

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/308968773>

Animal Farm as a Dismal Firm. Critical Interpretation of George Orwell's Memorable Fable

Article · October 2016

CITATIONS

0

READS

19,760

1 author:



Yuri Pavlov

Khabarovsk branch of the Saint Petersburg State University of Civil Aviation

27 PUBLICATIONS 0 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Social mobility in traditional societies [View project](#)



Military History [View project](#)

ANIMAL FARM AS A DISMAL FIRM
(Critical interpretation of George Orwell's memorable fable)

1. George Orwell and his *Animal farm*

George Orwell is a prominent English writer of the first half of the 20th century. He was recognized as one of the most influential satiric writers whose works have merited detailed scholarly attention. More than half a century after they were written, Orwell's books are still much in demand. John Rodden, the researcher of his works, wrote in 1989 that Orwell was 'alive today' because the topics of his works are alive today, and this is equally true in the twenty first century [Ingle, 2006: 22]. He is regarded as the greatest political writer in English during the twentieth century. George Orwell's world fame is due to a combination of high esteem from intellectuals and immense popularity with the general reading public. Although he died at the early age of forty-six, his last two works – *Animal Farm* (1945) and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) – have sold more than forty million copies and stand as the most influential books of political fiction of the twentieth century [Rodden, 2007: XI].

Orwell was rather a fabulist than a novelist, and in fact he always was a pamphleteer, who sought to join English tradition that includes Defoe, Swift, Edmund Burke, Carlyle and Ruskin, among many others.

The satirical nature of his books and ridiculing the defects of the society was derived by him from Jonathan Swift. There is no doubt that Orwell admired Swift enormously. On one occasion he even said that '*Gulliver's Travels* has meant more to me than any other book ever written' [Bounds, 2009: 102].

Orwell's creative work is multi-aspect and he is often cited by other researchers. Orwell's influence, however, is not limited to literary studies: historians, anthropologists, sociologists, philosophers, psychologists and political scientists find Orwell's books useful in their research. In his works they find answers to such questions as the psychology of management, leadership theory, sociology of revolution, political culture, sacralization and symbolism of the power, social stratification and social inequality, ideology and propaganda, conformity, etc. [McLaughlin, 2007: 160-170].

Animal farm is one of the most famous books of George Orwell. It was published in 1945 and soon became a bestseller. The book is characterized by such features as fairy tale, fable, satire, and allegory. The writer told a reader a fictional story as naive revolutionary ideals were gradually transformed into a hard pragmatic dictatorship. The phrase 'all animals are equal but some animals are more equal than others' became the basic idea of the book. The story of the animals by Orwell resembles the ancient animal fables of Aesop about the defects of animals, where an attentive reader easily sees the vices of the people.

Animal farm is a parody of the dictatorship and of the Soviet political regime. This fact was confirmed by Orwell himself. He described the main focus of the book in a letter to his agent Leonard Moore in 1946: 'If they question you again, please say that *Animal Farm* is intended as a satire on dictatorship in general but of course the Russian Revolution is the chief target. It is humbug to pretend anything else' [Quinn, 2009: 53].

THE UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

2. Animal farm as a dismal firm

However in this article an attempt will be made to look at the Orwell's memorable fable in a different way. The story of the farm will be analyzed here as the history of the firm. It is a managerial interpretation of the fable.

What do we observe very early in the story in the beginning? Orwell shows us the crisis of the farm. Its owner Mr. Jones drank heavily and economy went into decline. He failed in legal proceedings and ran his business carelessly. Animals (main labor force) protested that they bring 90% of all profits to this organization, and yet people like Mr. Jones command them, they will languish in poverty and the farm will deteriorate further. The animals begin Rebellion and seize the power in their hands.

