

## Reality, Fiction and History in George Orwell's novel *1984* and Kasëm Trebeshina's *Odin Mondvalse*

Marsela Turku

*Aleksander Moisiu University, Albania*

*Email: marselaturku@yahoo.com*

**Abstract** *In the recent years one of the major contributions to the distinction between fiction and real world has been provided by the theory and semantics of possible worlds, whose bases is the idea that reality is a universe composed of a plurality of distinct worlds. A writer of fiction usually "draws" his material from the reality, from the models and the entities provided by the actual world, realistic fiction, in particular, depends on "mimetic communication to create possible worlds. This paper deals with two novels that treat the same topic ("the transformation of the society and of the human being under the communist dictatorship") but with an enormous difference, Orwell based his book almost entirely on his fictitious reality and imagination whereas Trebeshina has experienced the regime and its reality. Many scholars and critics have tried to find similarities between Orwell's and Trebeshina's vision of reality and even in their life experiences. This paper deals with the construction of fiction, reality, the role of history and the similarities and differences presented on Trebeshina's *Odin Mondvalse* and Orwell's *1984*.*

**Keywords:** *Fiction, reality, dictatorship, utopia, vision, perception.*

### 1. Introduction

*"To the future or to the past, to a time when thought is free..."*

(Orwell 1983: 24)

After World War II Albanian literature is characterized by a forced detachment from the traditional literature and the restrictions imposed by the communist regime. The dissociation from the tradition and the imposition of the socio-realism literary method, not only harmed it immensely but they also influenced upon the thematic content, artistic structure, philosophical concepts, characters' development and so forth. A number of writers tried to escape the standardization of the literary process by attempting to bring forth new themes, ideas and new trends in Albanian literature. One of them is Kasëm Trebeshina who dared to contradict the communist regime and its pseudo-literary method. Written in 1955-1956 Trebeshina's novel *Odin Mondvalse* is a good example to analyze but at the same time to understand what was going on in one of the strongest communist regimes ever, where the only official and acceptable genre of writing was that of the socio-realism.

Orwell's nightmarish vision of totalitarianism in *1984*, written in 1949, remains a significant political text and even the title has become a political embodiment and an important warning about the future. As he constantly emphasized when writing about *1984*, it was not to be taken as a prophecy but as a picture of what could happen if not actively prevented. Orwell's focus on abuse of power, the denial of individuality, the transformation of the past and future and the language to control the thoughts are not easily forgotten by the reader. Many critics have tried to find similarities between Orwell's and Trebeshina's vision. Some of them have even tried to find the 'Orwellian vision' in Trebeshina's *Odin Mondvalse*. Although there are some similarities we should never forget the fact that Trebeshina had "the fortune" (or misfortune) to live under this dictatorship whereas Orwell had only a few glimpses of the regime and his "devotion" to the communist cause was very brief. Orwell had been a devoted communist and took part in the Spanish Civil War where he had seen evidence of the falsification and the invention

of false news. He later described it in an essay: "I saw history being written not in terms of what happened but of what ought to have happened, according to the party; . . . If he (a leader) says that two and two are five –well two and two are five." Another destructive element he saw during the Spanish War was the underground war directed by Moscow to eliminate the "heretics" inside the communist circles. Both these elements are present in his novel. Trebeshina's commitment to the communist cause is brief, too. He enrolled in the communist party and was engaged in the antifascist war in Albania. During this period he discovered the dangerous dimension that this war was taking and what he later saw in Moscow just confirmed his horrifying vision of what communism really meant and what was going to happen in Albania in the near future. Unfortunately Albania could not escape this destiny and the people were caught up in the totalitarian life full of ideology and demagoguery, repressed and 'deformed' by the collective machinery.

## 2. Trebeshina's *Odin Mondvalsen*- the Destruction of a Utopia

Kasëm Trebeshina joined the communist resistant movement in 1942. After the war he studied at the Ostrovsky Theatre Institute and during his stay in The Soviet Union he saw the real face of communism. In an extremely rare act of open dissent in Albanian intellectual life, Trebeshina sent a 'pro memoria' to Enver Hoxha on 5 October 1953, warning him that his cultural policies were leading the nation down the road to disaster. After this action, Kasëm Trebeshina, the unpublished author of eighteen volumes of verse, forty-two plays, twenty-two novels and short stories, etc., vanished from the literary scene. After seventeen years in prison, with interruptions, a 'comparatively light sentence' as he later noted, and twenty years of silence, Trebeshina resurfaced with a handful of other writers, artists and intellectuals to see that his prediction had come true.

