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# Scientific Background

The period 1960–1980 was a singular time in European cinema. Against the background of the Cold War, directors like Gillo Pontecorvo, Costa-Gavras, and Werner Herzog produced films that combined left-wing politics with critical acclaim and box office success. How was this possible, and what were the factors that underlie this mode of transnational European film production? The dominant tendency in previous studies has been to analyze this phenomenon in relatively narrow terms: as the result of individual, politically engaged filmmakers driven by their personal experiences, cultural interests, and aesthetic sensibilities (Lev, 1993; Balint Kovacs, 2007; Nagiv, 2011). This project takes a different approach, one that aims to draw on a wider body of previously neglected evidence and that considers these filmmakers and their films within a larger set of political and economic structures. These structures draw together a set of truly transnational elements from the global north and south, from Europe and the Americas, from Hollywood to Algeria. Focusing on the work of two key directors during the period under study, Gillo Pontecorvo and Costa-Gavras, the project will deliver new insight into the work of these two directors and on some of the most important films of the period, while shedding new light on the structures through which their work was realized and by which it was shaped. The result will be a new understanding of transnational European cinema during a crucial time in the history of the twentieth century.

Functioning as paradigmatic cases for the purposes of this project, Pontecorvo and Costa-Gavras belong to and are representative of a larger group of European filmmakers who created and produced political and/or artistically ambitious cinematic works intended for broad audiences during the 1960s, ’70s, and ’80s. German filmmaker Werner Herzog, French filmmakers Louis Malle and Marcel Camus, and Soviet filmmaker Mikhail Kalatozov are additional examples of European transnational filmmakers operating during the same period. Most academic studies tend to link Pontecorvo’s and Costa-Gavras’ political films to the post-Second World War decolonization process and struggles in Africa, Asia, and Latin America (Martin, 2009; O’Leary, 2009; Michalczyk, 1983; Welsh, 1977), overlooking the impact of the economy and politics of the film industry during that historical moment on the filmmakers’ aesthetic, narrative, and thematic choices. Gillo Pontecorvo’s *The Battle of Algiers* (1965) and *Queimada*/*Burn!* (1968) and Costa-Gavras’ *Z* (1968), *State of Siege* (1972), and *Missing* (1982) represent a unique moment in the film industry and world politics, where left-wing politics, critical acclaim, and box office success were not seen as mutually exclusive.

Although Gillo Pontecorvo directed only five feature films during his lifetime, his name remains widely regarded as that of an outstanding film auteur of the Cold War period. His 1966 film, *The Battle of Algiers*, achieved monumental success with both critics and audiences, becoming not only a cinematic milestone but also a key text of the era. Radical left-wing groups absorbed its portrayal of anticolonial guerrilla tactics and military anti-terrorist groups, and paramilitary organizations studied the film to learn how to combat such strategies (Robin, 2005; Riegler, 2018). After *The Battle of Algiers*, Pontecorvo directed two additional films, *Burn!*/*Queimada* (1968) and *Ogro* (1979), both of which received mixed reviews (Scott, 2004; O’Leary and Srivastava, 2009). From the unexpected critical and box-office success of *Z* (1969) to the multi-award-winning yet no less controversial *Missing* (1982), Costa-Gavras’ films were global top box-office hits. Despite his global impact during the 1970s and early ’80s, Costa-Gavras and his crew were attacked by critics from both the left and right. Among their reasons was the alleged application of a superficial, ready-made formula to different cultures and political realities (Comolli and Narboni 1971; Biskind 1973; Monaco 1976).

Gillo Pontecorvo’s and Costa-Gavras’ status as “European” and “outsider” filmmakers working within the commercial cinema circuit obscured the involvement of a complex, thick transnational network of political activists, filmmakers, cultural producers, and film viewers engaged in the production and consumption of their “political” genre films. The filmmakers’ biographical experiences and familiar backgrounds marked by the struggle against Fascism and foreign oppression are frequently mentioned as primary sources of inspiration for their narrative and stylistic cinematic choices (Bignardi, 1999; Wayne, 2001; Costa-Gavras, 2018). However, the fact that those films were European or American-European productions made by European filmmakers, but produced in Third World countries, was excluded from scholarly debate.

