
Article:
Kerr, R., Robinson, S.K. and Elliott, C. orcid.org/0000-0003-3838-4452 (2016) Modernism, postmodernism, and corporate power : historicizing the architectural typology of the corporate campus. Management and Organizational History, 11 (2). pp. 123-146. ISSN 1744-9359

https://doi.org/10.1080/17449359.2016.1141690

Modernism, Postmodernism, and corporate power: historicizing the architectural typology of the corporate campus

Introduction

The main purpose of this research is to identify what the transition from architectural Modernism to Postmodernism tells us about the evolution of ideologies that animate corporations in relation to wider developments in capitalism. In order to do this, we historicise the architectural phenomenon of the corporate campus headquarters (Gorski 2013), a type of business complex built in 'a pristine rural setting' that 'reinvents the traditional country estate and in terms of modern corporate programs' (Pelkonen and Albrecht 2006, 10).

In particular, we focus on a series of corporate campuses built in the period 1945-2005, designed by the three main architects responsible for originating and developing this type of building: Gordon Bunshaft (Skidmore, Owings & Merrill: SOM), Eero Saarinen (Saarinen & Associates), and Kevin Roche (KRJDA). This focus allows us to identify how corporate identity was designed and constructed through architecture; how changes in the relations between architects and corporate clients drove the transition from Modern to Postmodern in the construction of corporate identity; how corporate ideologies of identity and identification were realised in space; and how changes in architectural style and building use are related to changing forms of capitalism.

This research is situated in the recent revival of interest in the 'historical turn' in management and organization studies (e.g., Rowlinson and Hassard 2013; Suddaby, Foster and Mills

2014), which has raised questions of the benefits and dangers for historians and OS scholars alike of pursuing a synthesis of historiography and critical organisation studies. In responding to the call from this journal's Special Issue editors to revisit the 'historical turn' (Kieser 1994; Zald 1993)**,** we therefore explore the potential for a 'marriage' of history and critical organisation studies by focusing on the historicisation of corporate power as reflected through architecture.

Our theoretical approach is a synthesis of the critical sociology of Pierre Bourdieu with architectural historiography. This approach is, we believe, timely, given the recent publication of Bourdieu's lectures on the State, in which he discusses the relationship between historiography and sociology (Bourdieu 2012), and the growing interest by sociologists in the contributions of Bourdieu to historical studies, as evidenced by Gorski (2013), Swartz (2013), Calhoun (2013), and Charle (2013).

For Bourdieu, theoretical concepts are 'tools for conducting empirical research rather than formal constructs, definitions, or abstract, fixed, propositions' (Swartz 2013, 20). Keeping this in mind, we develop a conceptual framework with *temporal* and *spatial* dimensions. The temporal concepts from architectural historiography, *period* and *typology*, allow us to connect architecture and the social, tracking the phenomenon of the corporate campus through a delimited historical period. The spatial concepts, *symbolic*, *social* and *physical space* (Bourdieu 1993), allow more fine-grained analyses of the buildings in relation to the production of corporate power. In addition, by combining the temporal and spatial analyses, we identify what subsequent changes in use might tell us about changes in the social, political, and economic contexts in which the buildings as material objects continue to exist.

We address the following questions: What can a study of the post-WW2 architectural typology of the corporate campus headquarters in the US and Europe tell us about how

corporate ideologies are realised during a given period? What does historicising the corporate campus typology through the architectural transition from Modernism to Postmodernism, tell us about changes in corporate capitalism? And what does the fate of these monumental buildings tell us about the changing symbolic, economic and social power of such corporations in the period 1945-2005?

In addressing these questions, we make theoretical and methodological contributions to management and organizational history. At the epistemological level, we show how researching the history of corporate spaces over time generates knowledge about corporate strategies and organization. Our methodological contribution is to show how a synthesis of critical sociology and architectural historiography applied through a critical hermeneutic approach (Thompson 1981; Robinson and Kerr 2009. 2015) can be used as a way of analysing the same type of object (here, the campus) at different periods, thus shedding light on the rise and fall of individual corporations and the wider historical context within which this occurred.

Sociology, history, architecture and organizations

As already noted, the purpose of the paper is to trace the evolution of corporate campuses in the transition from architectural Modernism to Postmodernism. We propose to do this through synthesising critical sociology and architectural historiography, thus contributing to discussions in Management and Organization History (MOH) over the role of theory in historically-informed approaches to the study of organizations (Usdiken and Kieser 2004; Clark and Rowlinson 2004, Booth and Rowlinson 2006, Rowlinson and Hassard 2013).