Buçpapaj defines Trebeshina's art as 'a revolutionary art which is rebelled against the universal degeneration, corruption; against a reality where everything is reversed and it functions on the logic of absurdity. This art wants to protect the human world and the art which the communist reality was trying to standardize.' He defined his philosophy of writing as 'a philosophy in search for the lost man, a man who has lost his original features and is sheltered somewhere to escape the brutality of the regime.' One of the novels which best shows the above aspect is *Odin Mondvalsen*. It was written in 1955-1956, three years after the famous pro memoria that Trebeshina sent to Enver Hoxha. The author surrounded by a dangerous political background presents an original hero in the Albanian literature, a psychotic or mentally ill character. The story takes place in a prison hospital where the main character of the novel, Odin Mondvalsen is 'imprisoned' in a Psychiatric prison hospital for years. It is obvious that he has lost contact with reality, and it seems strange to us but his only crime is related with his conviction that he is from Denmark: 'Yes, sir. I am Danish because my grandfather has been Italian and he married a French woman. . .'; (The First Chapter. Italics are mine) whereas Odin's mother married a Dane. Since the very beginning we understand from his deduction that Odin Mondvalsen is not his real name (but is the name he has put to himself) and his reasoning does not make any sense.

In the following chapters the main character becomes even more complex, the images are reversed, but they convey realistic and powerful details of the regime. We are surprised and at the same time shocked by the reality revealed and the truths connected with the communist regime that he discovers:

As soon as I arrived on Mars I was detected, arrested, interrogated, insulted, beaten and then came people with the white blouses. They were primarily focused on injections and when they gave up from them, then came others, but without blouses and everything began from the start. (The First Chapter, the Second and the Third)

"Well, I have a very good salary and I take my groceries in 'block' " (The Chapter that is before the other chapters. Italics are mine)

The confused state of mind of the character is perfectly exploited by the author to show the main problems of the communist era like the collective property, the dictator's image, the men's disfigure under the regime, the pressure on the intellectual, and the vices that have sprung on the New Man created under the communist dictatorship:

"On 37 August I was arrested because I landed here, on Mars. I was surrounded by many people in uniforms and they arrested me on the spot. When the authorities arrived I was confined in a room

<sup>1</sup> In Albanian it is 'bllok' which refers to a restricted area in the capital city where were situated the most vital institutions of the country and the leaders of that time.

and the interrogation began..... Wow, how wonderful!....

Only a psychotic is not afraid of what he is saying, he is not even conscious if what he is saying is logical or illogical, he speaks out before the police, lawyers, the attorneys, things that other people are afraid even of thinking.

*“How strange, my friend standing over there in his bed insisted stubbornly upon his silence. Yes. Yes....He was standing there and he didn't want to talk even a word.*

*Why did he refuse to talk to me [...] I needed to hear the opinion of a friend for what I had told him....”*

*(My friend said)“....in the future you shouldn't talk so much....Because on the long nets of words and discussions may even penetrate a very short word, but with such colossal damages that can not be even described. That's why, better not talk at all”*

*“Well, you are right. He is a good man, a very good man, but his conversations ‘smell’ of prison. Do you know what I mean?...Ten years, fifteen years of prison. Perhaps, even more.”*

*(My friend continued) “Although, we have a lot of problems here, we are not so bad [...]. The psychiatric hospital is much better than the concentration camp...better than drying the marshes where people are dying of hunger and are ready to eat the other's defecation”.*

(The Chapter that comes after the twelfth. The italics are mine)

His reasoning, often philosophical and true, becomes the only way to see communism as it really was.

