with the virtual world, the office has to become more attractive. The more we do not have to go to work, the more design quality will matter.

We have frequently used the somewhat unlikely metaphor of the club to attempt to describe the quality of a social and physical environment that allows people freedom in time and space in an environment that is all the more affordable and all the more attractive because it is based on commonly agreed conventions of the use of space and time. Three things make a club work. The first is an imaginative understanding of how people are prepared, under certain conditions, to share space over time. The second is a statistical understanding of the probable consequences of the aggregated consequences of so much individual discretion and choice. The third is the willing acceptance of conventions of the use and time to support an agreed, common good. Old-fashioned gentlemen's clubs, despite their sexism and elitism, had all these features. Two thousand people literally clubbed together to timeshare a palace that provided a richness, a range of settings, an array of options that none of them could afford individually.

The metaphor of the club helps to articulate three paradoxes that encapsulate both the potential and the challenges of inventing the new office. First, the more mobile people are, the more enjoyment of the qualities of place will matter to them. Second, the more we are prepared to share and manipulate the resources of space and time, the more physical design choices we shall have to enjoy. Third, as we argued earlier, the more the architects and designers are prepared to involve themselves with those who design the nonphysical systems that complete the world of work—process and people—the more freedom they will have to invent innovative and interesting physical design solutions.

Designing for the Knowledge Economy

Architects and designers will have to fight both to get things right and to do the right thing–Peter Drucker's famous distinction between efficiency and effectiveness. The conventional North American office with its strong roots in the old economy of Frederick Taylor and Henry Ford is a powerful reminder of how design, of a very different sort, was very often used, in a less fortunate age, to exploit and manipulate people. The persistence of outmoded–not to say, contaminated–design conventions, at least by contemporary standards, particularly in North America, tells us how strong the Taylorist value system

remains in our culture—otherwise its growing incongruity would long ago have become intolerable. But the persistence of outmoded managerial ideologies embedded in the physical fabric of the conventional office is largely explained by a conservative delivery system, obsessed partly by efficiency but even more by its own short-term interests. The big danger, at this crucial moment in the development of the knowledge economy, is that office buildings and office interiors that speak far more eloquently about the past than about the future will drag us all, despite our highest aspirations, downward and backward.

The landscape of e-commerce is certain to be very different from that of the conventional office. Change management has become an essential part of the design process. Conventional ways of designing are no longer good enough—because they are as divisive, fragmentary, and unchanging as the physical environments they produced.

Bibliography

Clements-Croome, Derek, Editor. *Creating the Productive Workplace*. London: E&FN Spon, 2000.

DEGW. *Design for Change—The Architecture of DEGW*. Basle: Birkhauser, 1998.

Duffy, Francis. *The New Office*. London: Conran Octopus, 1997.

Mitchell, William J. *e-topia*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1998.

Mitchell, William J. *City of Bits: Space, Place and the Infobahn*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995.

Santa, Raymond, and Roger Cunliffe. *Tomorrow's Office*. London: E&FN Spon, 1996.

Turner, Gavin, and Jeremy Myerson. *New Workplace, New Office*. London: Gower, 1998.