They change the organizational culture (make the Seven Commandments, hymn, emblem, codes of conduct, etc.). The animals refuse to have contacts with other farms, where the owners are the people. All animals were consumed with euphoria, they worked tirelessly and every animal is pleased with the results of their work and their remuneration. They think their dreams have come true. However, it is impossible to control the farm all together, and among the animals were selected some leaders who is ready to lead others, these were the pigs. In the future, among the pigs are chosen an idealist, enthusiast Snowball, and cautious conservative Napoleon. They have a confrontation, during which Napoleon wins and establishes new orders. Pragmatism was proclaimed is a new ideology. The farm is developing, contacts with the people begin and economy shows growth. However, the standard of living of other animals (main labor force) remains at the same level. The results of their work and their reward were correlated weakly. The total farm's surplus profits were taken by the pig-leaders. As a consequence, a number of the ruling class tends to enlarge and an extensive managerial class comes into existence, followed by the appearance of bureaucracy. By the end of the fable it all came back to where it had started. The pig-leaders are happy, they got everything they wanted, while other animals got nothing. The naive illusion of the subordinate animals disappeared. The farm is brewing a new change of the power. The circle is closed up.

3. Discussion

Is the Rebellion betrayed?

The destruction of the revolutionary illusions and gradual change in the 'game's rules', that's what was bothering Orwell when he wrote this book. Was such ending inevitable? Orwell's answer was negative. But the researchers of social revolutions said 'yes'. Such classical authors as Alexis de Tocqueville, Gustave Le Bon and Pitirim Sorokin pointed that any revolutionary period inevitably consists of two parts, inseparably linked with each other: escalation and reaction. 'Reaction' is a phenomenon that does not extend beyond the revolution, is an inevitable part of the revolutionary period. 'Reaction' means that the revolution enters the stage of 'braking'. Revolution is inevitably replaced by dictatorship. The people can overthrow old institutions, but cannot change their souls. Occupying the place of the old rulers, the former revolutionaries take over their 'souls' and behavior, and begin reproduction of the old regime. This is natural regularity that was manifested in many revolutions [Tocqueville, 2011; Le Bon, 1913; Sorokin, 1925].

Revolution as the pendulum swings from left to right, and get back. These facts were confirmed in further studies [Eisenstadt, 1978; Huntington, 1968]. Nikolai Berdyaev, Russian philosopher, wrote: all revolutions ended in reactions. It is inevitable. It is the law. The stronger

THE UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

and fiercer were the revolutions, the stronger were the reactions. There is some kind of magic circle in the alternations of revolutions and reactions [Berdyayev, 1923: 13].

Despotic, exploitative power causes dissatisfaction among subordinates and is overthrown by them. But once that power collapsed, it is no longer either alien or repressive [Jouvenel, 1962: 109]. The crowd always has conservative instincts. It has a sacred respect for traditions and unconscious fear for any innovations, capable to change real conditions of the people's existence. The fact that so angered and disappointed Orwell has appeared a law governing social development. The rulers are gone, but the power always remains. The King is dead. Long live the King!

The Farm cannot have two executives!

A hundred years ago Henri Fayol, the French classic of management, described one of the main principles of it: the employee should have only one boss. This academic thesis is confirmed by the situation on the farm at the diarchy of pigs (Snowball versus Napoleon). The farm could have neither two, nor three, nor ten CEO¹. Between them inevitably arises a conflict, which involves all employees. The ideological struggle ended with the victory of one of them, Napoleon.

No contacts with organizational environment?

After Mr. Jones was thrown off his farm, the animals declared their farm isolated from other ones, which were headed by the people. Closed economy and autarchy became the basis of their system. At first all things went well. Soon, however, the animals revealed the lack of raw materials and tools necessary for economic activity. The utopian initial idea has become more pronounced. This fact made the animals to begin trade operations with the people. The farm as a subject could not be a closed economic system. Therefore, it was transformed into an open system that actively interacts with the organizational environment. Revolutionary idealism was defeated by economic realism and pragmatism.

The workaholics

The workhorse, Boxer by name, is a prominent example of a workaholic on the farm. He ate little and worked hard. His personal mottos were two phrases 'Napoleon is always right' and 'I will work harder'. Unlike other animals, he got up much earlier and continued to work till night. He worked till he was fit to drop. Much of what has been done on the farm after Mr. Jones's expulsion has been done with the active participation of the Boxer. Unfortunately, the furious rate of work has affected his physical health. Constructing the windmill he injured his leg and actually became a disabled person. Of the most active farm worker he has become a burden to his comrades. When he could no longer fulfill his work, he ceased to be of value in the eyes of the pigs, and he was secretly taken to the slaughterhouse.

Any organization requires from the employee as much as he can give it (physical and mental abilities). If the organization requires from the employee a lot more than he can give to it, this fact becomes disadvantageous for him, because his results will be less than the effort expended them.

