

Mari Laaniste

**Pushing the Limits:
Priit Pärn's Animated
Cartoons and
Soviet Cinema
Censorship[★]**

[★] The article is written under target-financed research topic no. SF0030054s08.

The following is a brief case study of one film-maker's career under Soviet rule. It highlights several key issues in analysing the late-Soviet era film heritage. The main problem this paper attempts to draw attention to is the question of giving due consideration to both the context and the content of this matter—whether we are willing to give it and if, in fact, we are capable of giving it.

The person in question, Priit Pärn (b. 1946), is probably Estonia's most well-known and respected film-maker (and not just animated film-maker). A large part of his reputation is based on his Soviet-era works. He himself is happy to talk about this period in his career, and quick to point out his troubles with the state-controlled Soviet film industry. In fact, the first ten years of Priit Pärn's career as an author of animated cartoons give the impression of being a David-and-Goliath type of dramatic narrative, meaning his early career has an impressive heroic storyline, presenting him as a one-man challenger of the all-powerful Goskino (USSR State Committee for Cinematography, in Russian Государственный комитет по кинематографии СССР or Госкино), and eventual winner in the epic battle that ensued. Other 'witnesses' tend to support this story as well and, to a degree, so does contemporary press coverage.¹ Thus, it is not unreasonable to assume there must be a good amount of truth in all this.

However, from a researcher's point of view, trusting the heroic eyewitness stories about a bygone era and taking them for the whole truth might be misleading. The overall Estonian view of our Soviet past, as well as of the cultural heritage of that era, is highly politicised—perhaps over-politicised, with a lot of attention given to 'heroic anti-system activity', which nearly everyone living and working in those days now appears to (and many literally claim to) have taken part in. We could be at risk of giving this issue too much significance in hindsight, relying on what could be selective, wishful memories. It is undeniable that the circumstances of the Soviet era affected the works of art created under them. The question is, is it possible to still understand now to what extent this was true?

Even with the Soviet system's all-powerful censorship machine practically acting as a co-author of all films, and Pärn's constant personal battles with the system, it would probably be an exaggeration to regard all of Pärn's Soviet era films as carrying some kind of deeper political meaning. There are arguable traces and reflections of the political circumstances in all of them, but in most cases, these can hardly be called the main themes (as getting away with this would have been unthinkable). In analysing them, there is an obvious risk of paying too much attention to the politics in the background, because approaching them from this angle could make the actual films look more interesting. In other words, we could be disregarding the actual content of the films themselves while getting carried away by the important-sounding and exciting historical context surrounding their making. Besides, the 'historical truth' of the context is slipping out of reach, as most reconstructions of it rely on personal, possibly retouched, versions of history and on records from that time, which everyone who lived through those times is quick to admit are skewed and unreliable.

It is clear that Pärn as a film-maker, just like his colleagues,² was subject to creative oppression under Soviet rule. Goskino, at the top of the hierarchy of the Soviet 'movie business', held complete control over it by controlling the finances: hardly anything, even the humblest animated shorts, could go into production without the script being officially pre-approved in Goskino's Department of Repertory Control. Goskino owned the completed films, and its officials decided whether they were good or not and distributed the films accordingly. The process of having to seek approval from Goskino's

1 One should keep in mind that the press in Soviet Estonia was subject to political censorship and thus the press coverage should not be seen as a highly reliable source of information. However, the interviews Pärn gave during the years in question, as well as the contemporary reviews of his works, make some references to the issues he now claims to have battled with.

2 Avo Paistik, another successful film-maker who worked at the Joonisfilm studio throughout the 1970s and 1980s, reports similar experiences in a lengthy interview titled 'Avo Paistik's battles with the government organs, censorship and Goskino' (see Kiik 2006).

bureaucrats, who were following a Kafkaesque list of prohibitions and restrictions,³ and could be patronising, hostile or paranoid, was humiliating and frustrating to most film-makers.

