

**SCREENING REPORT**  
**Owned: A Tale of Two Americas Director Giorgio Angelini**  
**Impact Project By: Anika Hussen and Roza Chervinky**

**MARKET:** New York City, New York

**DATE:** November 12, 2018

**TIME:** 7:30 pm

**TYPE OF SCREENING:** Film Festival Screening (Ticket + Payment Entry)

**THEATRE:** Cinepolis Chelsea

**COVERED BY:** DOCNYC

**ATTENDANCE/SEATING CAPACITY:** 100 – theatre fit approximately fit 90

**NGO PARTNERS?**

None

**Who and what role did they play?**

N/A

**OTHER PROMOTIONAL PARTNERS:**

Not specifically behind the film, but DOCNYC had their own sponsors A&E Indie Films, Netflix, History Films Amazon Studios and more, whom allocated funding for the whole DOCNYC festival.

**DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION:**

**ETHNIC BREAKDOWN:**

Caucasian: 85%  
African-American: 10%  
Hispanic: 2%  
Asian American: 2%  
Other: 1%

**AGE BREAKDOWN:**

2-17: 0%  
18-24: 5%  
25-34: 25%  
35-54: 35%  
54+: 35%

**AUDIENCE REACTION: (Bold One)**

Excellent

Very Good

**Good**

Fair

Poor

**BRIEF Description/Reaction from Audience:**

The night was pretty clear and regular cold weather, making it not as difficult to arrive on time. There was no pending line outside of the building, making it easy to enter into the theater and get to our front seats. The theater was half-occupied when we entered, and the remaining people trickled in as the DOCNYC trailers started to run. The front seats did not actually fill up, but instead, the back seats on the second platform/higher level of the theatre filled up. The audience was not overly eager, nor were they non-responsive. The audience let out a light laugh at the humorous initial commentary between the subjects and two or three more times throughout the film. There was one vague disdain sound when the 1950s commercials were displaying the emphasis on a "perfect" non-inclusive Caucasian family, among other stereotypes. There was almost a consensus on the ridiculousness of the post-war American culture. Other than that, the audience seemed to be very quiet, with a little side conversation here and there. After the film, there was no standing ovation, but there was an appreciative applause for the cinematic images and message. Although there was not a vibrant engagement during the screening, the audience clearly seemed to be engaged, since practically one-fourth of the audience stood in line to speak to the director afterward. The audience was quickly ushered out after the panel due to DOCNYC regulations, leaving the audience to crowd around in the theater halls waiting to speak to the director. The subjects and students from Rice University spoke to him first for a longer period of time. Everyone else just seems to give him congratulations on the film, with questions about location, time and why specific features/scenes were featured. There was no call of action or questions about how to get involved with

a solution to the primary issue: racialized housing. The problem was essentially very broad that it did not seem like a problem that individuals could tackle. The subjects lingered with him even after the rest of the audience had left.

#### **WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE PANEL DISCUSSION FOLLOWING SCREENING?**

**(Please list name of participant and affiliation)**

**The Film Director, Giorgio Angelini:** He received his Masters from the Architecture Program at Rice University during the 2008 real estate collapse, which led to his idea for his film focus. As a research grantee to photograph the abandoned McMansions of Inland Empire California, Giorgio realized that the environment and resources were in worse condition than he expected. Focusing on film currently, Giorgio has launched Section Perspective Films production company. He is already working on his next partnered documentary with animator Arthur Jones, focusing on Pepe the Frog and the rise of far-right politics.