¹ CEO (Chief Executive Officer)

THE UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

Chester Barnard, one of the classics of management, defined power as a form of communication within any organization. The employee himself makes the decision to recognize the order of the CEO as the act of the power, not CEO. If an employee believes that the order is unacceptable to him, he did not perform it and leaves the organization. Barnard thought up the term 'zone of indifference' within which an employee agrees to carry out orders uncritically. All the orders coming from the CEO should be acceptable, i.e. to be within the 'zone of indifference' of a subordinate. The good organization has always the rule: use only those orders that will not encounter insubordination. The main aim of CEO is to expand the zone of indifference of an employee [Barnard, 1938: 163-170].

This principle has been widespread on the farm. When the animals began to doubt of economic achievements, Squealer usually intimidated them by the return of former owners and their old orders. 'Wouldn't you like to see Mr. Jones come back?' The animals did not wish Mr. Jones' return. The temporary difficulties and a low standard of living for the animals were more acceptable than the return of the old economic system with the people at the head.

Are all animals equal?

'All animals are equal', this rule has been written on the barn by pigs after Mr. Jones has left the farm. Later on the rule was changed into: 'all animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others'. This formulation has been the subject of the most controversy among the researchers. It is immoral, it is wrong, it is insidious such was the opinion of many critics. However, none of the critics was indignant at watching various animals when reading the book. They were distinct from each other: strong and weak, clever and stupid, industrious and lazy, careless and vigilant, prudent and impulsive, ambitious and modest, attentive and inattentive. How could they be the same? How could they be equal?

Inequality is naturally reflected in the hierarchical structure of the farm. At the very beginning of the tale it was a three-level structure like a pyramid: Mr. Jones - his workers - other animals. After the rebellion it became a single-level (all animals are equal). However, this fact gave rise to a new round of the controversy. It was an unviable economic structure. There was a conflict of the roles: all animals were both managers and subordinates too. The function of commanding and obeying is the decisive one in every society. As long as there is any doubt as to who commands and who obeys, all the rest will be imperfect and ineffective [Ortega y Gasset, 1957: 140].

Soon, the hierarchical structure was again transformed into two levels: pigs and other animals. Better educated and more proactive pigs occupied command offices. Other animals have occupied a subordinate position. Then it became a three-level hierarchy: pigs - dogs - other animals. At the end of the fable, we see four levels of hierarchy: Napoleon (pigs leader) - other pigs - dogs - other animals. Dogs, loyal to Napoleon, began to support his personal power. As the tale progresses we see how one group of the animals from the object of influence becomes the subject of influence. Another group of animals remains in a subordinate position, a powerless object of manipulation.

The educational level of animals became the basis for constructing a new hierarchy. The success in education became to influence directly on the amount of power enjoyed by the different animals. Their knowledge of the human speech corresponds roughly to their levels of control over their lives in this new farm [Fowler, 2009: 72]. Thus, education finally formed and legalized social and economic inequality. By the end of the tale we have already noted class

THE UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

stratification: newborn pigs inherit places in the ruling class, newborns of other animals inherit the lower positions².

Is knowledge power?

Knowledge is power, said Francis Bacon. He affirmed that this is not a metaphor, but a reality. This idea acquired a new perspective in the works of Friedrich Nietzsche and Michel Foucault. In their books the ideas of knowledge and the power were closely related. Both philosophers believed the knowledge to be a tool of power. Knowledge is growing according to the growth of power. The power creates knowledge that serves it. Power cannot be done without knowledge, but knowledge cannot be spread without power. Knowledge (ideology) plays the role of symbolic violence in any society. The power allows to simplify and schematize the world and to give it the desired shape. Every ruling class seizes so much reality as it can take and make it to serve itself [Nietzsche, 1968: 266, 278; Foucault, 1980: 34; 1980a: 52].

In every community there is a group, whose main task is to create the necessary interpretation of the world's picture. This group of intellectuals monopolizes the right to interpret the truth. The sanctioning of the uniform knowledge of the world around is one of its main functions [Mannheim, 1936: 9].