However, it is also clear that all the trouble and perceived persecution that Pärn remembers having experienced certainly never led to him being banished from film-making. Instead, even with all his rather diva-like behaviour (meaning he was an egocentric talent who refused to direct films based on anyone else's scripts, and was constantly and stubbornly looking to do things 'his way' rather than suit the wishes and expectations of authority—or anyone else besides himself for that matter), he nevertheless appears to have worked steadily and have had a wide network of supporters within the local film industry. Whatever problems he may have had with Goskino and the officials in Moscow, he steadily gained and maintained admiration and respect on his 'home turf' in Estonia, to the point where it can be argued that he achieved the status of being the country's greatest talent working in the field of animation after only about ten years of being in the business.⁴ This included official recognition: Priit Pärn was awarded the title of Meritorious Art Worker of Soviet Estonia in early 1986, which proves that he was clearly not regarded as a political or artistic dissident at the time. It could therefore well be that his troubles with the Soviet film industry bureaucracy were not all that extraordinary under the circumstances and look more dramatic in hindsight than they would have appeared at the actual time of the events.

To illustrate the problem at hand, I will now present a quick overview of the 'epic battle' of Pärn's Soviet era career, based on Pärn's own account, as well as those of his contemporaries. After that, I will try to point out the impact, or lack of visible impact, of these political circumstances on Pärn's individual films from the period, one by one.

Priit Pärn's career in animated cartoons began in the mid-1970s, when he, already famous as one of Estonia's wittiest and most creative young cartoonists, was approached by Rein Raamat, the head of the Joonisfilm drawn animation studio (founded in Tallinn in 1971 as a division of the local film studio Tallinnfilm),

who at the time was looking for fresh and interesting artists to work with. From 1974 to 1977, Pärn was a guest art director on three of the studio's films (while still officially working at the Tallinn Botanical Gardens as a researcher) and developed an interest in writing and directing on his own. Although the script ideas he initially came up with were not regarded as very good, he obviously had talent as well as persistence, and, crucially, a certain amount of naiveté—it is quite possible that having a better idea of the many restrictions and inherent frustrations of the field he was seeking to enter could have scared him off (Kiik 2007).⁵ Also, the Joonisfilm studio, having been in business for several years already, was looking for someone to present as their own home-grown new animation talent (Kiik 2007). Eventually, Pärn was granted a chance to direct his debut film, which, as expected of most of Joonisfilm's animated cartoons, was meant to be a fun story for children, although carrying a didactic message.

Is the Earth Round? (Kas maakera on ümmargune?, 1977) turned out to be quite noteworthy, but not necessarily in a good sense. First of all, the film, a playful story about one man's life-long journey around the world, to an extent inspired by *Yellow Submarine* (1968), was arguably not very good. Secondly, Pärn's flat and somewhat scruffy-looking graphic style, very different from the usual smooth and appealing finish of Soviet drawn animation, shocked and irritated 'important people in Moscow'—meaning the officials of Goskino. Thirdly, Goskino officials also were not happy with the film's vague, ambiguous and rather non-didactic storyline—according to the official policy, Soviet animation was regarded as a propaganda tool meant to teach lessons to children, but Pärn didn't seem to pay any attention to teaching children.

Because of all this, the film only received a 'third category' rating,⁶ meaning it was deemed a poor artistic effort only slightly above complete failure (which was a first of its kind for the Joonisfilm studio); it was not translated into Russian and not screened anywhere outside of Estonia. This was a shock and a disappointment to Pärn, as well as to the studio. As a result, in giving him the opportunity to make another

film, better care was taken to ensure that he met Goskino's expectations.⁷

Pärn's second film, *And Plays Tricks (...ja teeb trikke*, 1978), was more coherent artistically, as well as more clearly meant for young audiences. His graphic style was still the same, but this time he used it to draw 'funny animals' rather than people, so it seemed less shocking and, also, the officials in Moscow were already acquainted with his style, even though they didn't necessarily like it. And even if in hindsight the film could be interpreted as having some political undertones, it is, overall, a fairly straightforward children's story. Hence, the film was approved for distribution across the Soviet Union, proved to be popular with audiences and was even sent to an international animation festival in Varna, Bulgaria (it was necessary to screen Soviet cartoons for children at international festivals, because they were an important export item and a source of profit for Goskino). According to Pärn's account, the film was only meant to be screened outside of competition, but actually ended up winning an award at the festival, which did not please Goskino, because this meant Pärn had officially become an 'award-winning film-maker', thus more difficult to control than an annoying beginner (Pärn 2006).