# The majority of academic debate surrounding the figure of the filmmaker as an “auteur” focuses on the stylistic and thematic choices of certain filmmakers (Balint Kovacs, 2007; Sarris, 2008; Lev, 1993), or, for instance, on the performative aspects of film authorship (Sayad, 2013; Rugg, 2014; Ribke, 2023). However, the political and economic aspects related to the construction of filmmakers as auteurs are largely neglected by scholarly research. Steinhart’s (2019) book on the internationalization of Hollywood production in the post-Second World War period represents a groundbreaking exception in film studies research due to its integration of economic, technological, and cultural factors shaping the production of transnational filmmaking in the 1950s and 60s. According to Steinhart (2019) and Rosendorf (2007), after the end of the Second World War, multiple geopolitical, financial, and technological factors encouraged the shooting and production of American films in Western Europe. The decision of a number of Western European governments to restrict capital flows, the higher availability of skilled workers with lower wages vis-à-vis Hollywood workers, the development of new technologies that improved shooting on location, and the cinematic appeal of authentic locales contributed to the phenomenon of Hollywood post-Second World War runaway productions (Steinhart, 2019, pp. 6-7).

# The present research project differs from Steinhart’s work in two key ways. First, it focuses on European filmmakers and European film projects produced in Third World countries. One of the main questions this project aims to explore is the extent to which European “runaway” productions in the developing world differed from Hollywood’s runaway film production in Europe during the 1950s and ’60s. Second, unlike Steinhart’s work, this research project centers on the Cold War period as a distinct historical framework that fostered a supportive environment for the European filmmaking projects under study. While American transnational films produced in Europe were the result of corporate strategies and international commercial agreements, the European transnational films examined in this research involved the active participation of extensive networks of left-wing cultural producers, social activists, and politicians in Third World countries (Lacruz Frachia, 2020; Celli, 2005; Ribke, forthcoming). Through an examination of the evolving networks and connections between European, Latin American, African, and Middle Eastern political activists, filmmakers, and producers during that period, the present study will reveal both collaborative mechanisms and decentralized processes operating in the production of European transnational films during the Cold War period.

Film scholars tend to emphasize the “realism” in political cinema of the 1960s and ’70s, linking it to the ethical stance of the filmmakers associated with that trend (Nagib, 2011). However, political filmmakers’ stylistic choices were the result of their ideological leanings, their orientation towards an aesthetic of realism, and budgetary strategies and constraints. A key factor for the filmmakers to secure financial support for later projects was their ability to produce low-budget films in “authentic” locations in Third World countries that would attract wider audiences across the world. When interviewed by the Brazilian press in 1980, the German filmmaker Werner Herzog referred to the economic calculations behind the films he shot in the Amazonas region in the following terms: “Aguirre’s budget, according to the American production costs, should have been 5 million dollars, however, the production cost was 320 thousand dollars. I don’t know the final figures of *Fitzcarraldo*, but I guarantee you that it will look like a 20–25-million-dollar film” (Schild, 1980). In several interviews and testimonies given throughout the years, both Pontecorvo and Costa-Gavras explained the large number of offers received from producers to finance their projects in terms of the extremely profitable budget and box-office relation of *The Battle of Algiers* (1966) and *Z* (1968) (Bignardi, 1999; Michalczyk, 1983).

The underlying connection between Cold War international politics and the economy of political filmmaking emerges as a decisive factor in Pontecorvo’s and Costa-Gavras’ films of the 1960s and ’70s. For example, Pontecorvo was contacted by Algerian producers to make a film about the Algerian independence struggle not only because of his previous record as a filmmaker and his political-ideological stance, but also because he was Italian and not French. Since the Algerian film industry was not developed enough back then, Algerian producers sought to establish partnerships with foreign filmmakers and production companies. However, they did not want to cooperate with their former colonial ruler (Forgacs, 2007). A partnership with American producers was probably not even considered, given the political alignments of the post-independence Algerian State. Nevertheless, Italy was regarded as a friendly state due to the support shown to the Algerians by the Italian state-owned oil industry under the chairmanship of Enrico Mattei (Bini, 2017; Bignardi, 1999, p. 120). Algiers’ benign weather and the lower cost of hiring a high number of extras were also important factors considered by Italian producers and financers. However, the Algerian government's cooperation in allowing access to locations in the city of Algiers and its casbah, together with granting the security of the film’s crew, was also a decisive factor in the production of the film (Celli, 2005, p. 52; Forgacs, 2007, p. 353).