Community members see the outside world is not as it seems to an outside observer, but how the leader and his advisers interpret it. If the leader reports to his subordinates that the world was not threatening them, they will lead common activities. If the leader reports them that the community is threatened by the world, they are expected to become suspicious. Therefore, a key role in determining the behavior of the community members will be played by the leadership and its values rather than the actual state of the external world. A leader may exaggerate the threat or distort the situation of the world to mobilize community members to fight against external threats [Berne, 1973: 28].

Pigs were such a group on the farm. In Orwell's fable *Squealer* was a prominent propagandist and PR manager. He created a positive image of his leader (Napoleon) inside the farm and outside it. On the farm, only pigs were educated, other animals while learning initial teaching alphabet have not moved beyond the first three or four letters. Therefore, a few animals could control the information coming from pigs. The monopoly on knowledge and the monopoly on the truth became the privilege of pigs. They knew what... They knew who... They knew how... They knew where... They knew why...

Knowledge of all these processes created new opportunities for them (including abuse of power). Wilhelm Windelband, the German philosopher, has properly pointed out: lack of knowledge limits the freedom of our choice. So other animals were in a less advantageous position in relation to the pigs.

Uneducated animals were sure of no things, because they did not understand the meaning of many words. The animals were caught in a semantic network: they could not decipher the complexity of the secret jargon of pigs and their senseless sounds.

The animals' learning disabilities impeded all efforts to improve their life on a renewed farm. Until most of the animals are unable to make out what is written and the words themselves

² Gradually the pigs have received the privileges as follows: (1) apples and milk and then beer became a bonus for pigs only; (2) pigs woke up an hour later than other animals; (3) pigs lived with comfort in the former house of Mr. Jones; (4) pigs had the double ration of meal; (5) only pigs wore clothes; (6) only pigs had the best education access.

THE UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

they cannot take any action upon the semantic word association perception. Their dependence on the pigs was conditioned by their linguistic and cognitive deficiency along with unthinking acceptance of facts and historical amnesia [Elbarbary, 2009: 38-42].

The monopoly on the knowledge is a kind of expert power. One who perceives information from the expert, thinks this way: 'He is an expert and knows it better than me. Even if I do not fully understand what he is saying and why, I will do what he says' [Gold, 2011: 68]. Farm pigs were undoubtedly experts. They were designers, engineers, and managers. Secret knowledge, together with the linguistic casuistry became the basis of their power.

Some psychologists consider that the language has three major functions: (1) describe and denote a reality; (2) express a thought and a state of the speaker; (3) have influence on the interlocutor. All of these functions are used when persuading the people [Landré, 1998: 115]. Other ways to influence through speech are: (1) the choice of words and expressions; (2) the choice of grammatical forms; (3) the choice of the sequence of presenting the facts; (4) the choice of intonation; and (5) the choice of hidden prerequisites [Rimé, 1984: 417-418].

Orwell showed that the pigs knew these methods perfectly. From year to year, the animals got less and less food, but Squealer, appearing before them, told them quite different information. He told them about over-fulfillment of the economic performance by 100-200 percent and excellent economic results on the farm. But sometimes the animals would sooner have had less figures and more food.

Gustave Le Bon, a French social psychologist, wrote: an orator wishing to move a crowd must make an abusive use of violent affirmations. To exaggerate, to affirm, to resort to repetitions, and never to attempt to prove anything by reasoning [Le Bon, 1896: 37]. Squealer understood it well. He actively made use of such methods.

The most important thing in Squealer's speeches was not only what he spoke but also what he omitted. Silence implies precise knowledge of what is silent. Since it is impossible to be always silent, an orator has to make a choice between what can be said and what should remain silent. To conceal the real facts from the people is the best known method for those who have the power [Canetti, 1981: 294].

Enroning on the Animal farm?

Systematic concealment of losses of the company by falsifying of accounts was named 'enroning'. Enron Corporation was the company involved in energy production, consumer goods and securities. Its headquarters was in Houston. The company has long deceived shareholders and investors by publishing false information about the income and hiding debts.

In 1998, when analysts from the Wall-street paid a visit to Enron, its CEO Kenneth Lee Lay hastily mobilized 70 employees, who were forced to play the role of traders. Their task was to make a due impression on the analysts. Lay wanted to create illusion of hard work. False traders imitated calls, exchanged remarks on fictitious sales of oil and gas. Lay wanted to make an impression on the analysts from Wall Street and was successful in it, but did it through a false facade.