Pärn blames the Varna award incident for the fact that his next, and up to this point clearly his best film, *Some Exercise in Preparation for Independent Life (Harjutusi iseseisvaks eluks*, 1980),⁸ was not screened outside of the Soviet Union. On the other hand, this could also have been caused by the fact that the film was, despite its obvious artistic merit, once again rather ambiguous in terms of having a didactic moral, not to mention being short on narrative. It was also more of a work of art than easily marketable children's entertainment. (It was becoming obvious by then that Pärn was never really interested in making films for children.⁹)

In any case, the bureaucratic process of getting this script approved for production and getting the film released had become increasingly slow and difficult. Pärn was gathering self-confidence as a film-maker, he felt he was not getting due recognition and he was clearly becoming fed up with the overall way he was being treated by Goskino.

It should be noted that what happened next was not really an act of one-man heroism, as it was in sync with other important events in Estonian culture at the time, in particular the 'Letter of 40 Intellectuals'. Nor can it really be regarded as a conscious act of political protest:

3 The basic principles of film censorship in use in the Soviet Union at the time dated back to the 1930s, and film scripts were also subject to censorship by Glavlit, the official censorship office of the Soviet Union, which provided lists of subjects and names that could not be mentioned. In addition, films could be censored as a result of pressure from certain interested parties, such as the Ministry of Defence or the Communist Union of Youth (Komsomol). Other guidelines the Repertory Control followed were the latest decisions of the Communist Party and the Soviet government on cinema (Golovskoy 1986: 29–34).

4 This process is evident in the press coverage of Pärn's career at the time: it can be traced in the perpetually admiring reviews of his films, as well as in the near-constant stream of news bits in the vein of 'Pärn wins yet another award'. One particular brief report stands out as revealing: on November 27, 1985, the House of Cinema in Moscow hosted a special event dedicated to Estonian animation, consisting of two parts, first a selection of works by 'young talents' and then films by Prit Pärn.

5 Silvia Kiik worked as an editor at the Joonisfilm studio.

6 The rating system used by Goskino at the time had five categories: the highest, first, second, third and fourth. Each completed film received a classification that determined whether the staff involved in producing the film and studio executives would receive bonuses (the 'highest category' meant the largest bonuses and was thus rarely used). Also, the category played an important part in deciding how many distribution copies there would be (the maximum number of copies was 2,000, but in reality even the most highly-praised films were rarely distributed with 1,000 or more. The average was around 200–300 copies, and some films were only approved for fewer than 20 copies.) (Golovskoy 1986: 47–48.)

7 Pärn, very keen to get started on another film, wrote several scripts in a short period of time but, to his frustration, the editors of the studio didn't think these were good enough and it took a while before it was agreed to send another one of Pärn's scripts to seek official approval for production (Pärn 2006). Some of the unused script ideas later took the shape of a wildly imaginative children's comic book called *Tagurpidi* (Tallinn: Kunst, 1980). It has been translated into several languages since Pärn became famous abroad.

8 The noted animation historian Giannalberto Bendazzi even considers this the best of Pärn's films (Bendazzi 1994: 377). It should be taken into consideration that Bendazzi's judgments are almost entirely based on formal categories and therefore it is no wonder that he prefers this one, Pärn's most musical film to date, to Pärn's other, more narrative works.