In the past the world had been bigger not only because we were less in number, but because we were more talkative. Yes! ....We had more words on what our mums had taught us, whereas now the words are reduced and swollen with an only reason, to fill the endless spaces so that there will be only the swollen words of those people who are loamed even beyond the term. [. . .] The world is smaller and it is filled up with the greatness of those people who seek to bury it and from the will of glory of those people who consider the grimaces of the monkeys as the start of civilization!...(The Chapter that comes after the one which was never written)

Trebeshina is often very ironic even with the communist institutions, he wants to present their real bureaucracy and malfunction:

*-When did you start your journey from Zaboliland?*

*-From where? - I asked surprised.*

*-Don't look at me as if you don't know what I am talking about!-the interrogator said in a ponderous voice. I am asking you again: when did you start your journey from Zaboliland?*

*I shrugged.*

*-The motive of your journey?*

*-To come here, in Mars.*

*-Where?!*

*-In Mars.*

*-To come here where I am and I wish I weren't...*

*-Write down!-he ordered his secretary. -I came in the New World as a spy agent for spying reasons.”* (The Forth Chapter which is focused on my landing on the New World, italics are mine)

As it is typical of the classic narration on the first chapter we are presented with the (anti)hero, Odin Mondvalsen, but from the subtitle of this chapter we learn that this is also the second, the third and the fourth. The novel presents us with a new code of reading, which somehow is completely different from the traditional chronological arrangement of the novel. Everything is seen through the eyes of the main character and it seems that absurd prevails on logic, but Trebeshina preserves certain elements to orient the reader through the confused mind of the hero. Another powerful element of the novel is the time, which is not chronological but it is easily reversible, it has the power to create but at the same time to destroy every thing that sprung from her. Trebeshina converts the axes of the time with a double purpose. He alters antiquity with the contemporary to demonstrate that the centralized power of an Egyptian Pharaoh or a communist dictator will be used for the same ends, to preserve their Power to rule a country and subdue the population. This absolute power creates an insuperable barrier by the community; it creates a dangerous hurdle where the Supreme Power of the State can not be enfeebled. The mixture of the present time with the past has also a historical purpose. It tries to bring forth historical truths like: the foundation of communist party in Albania, the economic reality, how the first secretary of the party was chosen etc.:

*“Well, the person standing outside Istanbul sent in Albania Miladin Popovic... Really! ...They sent*

<sup>2</sup> The translation of all the extracts, taken from *Odin Montvalsen*, from Albanian to English is done by me.

Miladin Popovicin and Dushan Mugosh to found the Communist Party. They found it. But another issue came out, that of appointing the first and second Secretary.”(The forth and the fifth chapter)

“Somewhere, on the most ancient Pharaoh’s Kingdom, had decided to found the agriculture cooperatives!..” (The third chapter)

In the verge of illogic is not only the time but also history, literature, politic, science and art which are distorted from their primary mission and misused by the regime to de-humanized the human being.

### 3. Orwell’s ‘Utopia’ in 1984

Orwell explains in a 1946 essay that a writer’s “subject matter will be determined by the age he lives in . . . but before he ever begins to write he will have acquired an emotional attitude from which he will never completely escape” (1981: 311). As such, the materials for this novel are drawn from the Spanish Civil War, Second World War, and the early years of the Cold War, the devastation of England, the bombing attacks of London and reports of cruelty, torture and purges of innocent civilians in Russia. The Ministry of Truth building in the novel was modeled on the London University building used during the World War II by the Ministry of Information, and the BBC’s main building seems to have provided the inspiration for the canteen smelling of cabbage and the singing prole women, the BBC office cleaners, while his wife’s work in the Ministry of Food, creating publicity to encourage the public to eat the “right” types of food, seems to have suggested the use of short crisp slogans of the 1984. He tried to incorporate all these elements to provide a realistic atmosphere rather than imaginary speculation about the future (Meyers 2000; 281). Another important element in his writing style has been his health problems. While he was writing 1984 he was suffering from tuberculosis, he was aware that death was approaching him and this fact “intensified his emotions and heightened his powers of expression” (Meyers 2000: 278), furthermore it is even regarded as the work of a dying man, written in disillusion with the present and despair for the future.

Orwell argues that “I write . . . because there is some lie that I want to expose, some fact I want to draw attention, and my initial concern is to get a hearing” (1981: 314). Orwell’s writing since 1936 displays his political orientation and mainly his socialist ideology and his desire to “push the world in a certain direction, to alter other people’s idea of the kind of society that they should strive after” (1981: 312-313). He also explains that “Every line of serious work that I have written since 1936 has been written directly or indirectly, against totalitarianism and for democratic socialism, as I understand it” (1981: 314).