The ‘historic turn’ in MOS (which follows similarly motivated ‘historical turns’ in sociology: see Elias 1987; Calhoun 1996) had the aim, by turning to history and historians’ practices, of countering the ‘scientistic’ positivism that has dominated MOS, particularly in US academia (see Ross 1991 for a history of the ‘scientisation’ of 20th Century American social science and its disconnection from the discipline of history).

Similar concerns concerning epistemology and methods motivated the more recent ‘historical turn’ in MOS (summarised by Durepos and Mills 2012, and Weatherbee, Durepos, Mills and Mills 2012). Dominant approaches within MOS were seen by, e.g.; Jacques (1996, 2006), Kieser (1994), Üsdiken and Kieser (2004) as, inter alia, ahistorical, presentist, universalistic in their presuppositions, positivistic in their approaches, methodologically individualistic, ‘privileging evolutionary notions of historical development’ in their philosophy of science (Kieser 1989), and lacking in criticality. Booth and Rowlinson (2006), for example, suggested that ‘more critical and more ethical reflection’ was required in the field and that the ‘historic turn’ might lead in this direction (Booth and Rowlinson 2006, 7-9). In particular, they continue, (2006, 10) ‘if there is to be methodological reflection and experimentation in historical writing, then this will involve further engagement with the philosophy of history and historical theorists’. Taking our cue from this, in this study, we put Bourdieu’s socio-historical method into dialogue with architectural historiography and critique.

Architectural historiography was an early interest of Bourdieu’s (see his postface to his translation of Panofsky: Bourdieu 1967) and has inspired a number of Bourdieusian scholars. For example, Lipstadt (2003), characterises the relationship between client and architect as a ‘dialectic of distinction’ through which each side gains prestige (Lipstadt 2003), while

Dovey's critical study of power and built form also draws on Bourdieu in a series of studies of building design in relation to political power (Dovey 1999).

Within MOS, a number of studies following 'spatial turn' in organization studies have focused on architecture and space from a variety of perspectives (the 'spatial turn': van Marrewijk and Yanow 2010). These include organizational aesthetics (e.g., Linstead and Höpfl, 2000; Wasserman and Frenkel 2011), organizational legitimacy (e.g., Proffitt and Zahn 2006), and organizational symbolism (Gagliardi, 1990; Berg and Kreiner, 1990). In many of these studies, the focus is primarily on the internal design of organisations (see, e.g., Clegg and Kornberger 2006, Hatch 1990, Hofbauer 2000), with those on organizational cultures often taking a strongly normative and functionalist perspective (e.g., Duffy 2000). Other scholars have identified links between architecture and ideology. For example, Gabriel (2003) discusses the link between new university buildings and forms of post-bureaucratic control; while Hancock and Spicer (2011) consider architecture, interior design and 'forms of identity' in relation to a new university library.

Issues of power, space and organisational contexts are central concerns in the work of Dale and Burrell (2003, 2011) and Dale (2005), who draws on Lefebvre (1991), to look critically at office space, focusing on control, materiality and spatial politics; while Kerr and Robinson (2015) take a Bourdieusian perspective to analyze the interactions between holders of corporate power and political power in relation to the planning and design of the corporate headquarters of a Scottish bank (Kerr and Robinson 2015).

With regard to historical approaches to architecture, space and organisations, two main research themes have emerged: namely, the role of buildings in the construction of

organizational *identity* and of organizational *identification*. For organizational identity Berg and Kreiner (1990) show how buildings have been understood to symbolise good taste, power, and status through the attention paid to the identity of the architect; while Kersten and Gilardi (2003) also look at corporate identity, providing a case study of architect Philip Johnson's design for the corporate headquarters for Pittsburgh Plate Glass (PPG), identifying the importance of externally projected image and the use of material symbolic of the corporation.

For organizational *identification*, Stanger (2000) shows how the Larkin Building, designed by Frank Lloyd Wright, was intended as a 'family home' for employees of the soap company (Stanger 2000; Dale and Burrell 2007; see also Jones and Massa 2013). Indeed, long before Mayo's work (1949) on the value of co-operation in increasing workers' productivity (Dale and Burrell 2007), companies such as Cadbury (Rowlinson and Hassard 1993), and Hershey were trying to create company towns as 'capitalism's utopias' (Green 2010, 37). Earlier still, in the 19th Century, Krupp moved their workers to a rural site in order to 'deproletarianise' the workforce (Bentmann and Müller 1992,114), while in the UK, industrial 'model villages' such as New Lanark in Scotland or Saltaire in Yorkshire were constructed in the mid-19th Century in order to create a 'family' of workers (McKinley 2006).