**The Panel Moderator/Interviewer:** Works for DOCNYC, in charge of the dissemination and collection of the audience

#### **BRIEF Description/Reaction from Q&A/PANEL:**

The Q&A was very short (barely 5-7 minutes), where the director was ushered onto the stage by the moderator, just how he had been to greet the audience prior to the film starting. The moderator asked two questions to elaborate on his background and identity: which he answered with his history in Architecture (at this point he happily acknowledged the Rice University students up in front who had cheered on the university). The moderator asked to follow up questions about the inspiration of the film and how he met the subjects, which he answered with the 2008 economic crisis during his education time and how he became affiliated with Jimmy from Levittown, Greg, the Baltimore, house flipper turned activist. He emphasized the story of seeing the protests of burning down neighborhood houses, where he became fascinated with how a group could simultaneously a place home and destroy it (seed of the film). There were 3 to 5 questions from the audience including; "Where did you get the archival footage?", "There seemed to be the racial tensions missing, was it intentional to leave out the current scenes of racial relations in Levittown?", and "Did you intend the film to be majority post-war imagery?" The audience was not overwhelmed with questions to ask, but the panel was cut after a few short questions. The questions did not address any further impact or campaign but rather were focused on the story and subjects. The subjects were sitting in the higher level/back of the theatre, whom Angelini would look back to when speaking about the film. Although the reaction of the audience was primarily positive, it was also very moderate and not necessarily seeking engagement/activity.

#### **COMMENTS/QUOTES/FEEDBACK (FROM AUDIENCE):**

#### **DIGITAL COMMENTS/QUOTES/FEEDBACK (FROM AUDIENCE ON TWITTER OR OTHER MEDIA):**

No prevalent social media reactions/feedback

#### **WERE ANY RESOURCES DISTRIBUTED?**

No

#### **WHAT WAS THE PRIMARY CALL TO ACTION FROM THE AUDIENCE?**

**(And what was their response to this?)**

No specific call to action

#### **WAS A SURVEY DISTRIBUTED AT THE SCREENING?**

No

**DID ANY TRAILERS PLAY?**

Yes

**DID ANY OTHER CONTENT PLAY? (PSAs, etc.)**

No

**If yes, what trailers and what was the audience reaction?**

Prior to the start of the film, there were of other documentaries playing during the festival. There was chatter amongst the crowd increasing in volume when there was an interesting film (some people were stating that they would like to watch the particular film while on the trailer)

**DID ANY PRESS ATTEND?**

No

**If yes, please list their reactions below.**

Journalist/OUTLET (Circulation or Affiliation)	Reaction

**WAS THERE ANY AREAS OF THE SCREENING EVENT THAT COULD HAVE BEEN IMPROVED? LOGISTICALLY?**

We would have loved to have more allocated time for the Q&A, where the subjects (who were present) would come down to the stage with the director. The audience, they could have asked more individual questions based on the visual memory of the characters and the subjects could give a multi-viewed answer to questions the audience asked. Especially since the film emphasized building conversation among communities, seeing all the crew talking about their own experiences would have shown how the conversation had been created through the film. We also feel like the moderator/DOCNYC should not have rushed out the audience so quickly and allowed the audience to not only ask questions on the panel but stay afterwards to come up on the stage and speak with the director within the screening room (keeping the mood/environment constant). Also, based on our impact campaign, we would like to see the screening of the film in more public establishments and in the communities spoken about in the film (ie. Levittown, Baltimore, Inland Empire California etc.) Instead, the Levittown residents/subjects came to the film festival in NYC (closest large city), perhaps because of the affiliation/free access. Other than that, the venue was well organized, the audience were all seated comfortably before the film began and the film/tech ran smoothly. There could have been a specific action like talking about equal housing organizations to participate with or donate to.

**CONTENT-WISE?**

The film was very cinematically beautiful and organized. The integration of the subject footage/dialogue and the archival commercials/footage from the 1950s was thought-provoking bringing up the necessary discussion of what the nation is built upon. However, we saw the film's subjects very broad and scattered at some points. The overview of American racial history did not necessarily allow the audience to focus on one issue to combat or even understanding where they could have their own input. We would probably focus on one particular message or idea that was discussed in the film and build a detailed story around that. For example, we would like to have footage of Greg and Jimmy having a conversation about their sides of the story with each other to show overlap and distinctions between the stories, since one of Giorgio messages was to show that these separated communities had more in common than believed).

**IS THERE ANY FOLLOW UP (BY NEWSLETTER OR SOCIAL MEDIA) TO THE ATTENDEES OF THE SCREENING? IF SO, WHO IS RESPONSIBLE AND WHAT DOES THIS LOOK LIKE?**

No

**PLEASE ATTACH INVITATION TO SCREENING TO THIS REPORT.**

**PLEASE ATTACH ANY PRESS MENTIONS ABOUT EVENT TO THIS REPORT.**

**ARE ATTENDEES INTERESTED IN FURTHER INVOLVEMENT IN THE FILM CAMPAIGN?**  
**(If so, please list here)**