1984 is set in Oceania, one of the three fictionalized superpowers which are immediately recognizable (Oceania, Eurasia and Eastasia) and at the same time it implies that these superpowers maintain similar totalitarian political structures and social stratification of the society (Craig 1983: 28). Orwell was convinced that Stalin, Churchill and Roosevelt consciously plotted to divide the world among themselves, this idea was supported by several events after the WWII and especially the Yalta conference (Deutscher 1971: 38).

By setting the novel nearly forty years ahead of the time he was writing it, Orwell was giving a warning about the future. Howe (1971: 44) contends that the text is “at once a model and a vision- a model of the totalitarian state in its “pure” or “essential” form and a vision of what this state can do to human life”.

The novel begins with the clock striking thirteen, which is a sinister sign, but at the same time it sets a negative atmosphere from the start. Even the following paragraphs display a harsh, uncomfortable and anxious atmosphere which is reinforced by the fact that they are constantly being watched via the telescreen and we have the appearance of the overriding force of Big Brother’s image:

The telescreen received and transmitted simultaneously. Any sound that Winston made, above the level of a very low whisper, would be picked up by it; moreover, so long as he remained within the field of vision which the metal plaque commanded, he could be seen as well as heard. There was of course no way of knowing whether you were being watched at any given moment. (Orwell 1983: 2)

Winston explains that apart from sounds, they have to be careful even with the facial expressions:

It was terribly dangerous to let your thoughts wander when you were in public place or within range of a telescreen. The smallest thing could give you away. A nervous tic, an unconscious look of anxiety, a habit of muttering to yourself - anything that carried with it the suggestion of abnormality, of having to hide. In any case, to wear an improper expression on your face . . . . was itself a punishable offence. There was even a word for it in Newspeak: facecrime, it was called. (Orwell 1983: 55)

It is easily perceived that the novel is based on the presentation of a dystopian world, where the citizens live in an atmosphere of mistrust and extreme surveillance, where the state is the only dominant power

and individuality and personality have become criminalized:

In principle a Party member had no spare time, and was never alone except in bed. It was assumed that when he was not working, eating and sleeping he would be taking part in some kind of communal recreations, anything that suggested a taste for solitude, even to go for a walk by yourself, was always slightly dangerous. There was a word for it in Newspeak: ownlife, it was called, meaning individualism and eccentricity. (Orwell 1983: 72)

The main protagonist of the novel, Winston Smith, works in the Ministry of Truth and his job is to *rewrite history*. He is established from the very beginning as an un-heroic figure, he is thin and frail, on the way to middle age, has a leg ulcer and later on we discover that he has false teeth and is subject to coughing fits. Ironically, he has been named after the British Prime Minister during the World War II, Winston Churchill, but in fact he stands for Everyman. Winston is read as an idealistic and is obsessed *‘in the typical humanist way, with unanswerable questions, and particularly the question of “Why”*’ (Orwell 1983: 113, italics are mine). It seems that its main aim throughout the novel is to remain human, not to be de-humanized under the tyranny of the state. This mission somehow fails when he betrays his belief and capitulates to “Big Brother”. Abrahams (1983: 5) suggests that Winston ‘is a type of colorless, minor civil servant who does what he is told to do- always’. Whereas Watt (1983:112) contends that he “is neither a conscious nor a heroic protagonist of moral and intellectual convictions” and according to them he is presented as a failed hero and coward (Meyers 2000: 287). I believe that these descriptions are a bit superficial and simplistic and they miss an important element “Winston’s resistance” and the fact that all facet of humanity are controlled and monitored. Winston describes his own life: *‘You had to live- did live, from habit that become instinct- in the assumption that every sound you made was overheard, and except in darkness, every moment scrutinized.’* (Orwell 1983: 2)