In addition to the dual themes of identity and identification, some historically-focused papers connect organizational theory with Modernist corporate architecture. In particular, the historical trajectory of Modernist corporate architecture is at issue in an exchange initiated by Guillén (1997), who claims that a dominant Taylorism is omnipresent in the industrial style of Modern architecture (see also Yates 2007; Mutch 2011). However, this thesis has been critiqued by Dale and Burrell (2007), inasmuch as European Modernists, including the

Bauhaus architects and Le Corbusier, were motivated by issues of Utopianism and social critique as well as productive efficiency (Dale and Burrell 2007, 166).

In contrast to the literature on architectural Modernism, little has been written by MOS or MOH scholars on the connections between architectural Postmodernism and organizations (although Spencer 2011, in a study of a new college, shows how Deleuzian philosophical concepts have been taken up for corporate ends). This is somewhat surprising, given the suggestive work in other disciplines by, e.g., Harvey (1990) and Jameson (1991), in particular the latter's 'Postmodernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism', with its identification of 'the extraordinary flowering of the new postmodern architecture grounded in the patronage of multinational business' (Jameson 1991, 5).

Taking a lead from Jameson and Harvey and their interest in the connections between architecture and forms of capitalism, we now go on to historicise the corporate campus phenomenon through an approach to sociology and history based on the work of Pierre Bourdieu and incorporating elements of architectural historiography.

Typology, periodization and space

Architectural typology

In terms of architectural historiography, the corporate campus is a *typology* or *building type* that has been developed through a tradition of architectural thinking and practice to offer solutions to questions related to building function, environment and ideology (Giedion 1970; Ackerman 1986; Bentmann and Müller 1990; Markus 1993). Typology in this sense is a concept that provides a way of identifying and studying the change and development of an

architectural 'building type', and how each particular example develops the typology further. The concept of typology is widely used by architectural historians and critics, for example, Markus (1993), who identifies the 19th century 'explosion of typologies' that met the demands of capitalist modernity (schools, hospitals, prisons, workhouses, etc.) and by the architects themselves, who draw on precedents when designing new buildings (Roche 1985).

This means that, although in the 1940s the corporate campus constituted a new typology, it drew on earlier building types by making explicit historical reference to, for example, Palladio's Venetian villas (Ackerman 1986). Such precedents are explicitly drawn on by architects, as Saarinen notes: 'When you do a job like this your mind goes back to Versailles, the Tivoli Gardens, San Marco' (in *Time* 1956). That is, in designing a new building, architects not only draw on recent examples of the building type, but also on how previous generations of patrons, architects, and builders addressed similar problems through the siting and construction of villas, chateaux, and so on.

Drawing on this tradition of architectural enquiry offers, we believe, real value to organizational research in that we can use the connection between typology and period (Lupton 1996) to analyse modalities of corporate power (one of the main interests of Critical Management scholars) in the Modern and Postmodern periods.

Periodization

'Period' is used in architectural historiography (in the tradition of Burckhardt 1860/1951) as a way of understanding connections between history, architecture, and the social. The concept of periodization provides a way of entering into critical debates around architecture, time and societies. By facilitating comparison between individual buildings, building types and

periods, it allows us to identify and explain related aesthetic and social changes at the macro level (Charle 2013). Thus, studying the relationship between monarchical absolutism and Counter-Reformation religious power through the lens of architecture can help to identify why the Baroque aesthetic supplanted Renaissance classicism (Maravall 1986; Buci-Glucksmann 1996; Benjamin 1998).

This identification of the Baroque as successor to Renaissance classicism has informed and structured recent debates on the *Postmodern* as successor to the *Modern* (Harvey 1990; Jameson 1984). Ideologically, the Modern movement in architecture rejected historical reference and ornament in favour of rationality and functionalism: the 'function is form' aesthetic promoted by key figures such as Le Corbusier (1927) and in Germany (and later in the USA), Gropius and Mies van der Rohe.