9 Pärn wasn't alone in this, as Avo Paistik has also stated he had no interest in making films for children (Kiik 2006 II: 100). In fact, the Joonisfilm studio's founder, Rein Raamat, had strived and succeeded to create a certain reputation of artistic merit for Joonisfilm from the very start and it could be claimed the studio made as few children's films as possible (Trossek 2007: 12, 39).

it is rather telling that in October 1980, Pärn reportedly refused to sign the Letter, apparently worrying that doing this might hinder his career.¹⁰ For all his rebellious and free-thinking attitude, he seems to have attempted to avoid any real trouble. (It is probably only fair to mention that, besides career concerns, Pärn was a family man with young children.) Also, Pärn's perceived confrontation-seeking steps in regard to Goskino had the support of the executives of the Joonisfilm studio, as well as the local film industry officials.¹¹

Pärn wrote the script for his next film, *The Triangle* (*Kolmnurk*, 1982), and presented it as an adaptation of a well-known Estonian fairy-tale, knowing that this would make it easy to get the project approved and to receive the necessary funding: the bureaucrats in Goskino loved folk tales (Pärn 2006).¹² In reality, he intended the film to be a very post-modern twist on a fairy-tale theme, clearly meant for adult audiences. The film, completed in 1982, turned out to be a masterpiece, but it caused a scandal with the officials in Moscow, as it became apparent that Pärn had made a joke out of one of Goskino's most important tasks, the whole process of script control. Blatant deviation from the pre-approved script led to Goskino demanding that nearly half of the film's length be cut, but Pärn refused to cut anything. The film remained unapproved and un-screened, which caused financial problems for the studio. After several months of negotiations, the film was finally approved, with just one minor cut. However, it only received a very limited run on Soviet screens¹³ and, once again, it was never shown anywhere outside of the Soviet Union, even though the few critics who reviewed it had nothing but praise for it.¹⁴

After *The Triangle*, it was obvious that Goskino was not going to make the same mistake again, and all of Pärn's projects were placed under increased scrutiny. Pärn's reaction was to seek open confrontation. He wrote a script for his most ambitious film, called *Luncheon on the Grass* (*Eine murul*, 1987) after the famous painting by Édouard Manet, knowing it would not be approved for production. Of course, this was exactly how it turned out. The Goskino official who read the script even told

the representative of the studio that a film like this would never be made in the Soviet Union (Pärn 2006).

Pärn didn't care: he was willing to up the ante and take his rebellion to the point of considering quitting film-making altogether and focusing on his very successful side career as a freelance cartoonist, book illustrator and printmaker. The Joonisfilm studio however was not keen on losing one of their most interesting film-makers and negotiated a compromise project, an animated collection of visual gags from Pärn's cartoons. The film was called *Time Out* (*Aeg maha*, 1984) and it turned out to be a huge success with both children and adults. But even after that, the officials in Moscow would still not green-light the script for *Luncheon on the Grass*.¹⁵

In the middle of what looked like a hopeless standoff, the circumstances suddenly changed, as the launch of perestroika in 1985 gradually brought changes to institutions such as Goskino, affecting the line-up of officials in charge, as well as their overall attitudes. It also affected the Soviet Union's relations with the rest of the world. *Time Out*, with its director in tow, was suddenly sent to several international film festivals, where the funny little film gathered an impressive number of awards. Encouraged by these and the change in atmosphere, the studio eventually made a third attempt to get the script for *Luncheon on the Grass* approved in 1986. This attempt was, incredibly, a success: as the empire was trying to reinvent itself, the sarcastic and highly critical film script had suddenly become exactly what the new and improved Goskino was looking for.

Even though the people at the studio found Goskino's new-found enthusiasm a bit hard to believe, the funding the studio received was real enough. Thus, the film went into production and was completed by late 1987. Before the premiere, Pärn and his co-workers were pessimistic and still anticipated a scandal. Instead the film turned out to be ideal for Goskino's current needs, and it was immediately sent to several film festivals abroad (Pärn 2006).¹⁶ The timing could not have been more perfect: the film quickly built up a reputation for being an emblematic perestroika masterpiece

and toured the world's film festivals for nearly two years, collecting a remarkable number of awards and turning its exotic East European director into an internationally acclaimed animation talent. And, in the end, to complete Pärn's triumph, *Luncheon* even managed to set him free from Goskino for good—the network of new connections in the field that he built up in the process of the film's run on the international festival circuit allowed him to start an independent career and continue working (as well as saving the Joonisfilm studio from going bankrupt) when the USSR, and with it the Goskino film funding system, collapsed.