In 2001, Enron Corporation became bankrupt. The failed firm was charged with false statements. The action was aimed at misrepresentation of true financial position of the corporation. Enron's shady business was not in concealing the income but hiding the losses. Among the causes of the crisis and the collapse of the Corporation were primarily the lack of an

THE UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

effective system of internal and external control, as well as the conflict of interests between top-managers and other employees [Siegfried, 2005: 289-290].

The situation on the animal farm during the pigs' management also resembled enroning. Manipulation of figures, hiding some facts and the exaggeration of other ones, unsubstantiated arguments were a common thing. For example, it was revealed during the food shortages. In one of the winters on the farm there was a threat of famine. Dangerous rumors that could undermine the pigs' reputation and their economic program spread themselves. It was necessary to conceal the fact of famine from the outside world. In this situation Napoleon decided to use a trick.

He invited Mr. Whymper, his old commercial partner, to visit the farm. This visit should show that actually everything is all right on the farm, and the problem of famine is a fabrication of his rivals. Napoleon ordered to fill the empty granary with sand, and to scatter the rest on the surface. Mr. Whymper went in front of the granary and he convinced that the farm has no problems with famine. A false facade with the grain helped pigs to create the illusion of stability and success. However, these manipulations could not continue permanently. (p. 29-30)

Who and how managed the Animal Farm?

To illustrate this fact we will use a managerial grid model developed by Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton. This is a 2-D model obtained the title of a coordinate leadership grid. Each of the grid axes represents a nine-level scale ranging from 1 (low) to 9 (high). The model is represented as a grid with relation to the production process as the x-axis and attitude to the people as the y-axis [Blake and Mouton, 1964].

In accordance with this grid it is possible to determine the position of leadership on the farm. We do not know what kind of strategy was used by Mr. Jones when he became a farmer. Orwell does not show it to us. He begins the tale from the point of economic collapse and personal crisis of Mr. Jones. It is obvious that at that moment Mr. Jones' strategy was 1.1 (the lowest attitude to the workers and lowest relation to the work process). The leader who uses the style of management like that was interested neither in employees nor in production plans. After he was driven out of the farm and the animals gained the power, the strategy has changed. Probably the index varied about 5.5 (moderate attention to employees and to the production activity). Under Napoleon's the leadership style was transformed. Now the index was 9.1 (the highest to the production and the lowest to the workers).

This approach may be characterized as follows: (1) a rigid total control; (2) production targets had a higher value than concern for employees's welfare; (3) organizational culture was like a 'voluntary prison; (4) the subordinate did not want to take responsibility and solve problems independently; (5) there was a constant distance between the leader and his subordinates; (6) often absent were direct communication and understanding.

At the end of the book when the delegation headed by Mr. Pilkington came to the animal farm, Mr. Pilkinton made a solemn speech in honor of its leader, Napoleon. Pilkington has seen here not only the most advanced methods of farming, but also discipline and perfect order. The animals were working harder, but they could be paid for their work lesser money. Pilkington eagerly wished to employ these methods at his own farm. This fact illustrates a great popularity of the style 9.1 among managers of the last century. It appeared to be more realistic as compared to the style 9.9. However, Blake and Mouton believed the position of 9.9 to be the most effective leadership style. Yet, however, to use this style in practice is difficult because it required a high

THE UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

degree of coordination and control. It is rather ideal for which to strive, constantly improving all elements of the organization.

Power distance

One of the symbols of power is the space structure. The space should be organized so as to emphasize distance and thus the difference in status between the ruler and the subordinates. The structuring of the territory often divides the space into two parts - the 'centre', where are the holders of power, and 'peripheral sectors', where are all the rest.

In business negotiations the person with a higher status sit closer to the centre of the table, the others rank in the distance. The lower status of an employee, the farther away from the centre of negotiations and decision-making centre he is. The employees of very low status are not invited to important negotiations at all.

CEO Office is often distant from the entrance and usually is rather more elevated, demonstrating the superiority of the person occupying it. In large organizations, the access of ordinary workers to CEO is limited. For this aim there is a staff of vice-presidents, assistants and advisors. They act as a filter screening out unnecessary information and unwanted people from their leader.