But, if Modern architecture expresses the unity of form and function, with an absence of decoration and a refusal of historical reference (Giedion 1970; Saarinen 1959), then (the argument goes), because Postmodern architecture dissociates form from function (e.g., offices appear as palaces) and celebrates pastiche, nostalgia, and historical reference, the Postmodern becomes, in effect, a replay of the Baroque (Jencks 1984, 1991; Scully 1996).

In this way, through 'the imitation of dead styles… stored up in the imaginary museum of a now global culture' (Jameson 1991), the Postmodern involves a 'loss of historicity', an eternal present. In order to address this naturalisation of the present, and to understand the role of culture in economic, social and cultural change over time, we *historicise* the Postmodern (Jameson 1991; Gorski 2013).

<<<<<take in Fig 1 about here>>>>>

Spatial concepts

If typology and period are concepts that allow us to study corporate campuses diachronically, then *symbolic, social,* and *physical space* (Bourdieu 1993) provide us with a synchronic view of an individual building at a specific time. For Bourdieu, symbolic power includes the power to impose a vision of the world, to realise the specific categories by which the social world is constituted (Bourdieu 2012). This includes the power to inscribe the symbolic on space: so, for example, 'the country' may be preferred as a symbolic category to 'the city' as a space of physical dwelling. Thus, the *symbolic* dimension of space is where categories of distinction are valorised and the *social* dimension is the topography in which social groups that possess forms of capital of various sorts are distributed: e.g., cultural capital as land or as heritage (the aristocracy), or economic capital as liking for ostentation (the *nouveaux riches*).

The possession of such forms of capital means that social space can be objectified and distributed in physical space to reinforce social distinctions (Bourdieu 1993). However, for Bourdieu: 'the most successful ideological effects are those that have no words, and ask no more than complicitous silence' (Bourdieu 1977, 188). In this study, we use these Bourdieusian concepts to question the taken-for-granted spatial arrangements of corporate buildings that reproduce forms of domination, i.e., 'history objectified in things' (Bourdieu 1989, 59).

Methodology

In this study we present a historically-grounded case in order to excavate 'the social conditions of possibility' of an empirical phenomenon (Bourdieu 1998, 129). To do this, and in order to develop a methodological framework to address our research questions, we followed Charle (2013), by initially posing the following questions: (1) what are the *problematics* that we want to address? Here, we wanted to 'read' and reconstruct the history of the great Post-War American corporations through their architectural projects; (2) how do

we understand – or construct –*the object of research*? This we identified as the corporate campus typology as a historical phenomenon that we could address through historical critique or *historicisation* to understand how forms of power are naturalised in changing socio-historical contexts and to critique the apparent permanence of these forms of power (Gorski 2013; Steinmetz 2011). Historicisation also allows us 'to take issue with the misrepresentations of reality that are produced by dominant ideologies, which are designed to conceal the material and symbolic divisions within vertically structured societies' (Susen 2015, 15).

We then identified two questions of scale. These were (3) the *scale of division* and (4) the *scale of time*. For the first, we restricted our study to the United States, in particular to exurban ('upstate') New York and Chicago; and then, as a sort of coda, to Europe (France and Spain). For the second, we delimited our research to the period 1945-2005 (the time in which the three architects were designing corporate campuses), although the issue of historical antecedents required us to consider a longer historical vista taking in Rome, Venice, and Versailles.

From this starting point, we employed a critical hermeneutic methodology (Kipping, Wadhwani and Bucheli 2014) drawing on architectural historiography (e.g., Panofsky 1939/2010) and critical sociology (Bourdieu 2012), critical hermeneutics being a development of hermeneutic method that aims to understand the object of research by passing it though successive cycles of interpretation: e.g., formal, socio-historical, and most importantly, critical/conceptual (Thompson 1981; for examples, see Robinson and Kerr 2009, 2015). Although historical hermeneutics (Dilthey 1883/1985; see Habermas 1972; Ricoeur 2004) originated in the historical interpretation of biblical texts, critical hermeneutics

considers ‘text’ to include a wide range of interpretable phenomena, from actions to art works: see Ricoeur (2004), Prasad (2002). In this research, as noted above, the corporate campus typology is the object of research to which we apply our cycles of interpretation.