Apart from Winston, the novel revolves around Julia and O’Brien. O’Brien, member of the Inner Party, is a mysterious and complex figure. On his first appearance Orwell, through Winston, points up two contrasting features in his character: a coarse brutality and the delicacy of the gesture which Orwell compares to that of the eighteenth-century nobleman. Winston believes that he is a member of a secret revolutionary group known as Brotherhood, an underground organization that exists to overthrow the Party. In fact, O’Brien not only is loyal to the party, but is also convinced that the party will always win and that men are incapable of ruling themselves and are unworthy of free choice (Meyers 2000: 286). Julia, employed in the Fiction Department in the Ministry of Truth, is more realistic and pragmatic than Winston and these ontological differences are related with the ways that they engage in the acts of resistance. Abrahams (1983: 5) describes Julia as a secret rebel against the regime, expressing her rebellion through the illegal enjoyment of sex.” At first, Winston believes that Julia is either an agent of the Thought Police or an amateur spy, until she declares her love and they begin a secret love affair, an act which itself becomes an instance of resistance. His contact with Julia leads him to put into words critical ideas of the society, *“the mute protest in your own bones.”* as he describes it, even if she hardly listens to him when he explains these ideas to her and does not understand their significance.

“The imaginary world of 1984 of a totalitarian society is modeled after the (real) fascist state of Mussolini’s Italy, the nationalist-socialist state of Hitler’s Germany or the communist state of Stalin’s Soviet Union. The form of social control, accordingly is manifested more broadly in the control of thought and the discretion of memory, history and the debasement of language, and thus speaks to totalitarian systems in general.” (Tyner 2004: 135) As Winston clearly explains in his diary it is not important if you write or think disloyal ideas to the Party because according to the Thoughtpolice, they were both condemned:

Whether he wrote Down With Big Brother, or whether he refrained from writing it, it made no difference... The thought police would get him just the same. He had committed- would still have committed, even if he had never set pen to paper –the essential crime that contained all others in itself. Thoughtcrime, they called it. (Orwell 1983: 16-17)

In Orwell’s totalitarian society people could disappear and be erased from the history and the memory of the people as if they never existed:

It was always at night. . . The sudden jerk out of sleep, the rough hand shaking your shoulders, the lights glaring in your eyes . . . In the vast majority of cases there was no trial, no report of the arrest. People simply disappeared, always during the night. Your name was removed from the registers, every record of every thing you had ever done was wiped out, your one-time existence was denied and then forgotten. You were abolished, annihilated: vaporized was the usual word. (Orwell 1983: 17)

And it is Winston’s duty, as an employee in the Records Department of the Ministry of Truth, to change

and to (re)write history according to the demands of the Party or Big Brother, but for him the most terrifying element is the control of the past and the process of re-writing the books: “The past not only changed, but changed continuously. What most afflicted [Winston] with the sense of nightmare was that he had never clearly understood *why* the huge posture was undertaken. The immediate advantages of falsifying the past were obvious, but the ultimate motive was mysterious. He took up his pen again and wrote: *I understand HOW: I do not understand WHY.* (Orwell 1983: 70; italics in original).

After the arrest O’Brien interviews and tortures Winston in the Minilove and asks Winston if he remembers writing the question (Orwell 1983: 70) “Why the huge posture was undertaken?” and asked him to explain (Orwell 1983: 233): “Now tell me why we cling to power. What is our motive? Why we should want power?” Winston replied that the Party believes that human beings are not able to rule themselves and they act to protect the majority. But for O’Brien the reason is another (Orwell 1983: 234-235) “The Party seeks power entirely for its own sake. We are not interested in the good of others; we are interested solely in power. Not wealth or luxury or long life or happiness; only power, pure power... Power is not a means; it is an end.” O’Brien’s purpose in his interviews in Miniluv is to turn Winston’s love for himself into love for Big Brother, implying that mere obedience is not enough, but Winston must achieve a moment of genuine love for Big Brother. In order to tell this love Winston has to reject, and to admit to himself that he has rejected all feelings of love and loyalty to anyone else. Under the sufferings, degradation, torture and humiliation he tried to resist, but when threatened with what is for him the worst thing in the world, he betrays Julia, something is killed in his own heart, he is not the same man anymore: “*burnt out, cauterized out.*” Now he is no longer a threat to the state or to anyone else.