The buildings of large corporations resemble the hierarchy: the higher the position of the employee, the closer to the top is his office. A leader located at the top gets a psychological advantage, because it made him look down at those who took their places at the bottom. In many countries the phrase in the lift 'I am to the highest floor' sometimes identifies the people, who have the highest authority in corporations. Command is a high achievement. They can breathe fresh air and new prospects were opening up before them. They are crazy about the order and genius of construction- The man who has grown great sees from the top of his tower what he can make, if he so wills, of the swarming masses below him [Jouvenel, 1962: 116].

In modern corporations the portraits of CEO in the offices of the employees embody his 'body'. At the same time they symbolize the all-seeing eye, which oversees employees and supervise their work. Everyone should see who is their leader. Everyone should know the leader, but he does not have to know everyone personally.

The theme of power distance is described by Orwell in detail. It is possible to consider this fact on the Napoleon's example. At first, he was one of the two leaders of the farm, who had no special privileges. All animals were sitting together at the bottom of a big granary and took a collective decision on the farm management. The position of Napoleon was changed after Snowball's expulsion from the farm. The animals no longer sat together in the granary at the same level. Napoleon and other pigs climbed up to the top surrounded by loyal dogs. Other animals were placed at the bottom.

Power distance is appeared. Napoleon announced that no meetings will be held. At present they are unnecessary. To hold meetings is a waste of time. All collective discussions were canceled. From his point on, all economic problems of the farm will be addressed to a special committee of the pigs, headed by himself. The Committee will meet separately and report its decisions to other animals. Napoleon read out the orders for them, and all the animals were to carry out their duties. (p. 56, 58-59)

At first, Napoleon made orders to the animals personally, but then he delegated these functions to Squealer. When Napoleon sometimes appeared in the farm's courtyard, he was always protected by six dogs and this ceremony was solemn. Then this ceremony became more

THE UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

complex. Now he was accompanied not only by six dogs but also a black cockerel that loudly greeted Napoleon. It was also announced that the gun would fire every year on Napoleon's birthday. It has become a tradition give Napoleon the credit for ~~habit~~ every success achieved on the farm. On the granary wall was hung a large portrait of Napoleon for all animals to see who is their leader. At the end of the tale Napoleon became the president of the farm and actually the absolute ruler.

Dysfunctional management?

Organizational culture of the farm is gradually changing. New commandments, emblem, hymn, rituals and ceremonies, and other items were established after Mr. Jones' expulsion. Changes in the organizational culture reflected the transformation of all elements on the farm. The leaders of the animals had a great influence on this processes. As Edgar H. Schein, prominent sociologist, rightly pointed out that a leader's talent is determined by his ability to understand the culture and to work with it, and one of the most important manifestations of the leadership is the destruction of culture, when it becomes dysfunctional [Schein, 2004: 11, 410].

Unfortunately, the leadership of the pigs (especially under Napoleon) was typical of such dysfunctional culture. Instead of trying to improve and create perfect examples of management, the pigs have created a vicious system. They were not 5-level leaders (as interpreted by Jim Collins). 5-level leaders are not implemented through their own success, but through the attainment of a significant goal (the creation of a great company). This does not mean that the 5-level leaders have no ambition. Of course, they are ambitious, but their ambition relates primarily to the companies they control, and not to themselves. They do not like to praise themselves and they talk more about a 'good team' with which they were lucky to work together. (Probably Snowball could eventually become such a leader!)

But pigs have created the opposite management system. When the farm showed excellent results, all merits were attributed to Napoleon. In the case of failures the pigs were looking for the animals responsible for the failure outside the farm. It was Snowball, the former leader of the animal farm, who was chosen guilty. Snowball blamed for slow construction of a windmill, a broken fence, poor harvest, hunger and disease on the farm. Although it was clear to an outside observer that the reasons for the failure was bad planning, coordination and control of Napoleon and his assistants.

Among the indications of ineffective teams modern researchers distinguish the following: (1) you cannot easily describe the team's mission; (2) the meetings are formal, stuffy, or tense; (3) there is a great deal of participation but little accomplishment; (4) there is talk but not much communication; (5) disagreements are aired in private conversations after the meeting; (6) decisions tend to be made by the formal leader with little meaningful involvement of other team members; (7) members are not open with each other because trust is low; (8) there is confusion or disagreement about roles or work assignments; (9) people in other parts of the organization who are critical to the success of the team are not cooperating; (10) the team is overloaded with people who have the same team-player style; (11) the team has been in existence for at least three months and has never assessed its functioning [Parker, 2006: 677-679]. Many of these signs appeared when the pigs came to power. The closer the end of this fable we come, the more of signs were coincided.