Initially, in the first cycle of interpretation, we conducted a series of detailed case studies, starting from photos and other visual representations of the buildings and working through the documentary evidence of the buildings’ conception and planning. Data included documents such as the client’s brief; the architect’s intention/vision from the KRJDA and SOM web archives; the social and historical context as understood by the architect and/or client (IBM and GM online archives); publically available interview transcripts (Bunshaft, de Blois, Saarinen, Roche); online archives of specialist journals and local and regional newspapers; photographs; and exhibition catalogues. For the second cycle of interpretation, we took our temporal concepts from architectural historiography and drew on architectural history for the social context as understood by architectural historians and critics. Then, for the critical cycle, critical sociology provided us with the concepts of symbolic, social and physical space (Bourdieu 1993). Bringing these cycles together allowed us to fuse empirical data, architectural history and critical sociology in order to historicise the phenomenon.

In researching the typology, we identified 42 completed buildings: see Appendix, where we list the corporate campuses that we have been able to trace (it is unfortunately impossible to estimate how many were built, given that in many cases both the corporations and the buildings have since disappeared). We categorised the campuses into *Modernist* and *Postmodern*, based on Jencks (1976). For the Modernist campuses we focused on GM, Bell Labs, Connecticut General, IBM (two campuses), and Union Carbide. The Postmodern

campuses were represented by General Foods, Bouygues near Paris, and Santander near Madrid.

In the analysis that follows, we 'follow the concepts': that is, the individual case studies are subsumed under the concepts we use to organise our analysis, i.e. the corporate campus as typology, followed by the spatial analysis and the periodization analysis. Through this we historicise the case (Gorski 2013), identifying the overdetermined nature of the phenomenon (Resnick and Wolff 2002): that is, the combination of political, aesthetic, economic, social, corporate, and ideological drivers, plus individual particularities (Craven 1992) that 'were indispensable for the occurrence of the effect in its concrete form' (Weber 1949).

Analysis

The role of architects in the construction of corporate identity and identification

By the early 1950s it was clear that the urban tower block office, although symbolically powerful, was failing to promote interaction and community within the corporation (Roche 1985). In contrast, the corporate campus, conceived as a 'horizontal' skyscraper (Bunshaft 1990) with communal areas for socialisation, set in a natural or landscaped 'pastoral' environment (Mozingo 2011), was intended to provide an alternative to the high-rise 'anthill approach' to office building (according to Henry Luce, CEO of *Time/Life*, 1955).

Three main architectural firms were responsible for the development of the new typology: SOM, Saarinen & Associates, and Kevin Roche John Dinkeloo & Associates (KRJDA). The first significant examples, built in the 1940s-1950s, were designed by either Gordon Bunshaft for SOM (Connecticut General) or Eero Saarinen for Saarinen & Associates (GM). Later (1960-2005), campuses were designed by Kevin Roche, who took over Saarinen's firm after the latter's death in 1958 (Pelkonen and Albrecht 2006). For the purposes of this study, the

work of these three architects provides a history of typological variation over the period 1945-2005.

Gordon Bunshaft, a Modernist designer schooled in the work of Mies van der Rohe and Le Corbusier, joined SOM in 1945 (Bunshaft 1990). Bunshaft was chief designer in SOM's New York and Chicago offices (Bunshaft 1990, de Blois 2004), and his design for the Connecticut General Insurance (CGI) headquarters at Bloomfield, Ill., can be considered the first corporate campus headquarters (Mozingo 2011, 119). This complex, inspired by Mies's Illinois Institute of Technology campus (Mozingo 2011, 119), and completed in 1954, was intended to provide a 'highly civilized and satisfying office environment' with 'extensive amenities' (SOM 2014; see Fig 1).

The second key architect, Eero Saarinen, emigrated from Finland to the USA in 1923 with his architect father, Eliel Saarinen (Pelkonen and Albrecht 2006). Having taken over his father's firm in 1950, the younger Saarinen won commissions to design a number of public buildings, including a series of US embassies and consulates (Lipstadt 2001; Loeffler 1998). Saarinen's success as a public architect has been attributed, in part, to the belief that his 'glamorous' Modernism was well suited to celebrations of post-War American power and confidence (Friedman 2010; Tuomi 2006). But Saarinen's style of Modernism also appealed to the leaders of IBM, Bell, and General Motors, who commissioned him to design a series of corporate campuses (Albrecht 2006).