**Research objectives and expected significance**

Based on archival research of audio-visual sources and printed press articles from Italy, France, Spain, the United States, Brazil, Uruguay, Chile, Colombia, and Mexico, along with historical research, biographies, and testimonies published during the last four decades, the present research project aims to assemble a transnational political, economic, and cultural history of Pontecorvo’s and Costa-Gavras’ films in the Cold War period. In contrast to the narrowness of previous readings, this project will situate the works of Pontecorvo and Cost-Gavras in relation to a more encompassing economic and political framework. The key elements in this framework, derived from key elements in the process by which these films were produced, are those of authorship, location, and casting. Through careful investigation of this threefold set of elements, drawing on the archival sources just mentioned, the project will bring to the fore previously hidden ideological presumptions and cultural, economic, and technological asymmetries between developed and underdeveloped (Third World) countries. The focus on these three elements structures the overall research approach, but these three elements also relate to the main objectives of the problem.

The first of these objectives concerns *authorship*. The framework to be developed will not only enable a wider approach, distinct from the narrower which characterized previous research on this topic, but it will also allow a more integrative understanding of European film authorship during the Cold War period. In doing so, it will connect political and economic factors as they operated across national borders, and at the same time, it will chart some of the complex networks of social and political activists, cultural mediators, and film workers who operated across the often-oversimplified dichotomies between engaged/artistic and commercial filmmaking, and between the American film industry and European and/or Third World film sectors. I anticipate that the integrative approach proposed in this project could also be adopted by scholars studying film production and reception across different historical periods and regions.

The second objective relates to film *location* and *casting* and their connection to the deep-rooted historical, cultural, technological, and economic factors that have shaped the globalization of film industries beyond the specific historical context of the Cold War. Once again, the aim is to arrive at a more integrative but also more comprehensive understanding of the way filmmaking decisions regarding location and casting were shaped by larger situational factors in ways that were often in tension with the supposed politics of the directors or their films. Mikhail Kalatozov's Soviet-Cuban film *Soy Cuba* (1964) and Gillo Pontecorvo’s anti-colonialist adventure film *Queimada/Burn!* (1968) serve as examples of high-budget radical left-wing films in which the selection of diegetic and extra-diegetic locations, along with the filmmakers’ casting decisions, reflected many of the colonial patterns and visions of the New World landscape and its people as an earthly paradise (Todorov, 1984)—a portrayal the films and their creators sought to denounce (Gorsuch, 2015; Rogatchevsky, 2020; Celli, 2005; O’Leary and Srivastava, 2009).

Drawing on the analysis of these key elements of film production—authorship, location, and casting— the third objective of the research is the integration of concepts and knowledge that have emerged from the professional practice and division of labor in filmmaking with the theoretical orientation and articulation developed by film scholars. For instance, the focus on location and casting, commonly regarded as technical concepts related to the *practical* aspects of filmmaking, and the way they operate within the project as a focal point for the understanding of the larger processes in which they are embedded. This highlights the potentially fertile cross-pollination between practical and theoretical issues in film studies—between analyses that foreground the practicality of film production and the ideals as well as creative impulses that cinema is taken to express.

# Detailed description of the proposed research

1. Working hypothesis

This project is based on the idea that key cinematic works of the Cold War period can be better understood by situating those works against the background of a set of transnational factors encompassing both economic and political structures, processes, and actors. That idea is developed through the analysis of the works of Pontecorvo and Cosa-Gavras, taken as representatives of the broader landscape of European cinema during the period in question. Through the analysis results, new insights will be generated into the multiple forces shaping European political filmmakers’ works, as well as the dynamics of the global film industry and international politics during the Cold War. There are three main interconnected hypotheses that constitute the basic conceptual foundations on which the research proceeds.

The first hypothesis posits that European transnational film production during the Cold War period represents a unique phenomenon in the history of cinema, arising from the specific cultural, political, social, and economic conditions under which European filmmakers were operating. However, despite its distinctiveness, these transnational European filmmaking ventures during the Cold War often mirrored, in both their narrative and stylistic approaches, as well as in their market strategies and production patterns, various aspects of American films produced for the commercial market, revealing a complex interplay between artistic autonomy and commercial pressures.

The second hypothesis posits that the specific social, cultural, and political networks that circulated between Europe and Third World regions during the 1960s and ’70s facilitated the production of European films in and about South American, African, and Asian countries during the Cold War. While these transnational networks were rooted in shared political and ideological beliefs, as well as common cultural values and sensitivities, the production and content of the films often perpetuated long-standing colonial attitudes and stereotypes about the people and cultures they depicted.