### 3. Reality Versus Utopia, Concluding Remarks

Sharp (2000: 332) cautions that “Some texts may present revolutionary worldviews, but unless they are widely read, their influence on popular imaginations will be slight”. Orwell’s *1984* presents a radically and revolutionary world-view, one that clearly is widely read; more than ten millions of copy have been purchased and his neologisms permeate our conversations like “Big Brother, Thought Police etc” (Tyner 2004: 145). Further more, critics asserts that Orwell achieved something that none of the theoreticians did: he made his imagined world real for us, whereas very much of the scholarly literature made the real seem remote (Tucker 1983: 93-94). What can we say about Kasëm Trebeshina’s *Odin Mondvalsen*? Does it present a revolutionary world-view? Unfortunately, Trebeshina did not have the chance to publish his novel when he wrote it, in 1955-56, and unmask communism. It was published only in 1992, after thirty-six years. Perhaps, this is one of the reasons why it does not have the same width spread and popularity and the influence on the popular imagination, as Orwell’s novel does. Nevertheless, one of the best achievements of Trebeshina’s novel is the fact that he presents us with the real face of communism, with real colors and real people, not the imagined one.

One of the main differences between Trebeshina and Orwell lies in the way they use language. Orwell is interested in the modern use of English language and particularly in the abuse and misuse of English. He accomplishes this by placing a great focus on Newspeak and the media. Demonstrating the repeated abuse of language by the government and by the media in his novel, Orwell shows how language can be used politically to deceive and manipulate people, how it becomes a mind-control tool, with the ultimate goal being the destruction of will and imagination. Another supporter of the link between thought and language is the linguistic Benjamin Lee Whorf who argues that: “different languages impose different conceptions of reality” (Myers 1986: 352). So when words that describe a particular thought are completely absent from language that thought becomes more difficult to think of and communicate. For the Inner party the goal is to “make thought crime literally impossible... because there will be no words in which to express it” (Orwell 1983: 55). So by designing Newspeak, a totalitarian system narrows the range of thought and shortens people’s memories. Whereas Trebeshina exploits the thoughts and the language of an unstable person, by reversing the images, the words, the time, the figures of speech we realize the truths that Mondvalsen is revealing. So for Mondvalsen this reversed language, full of symbols and metaphors is a way of escaping but at the same time revealing the truth.

Orwell tried to present a “utopian” world although he projected it in its negative consequences and the coming years proved that part of his visions were erroneous. Just to mention the ending of *1984* which shows no hope, especially for Winston who betrays Julia and an inner part of himself can never be recovered. At the end he is seen in The Chestnut Tree café where he admits that “He had won the victory over himself. He loved Big Brother.” Trebeshina has also dared to walk on the same path, but as he lived under a communist regime he did not need to use his imagination, he had the ‘chance’ to see with his

own eyes the 'real and sincere devotion' of the people toward socialism or to be more clear their adaptation towards this cause, but his hero is an evidence of the contrary, is an evidence of resistance, is a live proof of how this hero (easily identified with the writer) and with many other people who could survive and remain unaltered from the brutality of the regime, even though it has caused "a pretended deformation or madness" of the hero. In the totalitarian world of Orwell power becomes the State and the State is power. It is through the power/knowledge nexus that all semblances of humanity are eradicated leaving ostensibly nothing but the State (Tyner 2004: 141): "Never again will you be capable of love, friendship, or joy of living, or laughter, or curiosity, or courage, or integrity. You will be hollow. We shall squeeze you empty, and then we shall feel you with ourselves" (Orwell 1983: 228-229). Orwell hyperbolized the control of the state over the human beings and the possibility and the ability of the state to change people's ideas, to subdue them totally through the terror. In Trebeshina's *Odin Mondvalsen* and even in Kadare's novel *Spiritual Session in the city of N*. we have the disapproval of this. It does not matter how strong the control over the population could be, it is never absolute. The human being always finds a way out, even though it may be an "odinmondvalsen way." So, Denmark can be far away, according to a geographical map, but for Mondvalsen it is not, because he has got its freedom concepts in his mind. (Plasari 1993: 5)