And now, with that heroic story of Pärn's struggles under the Soviet rule in mind, I will take a look at the evidence to determine how much of all the above-described dramatics and political pressure is reflected in each of his films from the era in question.

IS THE EARTH ROUND?
(*KAS MAAKERA ON ÜMMARGUNE?*)
1977

Besides the film's ambiguous moral, and the overall visual style, being different from the norms of the 'Soviet animation school' (even to the point of making a direct reference to *Yellow Submarine*), it is hard to point to anything that could be interpreted as a statement or hint of an 'anti-Soviet' attitude, unless one counts the film's penchant for random irrational adventures in far-away lands. It is also fairly likely the censorship officials were not too pleased to see a topless mermaid teasing the protagonist in what is supposed to be a didactic children's film. At the same time, it is evident that some of the content could even be described as somewhat conformist (the portrayed unpleasantness and inhumanity of a big Western city). The establishment obviously had mostly other than ideological or political reasons to dislike this film.

AND PLAYS TRICKS
(*...JA TEEB TRIKKE*) 1978

As already stated above, this is a fairly straightforward children's film, taking place in a world

filled with funny animals. Pärn himself has said that his main interest in making this film was to explore animation's possibilities in morphing objects and images (Pärn 2006). With a little bit

10 One of the co-authors of the letter, Andres Tarand, worked at the Tallinn Botanical Gardens where Pärn had kept his 'day job' in the early 1970s. Since Tarand was well aware of Pärn's views as well as his renown as a cartoonist, Pärn was among the very first to be asked to sign the protest letter. To Tarand's surprise, Pärn wanted some time to think and later turned the offer down, citing concern over the impact this signature would have on his film career and travel options (Tarand 2005: 13, 23, 25). Pärn's concern might come across as somewhat selfish, but it wasn't unfounded, as the people who signed the letter were later questioned by the KGB, four of them were sacked from their jobs and most suffered some damage to their further careers under Soviet rule. Signing also likely had an impact on their chances of being allowed to travel outside of the Soviet Union.

11 Jaan Ruus, an editor in Joonisfilm, has reported that for proposed film scripts to even reach Goskino in Moscow, they needed to get the approval of the studio editors and executives as well as the local branch of Goskino, the Committee for Cinematography of Soviet Estonia, and from *And Plays Tricks* onwards, Pärn had no problems with getting approval (Ruus 2007).

12 Of course, there was a reason why Goskino loved folk tales: they usually meant the end product would be a children's film.

13 Goskino only ordered 20 copies instead of the usual 200 or 300 (Pärn 2006).

14 The film received an award at the Film Festival of Soviet Estonia and was described by a local critic, reviewing all the animated films made in Estonia in 1982, as 'without a doubt, the year's most gifted work' (Pärn himself was described as 'a phenomenon' in the same review) (Pii 1983). Besides the local press, the film also impressed Soviet Union's most prominent animation critic, Sergei Assenin. His book on Estonian animation, containing a favourable description of *The Triangle*, was only published in 1986, but as the process of getting it published took a few years, this should be regarded as contemporary, rather than retrospective feedback (Assenin 1986: 97).

15 As the opinions of Goskino bureaucrats were known to differ, the studio actually tried to get the same script approved under a different title in either 1984 or 1985, but the film was recognised and turned down (Pärn 2006).