The third hypothesis posits that the specific political and cultural dynamics of the Cold War period created a unique ecosystem in European film industries. This encouraged both the production and consumption of political films produced in and about the Global South aimed at large global audiences. The end of the Cold War, which had fueled much of the political drama inspiring European transnational films of that era, led to a rapid decline in some filmmakers’ careers, as seen with Costa-Gavras, or even a sudden halt, as in the case of Gillo Pontecorvo.

1. Research Design

This research project will explore Gillo Pontecorvo’s and Costa-Gavras’s filmmaking careers during the Cold War period through an analysis that revolves around the three interconnected levels: (1) *The Poetics and the Economy of Authorship during the Cold War Period*; (2) *Location and Casting and Neocolonial Practices in European Political Films;* (3) *Looking for the Lost Audiences, Reconstructing the European Transnational Film Ecosystem.*

1. *The Poetics and the Economy of Authorship during the Cold War Period*

When analyzing the European filmmakers’ oeuvre on which this research focuses, film scholars, as well as filmmakers themselves, often cite the struggle against Fascism and foreign oppression as key sources of inspiration for their narrative and stylistic cinematic choices (Bignardi, 1999; Wayne, 2001; Costa-Gavras, 2018). Their rise to prominence as political filmmakers was the result of multiple factors, including personal decisions, individual talents, and chance. However, these research works and testimonies tended to overlook three central aspects of their filmmaking styles and careers. First, the filmmakers’ evolving transnational network of social and political activists, cultural mediators, film producers, and film workers facilitated the production of their films in and about the Third World/Global South. Second, the long-lasting impact of the filmmakers’ early exposure to American films during their childhood, which is reflected in an eclectic use of film genre forms. Third, the far-reaching impact of American economic, political, and cultural presence in the European film industry during the post-World War II period.

For example, Costa-Gavras’ use of the thriller genre in *Z* (1969) and *State of Siege* (1972), along with the recurring appearance of French film star Yves Montand, a former member of the French Communist party and left-wing activist during most of his career, highlights Costa-Gavras’ adoption of genre formulas and casting strategies typically associated with the Hollywood system. At the same time, it also reflects the intersection between Costa-Gavras’ political beliefs and social networks and his filmmaking practices. After American producers became aware of the favorable budget-box-office ratio of Gillo Pontecorvo’s *The Battle of Algiers* (1966) and Costa-Gavras’ *Z* (1969), they eagerly sought out European filmmakers to replicate this successful formula in political films.

1. *Location and Casting and Neocolonial Practices in European Political Films*

Understanding the way individual films are connected to the larger background requires attending to the way external factors are filtered through the filmmaker’s production practices and decisions. By tracking the location selection process and casting choices, the present project proposes to take a closer look at the interaction patterns between European filmmakers and their local contacts and crew in the developing countries their films dealt with. It is the case that European transnational films produced during this period were the result of the cooperation of a vast network of activists, cultural agents, and film producers from Europe and Third World countries who shared a similar political worldview and cultural sensibilities. However, these movies also reflect structural economic, cultural, and technological asymmetries between developed and peripheral countries.

The casting of José Dolores, Marlon Brando’s antagonist and the leader of the slave revolt in Gillo Pontecorvo’s *Queimada/Burn!* (1968) is particularly revealing of the conflicts and contradictions between the Italian filmmaker’s realist aesthetics and ideology and the underlying racist and colonialist values present in transnational European cinema of the 1960s and ’70s. Pontecorvo rejected the casting of Sidney Poitier and Harry Belafonte for the role of the Black slave revolt leader, arguing that their polished and refined appearances reminded him more of urban Black New Yorkers than of exploited, physically oppressed slaves (Ionio, 1967; AC., 1968). According to Bignardi (1999, p. 150), Pontecorvo began searching for candidates for José Dolores’ role in off-Broadway theaters. During one of these searches, he found an actor with the “right face” and an “element of savage violence” he was looking for, though the actor had a noticeable crooked black tooth. After a series of screen tests, Pontecorvo and the film’s producer sent him to a renowned dentist in Rome to have his teeth completely redone. However, when they met the actor after the procedure, they felt his face had changed completely, no longer fitting the type they had envisioned. They sent him back to New York—with a new face but without the role. This research project suggests that the neo-realist impulse to search for, discover, and showcase “real people” from the Third World on screen bears a resemblance to what Fatimah Tobing Rony (2003, p. 100-26) described as the “taxidermic impulse” and “romantic primitivism” of early ethnographers and documentary filmmakers.