In a society where power is ultimately possessed by the state, like that presented by Orwell, is resistance possible? Does he provide a space for resistance in a totalitarian society? During the novel, we understand that resistance, for Winston, means to retain a semblance of humanity, of individuality and not to acquire power. Consequently, the actions of Winston are directed toward a personal liberation rather than a complete revolution. In the novel Winston discovers that is the proletariat who has not lost sight of their humanity or individuality: "if there is hope, it lies in the proles." So there is space for resistance, however, Winston recognizes that overt resistance is neither practical nor desirable because the disciplinary control of the party was near complete. And yet, there are several fleeting instances of resistance in the novel, just to mention the diary, the avoidance of the telescreen; '(Winston) kept his back turned to the telescreen. It was safer; though as he well knew, even a back can be revealing' (Orwell 1983: 3) or other times while he was facing the telescreen 'He had set his features into the expression of quiet optimism which was advisable to wear when facing the telescreen' (Orwell 1983: 4); even the sexual relationship with Julia is read as a form of resistance, Winston reflects 'Their embrace had been a battle, the climax a victory. It was a blow struck against the party. It was a political act'. (Orwell 1983: 112) What about Trebeshina's novel? Does it have elements of resistance in it? I believe that resistance is not the primary mission of Mondvalsen. In the contrary, *Odin Mondvalsen* stands for everyman who has lived, has loved, has worked and has survived in a real communist regime. Mondvalsen is not interested to carry out a revolution, like Winston tried (although unsuccessfully), sometimes he even appear like a naïve narrator who fails to comprehend the implications of plot, the brutality of the regime, the frightening people, it seems that his only preoccupation is to live, to love and why not to beget children. It seems that Orwell overlooks the strength of the human character, his ability to suffer and to adapt to suffering, tortures, misery, injustices, mental pressure, lack of freedom, lack of food and even to slavery, although it may be an *odinmondvalsen* adaptation. For Trebeshina the suppressed people, even the slaves have their moments of joy, of happiness and *Mondvalsen* is a testimony of the communist regime and at the same time is an evidence of the ability of adaptation of the human being under the worst circumstances ever.

## References

- Abrahams, W. (1983) *Nineteen Eighty-Four: the novel*, in Sanksy, P. (ed.) *On Nineteen Eighty-Four*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Co.
- Allen, F. A (1984) *Nineteen Eighty-Four and the eclipse private worlds*, in Jensen, E. J. (ed.) *The Future of Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, pp. 151-175.
- Atkins, J. (1954) *George Orwell: A Literary and Biographical study*. New York: Fredrick Ungar Publishing.
- Buçpapaj, S. (1992) *Art që ngre krye kundër çoroditjes universale*, *Gazeta Drita*, 5 korrik, Tiranë.
- Craig, G. A. (1983) *Triangularity and international violence*, in Stansky, P. (ed.) *On Nineteen Eighty-Four*. New York: W. H. FreemanDeutcher, I. (1971) '1984'- the mysticism of cruelty, in Hynes, S. (ed.) *Twentieth Century Interpretations of 1984*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Howe, I. (1971) *1984 History as a nightmare*, in Hynes, S. (ed.) *twentieth Century Interpretations of 1984*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, pp. 41-53.
- Howe, I. (ed.) (1983) *1984 Revisited*, New York: Harper and Row.
- Hynes, S. (ed.) (1971) *Twentieth Century Interpretations of 1984*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Jensen, E. J. (ed.) (1984) *The Future of Nineteen Eighty Four*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

- Meyers, J. (2000) *Orwell: Wintry Conscience of a Generation*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.
- Orwell, G (1981) *A collection of Essays*, New York: Harcourt.
- Orwell, G. (1983) *1984*, New York, Plume.
- Plasari, A. (1993) Odin Mondvalseni dhe fundi i utopive, *Gazeta Drita*, 14 mars, Tiranë.
- Sharp, J. P. (1993) Publishing American Identity: popular geopolitics, myth and the Readers Digest Political Geography 12, 15.
- Sharp, J. P. (2000) Towards a critical analysis of fictive geographies *Area* 32: 327-334.
- Sharp, J.P (1993) Publishing American Identity: popular geopolitics myth and the Reader Digest, *Political Geography* 12 (491-503).
- Trebeshtina, O. (1992) *Stina e stinëve*, Prishtinë.
- Tucker, R.C. (1983) Does Big Brother really exist? In Howe, I. (ed.) *1984 Revisited*, New York: Harper & Row, pp. 88-102
- Tyner, James. A (2004) Foucauldian reading of 1984; *Social and Cultural Geography*, Vol. 5, NO 1, 2004, p 129-149
- Watt, I. (1983) *Winston Smith: the last humanist*, in Stansky, P. (ed.) *On Nineteen Eighty-Four*. New York, W. H. Freeman & Co.