16 The exact number of the film's festival appearances is unknown, but *Luncheon on the Grass* received the following awards, in chronological order: Grand Prix from the XVIII Tampere Short Film Festival, Finland, 1988; Grand Prix, best film in (length) category C and the critics' prize from the VIII Animated Film Festival in Zagreb, Croatia, 1988; third audience prize from the Short Film Festival in Bonn, Germany, 1988; first prize in category C from the First Animated Film Festival in Shanghai, China, 1988; Grand Prix from the Cinanima Festival in Espinho, Portugal, 1988; first prize from the XXI USSR Film Festival, Baku, Azerbaijan, 1988; best animated film award from Melbourne Film Festival, Australia, 1988; third prize from the VIII Odense Film Festival, Denmark, 1989; and the Nika award (USSR's / Russia's 'Oscar') for the best animated film, 1989. In Estonia, the film won the audience award at Tallinn's Polytechnic Institute's Film Club's film festival.

of generalisation, the protagonist, a small green teddy bear who is a gifted illusionist, could be interpreted as an artist, and the other animals that make up his rather unwelcoming audience could be seen as the working classes of society, who see the artist as a troublemaker. The cherry red elephant, as the leader that all the other animals cower before, could arguably be regarded as a jab at Soviet rule—but one would have to specifically look for possible hidden meanings to establish this interpretation. There are reports that Goskino officials could sometimes be incredibly paranoid in such matters: back in 1975, the sight of a mechanic using a wrench that had been randomly coloured red in Avo Paistik's film *Trifle (Pisiasi)* had caused a scandal at the film's approval screening and landed the studio, as well as Paistik, in trouble, and in 1978, an out-of-control red vacuum cleaner in Paistik's film *Vacuum Cleaner (Tolmuimeja)* was met with a similar reaction (Kiiik 2006 II: 104–105; Kiiik 2006 III: 92). However, there isn't any surviving trace of similar reactions to Pärn's cherry red elephant.

*SOME EXERCISE IN PREPARATION
FOR INDEPENDENT LIFE
(HARJUTUSI ISESEISVAKS ELUKS)*
1980

In essence, this is a film about rhythm, repetition and discord, and showcases Pärn at his most musical (even though the wonderful score by Olav Ehala, Pärn's preferred composer, was only written after the animation was completed). The film is short on narrative; however, once again, there are several small elements that could be interpreted as 'rebellious ideas'—up to claiming that the film has an anti-bureaucracy message and is in fact all about re-discovering individual freedom. It is possible some of the more paranoid bureaucrats at Goskino sensed that as well when they decided not to screen the film outside of the Soviet Union. Or, then again, they might have just thought the film was too avant-garde to be successfully marketed as a cartoon for children. Nobody can really tell any more.

*THE TRIANGLE
(KOLMNURK)* 1982

Goskino's objection to this film could well have been that it was not the children's fairy-tale they had ordered and were paying for, but clearly a film for adults—and a rather frisky one at that, with the female lead appearing somewhat more flirtatious and gullible than was deemed appropriate for a proper Soviet woman. Even so, the film is essentially about a private matter (a marriage crisis) and it does not really convey any kind of a general political message. It should be noted, however, that much of the film's 'clever post-modern approach' in reworking a fairy-tale in this manner stems from the need to keep up appearances in the eyes of the Soviet cinema censorship, while striving to make a film about modern life for adults. It is a case of accidental, rather than deliberate post-modern film-making.

*TIME OUT
(AEG MAHA)* 1984

The film bears an ironic title (Pärn was literally taking 'time out' from his efforts to make *Luncheon on the Grass*), but it is nevertheless little more than an unpretentious collection of visual puns and gags Pärn had already used in his cartoons and illustrations. Goskino officials had some minor objections to this film. For instance, two of the characters who were originally stereotypically dressed Russian construction workers had to be redrawn as circus clowns, thus eliminating a hint of satire directed at the Soviet work ethic. But, overall, this film was really neither intended nor perceived as anything more than a bit of harmless fun.