THE UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

A dichotomy of power and dependence: why some get everything that they want, while others that remain

Table 1 shows the difference of the personal positions of the pigs and other animals. The pigs had a high power motive; they were proactive, more enterprising and cunning; they relied only on themselves; they had a high self-appraisal; they believed in reason and logics, but were able to manipulate feelings and emotions of other animals; they were pragmatic executives focused on personal success and personal privileges in prejudice of other animals; they were snobs and considered other animals only as a tool for fulfillment of their desires and realization of their dreams.

Other animals were naive idealists, they believed almost to all that they were spoken by pigs; they respected the authority of pigs and their educational level; they had a low self-appraisal and little thought; they acted passively reacting to external motives and incentives; they wanted a lot of things, but their desire for security and conformity will not allow them to realize their dreams.

While some of them chose the way of Machiavellianism, others were true to their base principles. For some, morality was determined by the phrase 'if it is forbidden thing, but you would like it, it is permitted for you'. For others the words 'rules of the game cannot be broken' were their principles. Certainly, the economic results in both cases differed significantly.

Table 1

A comparison of personal positions of the pigs and other animals

Pigs	Other animals
High power motive	Low power motive
Proactivity	Reactivity
Internal locus of control	External locus of control
Freedom is a primary need	Safety is a primary need
High self-estimation	Low self-estimation, conformity
Rationalism	Idealism
Interpersonal relation based on "I-It"	Interpersonal relation based on "I-Thou"
Power and authority	Dependence and obedience
Think at first, do then	Do at first, think then

The Inner Ring

In 1944 Clive Lewis gave his memorial lecture "The Inner Ring" to the students at University of London. He spoke about the basic desire of every individual to belong to any community, to be a member of the Inner Ring. Everyone wants to be inside this ring and is afraid to be outside. This fact leads many individuals to sacrifice their interests and desires only in order to remain a member of the Inner Ring. This fact can be extended to such a phenomenon of management as organizational commitment and engagement. More than 40 years ago L. Porter et al. have described three main factors why the individual does not leave the organization and keeps loyalty to it. The factors are: (1) a strong desire to remain a member of the organization; (2) a strong belief in, and acceptance of, the values and goals of the organization; (3) a readiness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization [Porter et al., 1974].

Let's return to the Orwell's tale. Why did not the animals under the pigs' power leave the farm, though dragged a miserable existence? What kept them inside the farm? I think these were

THE UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

the above-described phenomena. Animals have been a loyal to the farm because (1) their dreams have come true; (2) their farm became the first farm ruled by animals, but not humans; (3) their farm is an island of harmony and happiness in the ocean of violence and sufferings; (4) their farm is an ambitious project for the reconstruction of agriculture. It is a great pride for all animals to be involved in such large-scale events. They understood that for them there is only one hard way forward, no way back.

Spoon of Tar in a Barrel of Honey or Spoon of Honey in a Barrel of Tar?

Orwell's tale *Animal Farm* and the discussion that took place around the theme that has the English writer has touched upon, is one of the main in the social sciences. It is the eternal question. Who is to blame in this finale: the leaders or the system? If we focus on the books like *Parkinson's Law* by C. Northcote Parkinson or *The Dilbert Principle* by Scott Adams, it is a logical ending, to avoid which was hardly possible. If chickens or cats were placed on the pigs' place, the result was the same. No one can fight against the natural causes, it should be taken as a due. If we focus on the books *Good to Great* and *How the Mighty Fall* by Jim Collins or *Organizational Culture and Leadership* by Edgar H. Schein, the fault here lies entirely on the leaders who, by their wrong actions, have brought their organizations to the crisis and the fall. And the research like *Managing Corporate Lifecycles* by Ichak K. Adizes comprises both viewpoints.

