest to your own way of working?

Q9A: All three of them. They have been clearly built in a different way. As we said before, the role of the editor is the protagonist of these films, but they exist inside, in the mind, the heart of an author. As products, as outputs they are built by someone, so the context changes a lot from film to film. I can say that all of them are different from each other. Having used the approach, which I tried to explain above, I followed a different path each time, which connected me to all three of the films you mentioned. Then I can say that inside these films, there are some parts, which I have 'felt in a special way'. For example in This Story Here, I feel most the part of the 'birth of Vasco Rossi's first song', where the mother of the author says that he was filming that what he was seeing, that Vasco was narrating in his songs that which he was seeing. This passage and the rest of the scenes that talk about this song has particularly interested me, because the material I used was not Vasco Rossi's own family footage, but footage provided by the people who lived in the area, Vasco's neighbours and friends. Therefore a whole new imaginary was created, one made by those people and their faces, and I liked this dialogue between the song and the loan of the home movie footage of these people, that told his story. I like how Vasco's mother introduced this dimension of the artist as the one who narrates that what he sees. But in this case, what we see is something that was donated by the people living in the area. A beautiful and intense circuit was being created at that point and it seemed to me that the editing of this material and bringing it together had valorised these various levels of layers, in such a way that a single story, made by all, taps into the generosity of everyone. Then also We want also the roses, is very important, because it touches themes that define my life, my way of seeing the world. Then also because the intent was to create a female-defined image, creating characters who 'were different'. These single stories, of the three diaries, were stories nurtured by a polyphony of other stories, passed through by other stories, with the aim to create, not heroines, or classic characters who define in an emblematic way the aura of an era, but single stories that exist because they are open, and crossed by other stories. This interested me a lot in this film and also because it was done through the way images were deployed, not only by the the construction of the plot. Therefore one was integral part of the other, and it became very interesting. In Circle I found very poetic parts. Despite of the story, which is very precise and linear, the story of an important family, whose images were taken not only from private but also from public archives, created a beautiful dialogue between these two levels, two types of footage of distinct nature: institutional archives representing the public image of this family and private archives such as diaries, memorials, but also footage recorded inside the circus by family members or other people from their community. I liked this dialogue. Then I liked the poetic moments that 'stepped out' of the story. In this film I liked the digressions.

Q10Q: As a last question I would like you to watch a small video I have put together from home movies and tell me what you think about it.

Q10A: Ok, finished.

Q10Q: Ok, it is all about giving a spontaneous impression of these images.

Q10A: If I can talk honestly they have made me think about death, I do not know why.

Q10Q: The entire editing or was it a specific scene?

Q10A: Well yes, the scene with the rabbits, but it was not only this. The entire editing looked like the images that flash before your eyes before you die; with those black spaces between them, from

which I cannot extrapolate any narrative except for the story of a lifetime; such as the last instances of life. I am sorry about this.

Q10Q: No, there is no problem about this. It is interesting to see the reaction from different people. One also made a reflection on the high number of old people present in these images. You might think about home movies in more happy terms, about births, birthdays or weddings and not connected more to the passage of time and ageing.

Q10A: Yes, I was impacted also by the breaks which maybe for you were arbitrary, but to me they seemed like palpitations, like hear-beats, like a de-composed form of trying to cling to memory as long as possible, because afterwards there is nothing there.