*LUNCHEON ON THE GRASS
(EINE MURUL)* 1987

This is a masterpiece of political film-making in cartoon form, and unlike any of the previously mentioned films, one of the very few statement films in Pärn's entire career. The story is a metaphorical analysis of an artist's life in a totalitarian (Soviet) society, with the four lead characters each representing a different depressing aspect of that society. The most scathing part

of the film is the fourth section, which depicts a character's many humiliations during a visit to a big bureaucratic institution—this is directly based on Pärn's experiences with Goskino and, as absurd as it may seem, the atmosphere depicted is reported to be very accurate.¹⁷ It is also obvious that discussing this film without taking into account its political context could never do it justice. However, it should be noted that *Luncheon*, with its overtly political content, is in fact a major exception in Pärn's body of work: he seems to have exhausted what he wanted to say on the matter with this film and has avoided overtly political themes, as well as clear statements, in his work ever since, although he has been free to make films about anything he pleases.

In conclusion, in Pärn's case, it would seem that the Soviet system eventually managed to put enough pressure on a thoroughly idiosyncratic film-maker to push him to make a political protest film. However, this does not make Pärn a martyr or a heroic political dissident. Even though the memories from this era tend to focus on the political circumstances, his only overtly political film, *Luncheon on the Grass*, is clearly an exception in his body of work, and compared to his contemporaries, he did not suffer from exceptional amounts of creative or personal persecution. Also, it must be noted that, without the oppressive Soviet system, *Luncheon* would not exist. Despite all the unpleasantness involved, in hindsight it is rather obvious that facing pressure propelled Pärn to new creative heights, driving him to make what were possibly the finest films of his career (judging by his later works, it would appear that sometimes a bit of oppression can be more inspiring than complete creative freedom).

17 So says Jaan Ruus, who was an editor at Joonisfilm and often accompanied film directors to Goskino's head offices in Moscow on similar approval-seeking missions (Ruus 2007).

FILMS

- And Plays Tricks (...ja teeb trikke)*, dir. Priit Pärn. Estonia, 1978
- Is the Earth Round? (Kas maakera on ümmargune?)*, dir. Priit Pärn. Estonia, 1977
- Luncheon on the Grass (Eine murul)*, dir. Priit Pärn. Estonia, 1987
- Some Exercise in Preparation for Independent Life (Harjutusi iseseisvaks eluks)*, dir. Priit Pärn. Estonia, 1980
- Time Out (Aeg maha)*, dir. Priit Pärn. Estonia, 1984
- The Triangle (Kolmnurk)*, dir. Priit Pärn. Estonia, 1982
- Trifle (Pisiasi)*, dir. Avo Paistik. Estonia, 1975
- Vacuum Cleaner (Tolmuimeja)*, dir. Avo Paistik. Estonia, 1978
- Yellow Submarine*, dir. George Dunning. UK, USA, 1968

REFERENCES

- Assenin, Sergei 1986. *Etüüde eesti multifilmidest ja nende loojatest / Estonian Animated Films and Their Creators*. Tallinn: Perioodika
- Bendazzi, Giannalberto 1994. *Cartoons: One Hundred Years of Cinema Animation*. London: John Libbey
- Golovskoy, Val S. 1986. *Behind the Soviet Screen: The Motion-Picture Industry in the USSR, 1972–1982*. Trans. Steven Hill. Ann Arbor: Ardis
- Kiik, Silvia 2006. Avo Paistiku võitlused võimude, tsensuuri ja Goskinoaga I–III. — *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, no. 4, pp. 75–83; no. 5, pp. 97–107; no. 6, pp. 90–97
- Kiik, Silvia 2007. Author's interview, June 19
- Pii, P. 1983. Kaheksa multifilmi. Tallinnfilmi multifilmiaasta 1982. — *Sirp ja Vasar*, May 13
- Pärn, Priit 2006. Author's interview, August 18
- Ruus, Jaan 2007. Author's interview, June 15
- Tarand, Andres 2005. *Kiri ei põle ära. Päevaraamat 1980–...* Tallinn: Eesti Päevaleht
- Trossek, Andreas 2007. *Tsitaat väljaspool konteksti: Eesti NSV joonisanimatsioon 1970. ja 1980. aastatel kui "kunst" ja kui filmikunst*. (Unpublished MA thesis.) Tallinn: Eesti Kunstiakadeemia