1. *Looking for the Lost Audiences, Reconstructing the European Transnational Film Ecosystem*

In an interview published in 1980 by *L’Unità*, the interviewer asked Pontecorvo why his films did not deal with Italian reality and whether it was easier to tell stories about other countries and societies. He answered that he tried to make a film about the government persecution and repression of unionized workers during Mario Scelba’s tenure as Italy’s Minister of the Interior (1947-1953), but he could not find any producer willing to take on that project (Garambois, 1980; Bignardi, 1999). In 1983, Italian producer Giorgio Nocella mentioned in an interview with the Italian newspaper *La Stampa* that he was producing a film with Pontecorvo about the involvement of the Italian Mafia in the country’s politics and economy (Gianeri, 1983). Pontecorvo’s last feature film had been released four years before that interview, and the film Nocella was enthusiastically discussing never came to fruition.

Costa-Gavras’ autobiography (2019, pp. 271-280) also offers a riveting example of the topics that political filmmaking aimed at wider audiences during that period, which could not be addressed for multiple reasons. Backed by the commercial and critical success of *Z* (1969), *L’Aveu* (1970), and *State of Siege* (1972), Costa-Gavras began to work on a film project with American actor and producer Robert Redford, one of the biggest Hollywood stars at that time. According to Costa-Gavras’ testimony, the film’s story, which centered on the troublesome ethical and social operations of multinational corporations, did not prosper because of disagreements with Robert Redford regarding the film’s ending. In Costa-Gavras’ words, while Robert Redford proposed a happy ending, Costa-Gavras supported the idea that representing a victory of a single man against a powerful multinational corporation would deliver a non-realistic, comforting message to the audiences, undermining the film’s political message. According to Costa-Gavras, he proposed the film’s project to other Hollywood stars and producers, but none of them agreed to finance the film.

The present research project argues that to fully uncover the distinct transnational film ecosystem of the Cold War period, it is essential to transcend the fragmentation in film studies, which often divides scholarly research into separate subdisciplines focused on film production, reception, and narrative and style, isolating them from one another. European political filmmakers like Gillo Pontecorvo and Costa-Gavras thrived during the Cold War. This was not only due to their creative and professional filmmaking capabilities but also because there was a global audience eager to pay for movie tickets to see their films/stories, which sometimes anticipated and sometimes retold narratives familiar to international audiences. Their careers also flourished because film producers anticipated profits from political films, and the external realities of the Cold War provided these filmmakers with rich, dramatic material for their big-screen stories.

**Methods**

This research project ambitiously aims to examine European political films during the Cold War through the works of Gillo Pontecorvo and Costa-Gavras, employing three interdisciplinary research methodologies rooted in Bruno Latour’s (2005) Actor-Network-Theory: (1) Archival Research; (2) Formal and Aesthetic Analysis; (3) Micro-Historical Research. From the current research perspective, Latour’s ANT helps to avoid the fragmentary approaches prevalent in much of film research, which often separate the analysis of film production from film reception, the economy and technology of film production from aesthetic and stylistic choices, and the filmmakers’ oeuvre from the political, cultural, and historical networks they were immersed in.

Although each methodology requires different procedures and skill sets, the proposed approach aims to “bring back to life” the unique network behind the production and reception of transnational European political films from the 1960s and ’70s, capturing the multiple structures “of cables and conduits” (Latour, 2005, p. 191), assembled around the concepts of authorship, location, and casting.

(1) Archival Research: Given the historiographical and analytical character of the project, archival material represents an important evidential source for the research. The main archival materials relevant to the project are held in: a) *Museo Nazionale del Cinema* in Torino, where I intend to locate primary sources related to Gillo Pontecorvo’s films; b) *Filmoteca Española* and *Archivo General de la Administración* in Madrid, where I aspire to locate primary sources related to Gillo Pontecorvo’s last two films, *Queimada/Burn!* (1968) and *Ogro* (1979), as well as Costa-Gavras’ film *Missing* (1982); c) the *Cinémathèque Française* in Paris, where I aim to locate primary sources related to Costa-Gavras’ films.

(2) Formal and Aesthetic Analysis: Throughout this study, I will examine the organizing principles, or what David Bordwell (2007) refers to as the “poetics of cinema,” within the filmographies of Pontecorvo and Costa-Gavras, focusing on the narrative, visual, and auditive stylistic elements that defined their filmmaking style during the research period. The films’ formal systems—their narrative structures and key shooting and editing techniques—are crucial from the present research perspective, as they offer insight not only into the filmmakers’ personal style and aesthetic sensibilities but also into fundamental economic and technological aspects related to film production.

