

now delineated, was born and grew. Once a suitable interior was designed to contain it, it flourished.

In the corporate hierarchy, order ruled. To stay in control, however, the ruling order needed to keep an eye on the workers. Workplaces were designed for management, who typically constricted a large group of workers in a single, vast space. From the giant panopticon that was the top of the hierarchy, managers looked down over rows of workers at their typewriters or sewing machines or tables where they assembled the typewriters, sewing machines, Victrolas, and other machines that had become part of twentieth-century life.

At the turn of the twentieth century, the hierarchy was the metaphor for society in all its forms; the elevator, invented in 1857, suggested that, in a democratic American society, workers could aspire to access any level they chose. This was the era of the great retailers such as Marshall Field, whose establishments were organized into departments, just like the Ford Motor Company. This was the era that saw the construction of the Eiffel Tower as a brand mark for Paris, along with the great railway hotels, large city apartment buildings, the modern hospital, and the first skyscraper office buildings.

In business, Taylor's scientific management prevailed, but he had his critics, who were concerned about issues that interior designers still find themselves dealing with a hundred years later. They included Mary Parker Follett of the Harvard Business School, whose humanist, behaviorist approach to the management of organizations represented the opposite side of Taylor's machine-tooled coin. In the 1910s she championed such far-sighted approaches to work, and the workplace, as "the law of situation" and cross-functional teams. She also insisted that individual workers, rather than being merely static units of work with a prescribed place on a linear assembly line, as Taylor would have it, contributed to the strength of the organization as a whole. She believed that, within the organizational structure, men and women should be free to experiment until they found ways of working that were effective for the tasks at hand and for themselves as individuals.

In the 1920s, Harvard was also the academic home of Elton Mayo and his colleague Fritz Roethlisberger, who are the acknowledged creators of the human relations movement and whose work also has contemporary implications. They conducted their famous Hawthorne experiments over a period of more than 30 years—from the 1920s to the 1950s—at the Western Electric Hawthorne Works in Cicero, Illinois. Their studies, which anticipated the

current interest and advancements in ergonomics, focused on the physiological aspects of work, particularly the impact of various levels of illumination on workers' efficiency and the causes of fatigue. They also studied the psychological aspects of work and looked closely at employees' motivation, satisfaction, and personal well-being, particularly as these abstract states took form in workers' relationships with their supervisors.

The Harvard theorists, along with Chester Barnard at AT&T and other humanists, created a groundswell against scientific management. It was now clear that not all work fit the model of Ford's assembly line. And simply because the assembly line itself depended on human beings but was, in fact, profoundly dehumanizing, it was time to step back and rethink the nature of work—and the workplace. The time had come for a paradigm shift in the way organizations were structured and in the way the physical spaces of organizations were designed. But then came World War II, and the hierarchy not only prevailed, it joined the military.

THE BAUHAUS ARRIVES IN AMERICA: 1940 TO 1950

The end of World War II brought a period of prosperity to the United States that lasted almost 20 years. America had definitively won the war. By putting its own interests aside and contributing its physical and material resources to the war effort, corporate America was in large part responsible for the country's victory. Although American business quickly recovered from the war, the military mindset prevailed during the remainder of the 1940s. At the Ford Motor Company, decision making was based on numbers; numbers and rigid control also defined management. This approach led eventually to systems analysis, a rational, mathematically rigorous method of decision making that was considered to be especially effective in situations of uncertainty.

The war effort had been American through and through, but now that peace had come, corporations wanted to reclaim their unique identities. They wanted new headquarters that would function like the great cathedrals of Europe—buildings that would announce the importance of these corporations to society, reflect their mission, embody their technological expertise,