In this book George Orwell played two roles: as an anti-utopian and utopian writer. He debunked the myth of freedom and equality, which quickly led to economic stratification and social inequality. But at the same time Orwell was writing this book as a humanist and an idealist. There is no doubt that Orwell was a dreamer who wanted to improve the lives of the workers. In this case he was like Robert Owen, his fellow countryman humanist and educator who dreamed in the 19th century of creating an ideal factory at New Lanark and find harmony between the labor and the capital... As history has shown, their ideas appeared to be vain dreams.

References

- Barnard C.I. (1938) *The Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Berdyayev N. (1923) *The Philosophy of Inequality*. Berlin: Obelisk. (In Russian)
- Berne E. (1973) *The Structure and Dynamics of Organizations and Groups*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Blake R.R. and J. Mouton. (1964) *The Managerial Grid. The Key to Leadership Excellence*. Houston: Gulf Publishing.
- Bounds P. (2009) *Orwell and Marxism. The Political and Cultural Thinking of George Orwell*. London & New York: I.B. Tauris.
- Canetti E. (1981) *Crowds and Power*. New York: Continuum.
- Eisenstadt S.N. (1978) *Revolution and the Transformation of Societies. A Comparative Studies of Civilizations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Elbarbary S. (2009) *Language as Theme in Animal Farm // George Orwell's Animal Farm*. Ed. by Harold Bloom. New York: InfoBase Publishing: 35-44.
- Foucault M. (1980) *On Popular Justice. A Discussion with Maoists // Foucault M. Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings. 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon Books: 1-36.

THE UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

- Foucault M. (1980a) *Prison Talk* // Foucault M. *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings. 1972-1977.* New York: Pantheon Books: 37-54.
- Fowler R. (2009) *Animal Farm* // *George Orwell's Animal Farm.* Ed. by Harold Bloom. New York: InfoBase Publishing: 59-78.
- Gold G.J. (2011) *Bases of Power* // *Encyclopedia of Power.* Ed. by Keith Dowding. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications: 66-71.
- Huntington S.P. (1968) *Political Order in Changing Societies.* New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Ingle S. (2006) *The Social and Political Thought of George Orwell. A Reassessment.* London & New York: Routledge.
- Jouvenel B. (1962) *On Power. Its Nature and the History of Its Growth.* Boston: Beacon Press.
- Landré A., Friemel E. (1998) *Opérateurs et Ejeux Discursifs* // *Langages*, 32e annee, no 132: 108-123.
- Le Bon G. (1896) *The Crowd. A Study of the Popular Mind.* New York: The Macmillan.
- Le Bon G. (1913) *Psychology of Revolution.* London: T. Fisher Unwin.
- Mannheim K. (1936) *Ideology and Utopia. An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge.* London: Routledge.
- McLaughlin N. (2007) *Orwell, the Academy and the Intellectuals* // *The Cambridge Companion to George Orwell.* Ed. by John Rodden. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 160-178.
- Nietzsche F. (1968) *The Will to Power.* New York: Vintage Books.
- Ortega y Gasset J. (1957) *The Revolt of the Masses.* New York: W.W. Norton.
- Parker G.M. (2006) *What Makes a Team Effective or Ineffective?* // *Organization Development. A Jossey-Bass Reader.* Ed. by Joan V. Gallos. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass: 656-680.
- Porter L.W. et al. (1974) *Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Turnover Among Psychiatric Technicians* // *Journal of Applied Psychology.* Vol. 59: 603-609.
- Quinn E. (2009) *Critical Companion to George Orwell. A Literary Reference to his Life and Work.* New York: Facts on File.
- Rimé, B. (1984). *Langage et Communication.* // *Psychologie Sociale. Sous la Direction de Serge Moscovici.* Paris : Presses Universitaires de France: 415-446.
- Rodden J. (2007) *Preface* // *The Cambridge Companion to George Orwell.* Ed. by John Rodden. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: X-XI.
- Schein E.H. (2004) *Organizational Culture and Leadership.* 3rd ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Siegfried M. (2005) *Enron Corporation* // *Encyclopedia of White-Collar and Corporate Crime.* Ed. by Lawrence M. Salinger. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications. Vol. 1: 289-290.
- Sorokin P. (1925) *Sociology of Revolution,* Philadelphia & London: J.B. Lippincott.
- Tocqueville A. (2011) *The Ancien Regime and the French Revolution.* Ed. by Jon Elster. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.