(3) Micro Historical Research: Drawing on data obtained from film archives, printed media sources, biographies, and oral histories gathered through video and audio-recorded interviews, this research project proposes an intensive historical investigation of individual films as “relatively smaller objects” (Magnusson and Szijarto, 2013). This approach is particularly suited to track the histories of the films’ construction of authorship, location, and casting decisions. By focusing on the micro-histories of the production of Pontecorvo’s and Costa-Gavras’s films, the present project aims to provide a different perspective on both the history of cinema and the history of the Cold War.

**Expected Results and Pitfalls**

This research project builds on the PI’s studies and research on transnational film and television. In 2024, an article by the PI as the first author of Costa-Gavras’ *State of Siege* (1972) and *Missing* (1982) was accepted for publication by the *Journal of Latin American Cultural Studies*. The present project aims to develop a new conceptual and methodological framework to understand the connection between European transnational films during the Cold War period by focusing on the works of two prominent political filmmakers, Gillo Pontecorvo and Costa-Gavras, who operated in the commercial film circuit during the 1960s and 1970s.

One criticism that could be made regarding the present project is that focusing on just two filmmakers might provide a very partial and incomplete picture of European transnational cinema during this period. After all, Pontecorvo and Costa-Gavras are generally identified as “political filmmakers,” while other significant European filmmakers who embarked on transnational films in Latin America, Africa, and Asia during that period—Marcel Camus and Louis Malle, for example—could be seen as less connected to the Cold War dynamics. A second criticism could arise regarding the research aim to make wider claims concerning a structural connection between the Cold War zeitgeist and European transnational films, based on the micro-histories of the films’ production and reception.

I could offer three complementary answers to the first criticism. First, Gillo Pontecorvo and Costa-Gavras were prominent figures in European transnational films of the 1960s and ’70s, and their work is paradigmatic of the main film production and reception patterns during that period, providing a means to develop and test the main hypotheses, which can be applied to the broader field. Second, although a thorough analysis of Marcel Camus’s and Louis Malle’s transnational film projects is beyond the scope of this research, there is wide evidence that their works during the 1960s and ’70s were also widely connected in multiple ways to the Cold War dynamics. Third, the conceptual dividing lines separating “political film works” from “artistic” and “commercial” films are always dynamic and subject to change. However, during the specific historical framework this research deals with, those dividing lines were particularly blurry.

The answer to the second criticism implies an acknowledgment that transitioning from the results of a micro-analysis to a higher level of macro-structural arguments is always risky. However, I am confident that the breadth and richness of the collected data for this project, as well as the cautious and meticulous amalgamation of the micro-histories into a macro level of analysis, will be extremely helpful in avoiding that pitfall.

This project is intended to materialize in a series of articles, the initial intention being that they appear in well-ranked international journals (although there is a possibility, depending on how the research proceeds, that they may be better positioned through publication as part of a single research volume). From this research, two sets of results will be generated: a body of materials relating specifically to the works of Pontecorvo and Costa-Gavras and another series of materials, including a set of general hypotheses and frameworks relevant to a broader body of European cinema during the Cold War period, and so encompassing other films and directors. In this respect, the research will not only have short-term outputs in the form of immediate publications but also a longer-term research agenda, which will give rise to a larger body of published work.

**Films Examined:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Director** | **Year** | **Name** | **Producers** | **Runtime** | **Country of Origin** |
| Gillo Pontecorvo | 1966 | The Battle of Algiers | Antonio Musu and Yacef Saadi | 121 min | Italy and Argelia |
| Costa-Gavras | 1969 | Z | Jacques Perrin, Phillipe d’Arguila and Ahmed Rachedi | 127 min | France and Argelia |
| Gillo Pontecorvo | 1969 | Burn!/Queimada | Alberto Grimaldi | 112/132 min | Italy and France |
| Costa-Gavras | 1972 | State of Siege | Jaques Perrin, Jacques Henri Barratier and Leon Sanz | 115/130 min | France, Italy, West Germany and Chile |
| Gillo Pontecorvo | 1979 | Ogro | Nicola Carraro and Franco Cristaldi | 115 min | Italy and Spain |
| Costa-Gavras | 1982 | Missing | Edward Lewis and Mildred Lewis | 122 min | United States and Mexico |
| Costa-Gavras | 1983 | Hanna K. | Robert Cortez and Edward Lewis | 111 min | Israel and France |
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