<<<<take in Fig 2 about here>>>>>

The first of these, for General Motors (GM), was an enormous campus, with five departmental buildings around a 22-acre decorative lake (Pelkonen and Albrecht 2006: see Fig 2). Saarinen then went on to design two campuses for IBM, at Rochester, Minnesota (1958) and at Yorktown Heights (1961) and a campus for Bell Labs at Holmdel, NJ (1962) (Pelkonen and Albrecht 2006). For IBM Rochester, CEO Thomas Watson wanted the facility's identity to be 'both populist and aristocratic, contemporary and historic', in order to 'visually express the character of the new IBM' (IBM archive 2014). The glass curtain wall of IBM Rochester was IBM blue, while Yorktown Heights presented a curving, crescent-shaped, glass-fronted building, sited, like a feudal fortress, on the crest of a hill (Pelkonen and Albrecht 2006: Fig 3). Both the Rochester and Yorktown buildings were intended to encourage 'mobility between academia, government, and industry' (Albrecht 2006, 53), as was Saarinen's fourth research centre, Bell Labs. This also featured curtain walls (in effect a vast reflecting mirror) and a lake, while a transistor-shaped tower symbolized the Labs' key contribution to the invention of the transistor (Pelkonen and Albrecht 2006). These exurban campus complexes were described at the time as the 'Versailles of industry' (*Time* 1954), thus equating symbols of US corporate power with the greatest architectural symbol of the absolute monarchical power.

<<<<take in Fig 3 about here>>>>

After Saarinen's death, his assistant, Kevin Roche took over the firm in partnership with engineer John Dinkeloo (KRJDA). Roche, who would go on to become 'the favoured architect of corporate America' (Pelkonen 2011, 5), claimed that he 'wasn't interested in making works of art' but 'believed very much in communicating with the client' (Roche 1985, 257). This increased focus on the wishes of the client represented, according to Roche,

a ‘turn to identity’ in architecture, inasmuch as the corporate architect was required ‘to produce a distinctive building that can provide an identity for a corporation’ (Roche 1985, 37). We can see this play out in Roche’s series of corporate campus buildings, from the College Life ‘pyramids’ (1967-72), through Union Carbide, General Foods, Conoco, and Merck, culminating in Bouygues (1985) and Santander (2005).

The preoccupation with ostentation, identity and emotional impact (Roche 1985, 74) is particularly visible in the General Foods HQ (Dal Co 1985) and marks Roche’s move to ‘visible monumentality as a corporate ideal’ (Harris 1996, 460): the white aluminium-clad building, with its Palladian pillared portico and dome, was designed to make an instant impression on passing motorists (Roche 1985). As architectural critic Paul Goldberger reported, the then newly-opened HQ constituted ‘a stunning and powerful presence’ (Goldberger 1985), a deliberate assertion of corporate identity by a previously invisible corporation (Roche 1985: see Fig 4).

In addition to the projection of corporate identity, exurban relocation was intended to promote corporate identification. So, according to Saarinen, the IBM Rochester building was intended to ‘foster IBM’s own community of loyal employees’, while for the client, the new IBM campuses would make ‘the attitude of our people who work in them lifted and more rapid and more efficient’ (quoted in Albrecht 2006, 49). Roche and his clients were also concerned with promoting community: in designing the Union Carbide building,

> ‘the intention… was to accommodate a very large number of people in units, which themselves are very small and intimate. It’s that same thing we keep talking about: that sense of family, that sense of community’ (Roche 1985, 262).

This means that the design of physical space had a social purpose, that of promoting the ideal workplace, at least for its headquarters staff – a small, regulated and integrated community, ruled over by a benign paterfamilias (Bentmann and Müller 1992, 21). So for Union Carbide the aim in co-locating divisions was to 'deal humanely with the workplace' (Roche 1985, 58) through the design of a building with 1200 individual offices and central social areas, restaurants, bars, etc. According to one employee, (quoted in Miller 2010), 'it was like working in a city… everything was available in that building. They didn't want you to leave'.

<<<<<take in Fig 4 about here>>>>

The corporate campus in the US and Europe: realising corporate ideologies of identity and identification

How were symbolic space and social space inscribed on physical space in the corporate campuses? In this section, we identify the *country, rural, pastoral* as symbolically positive in the location of the campuses; while the *city, the urban* were negative.

We then consider how combinations of the *visible, ostentation, concealment* and *discretion* were employed to inscribe corporate identity on physical space. Finally, we turn to the symbolic inscription of hierarchy: campus buildings were hierarchical spaces that reproduced social status in taken-for-granted ways, sometimes explicitly, as with executive/non-executive spaces, and sometimes not, as with social and physical space as gendered space.

Corporate relocations from city centre HQs to exurban campuses were facilitated by the post-War suburbanization of America (Pimlott 2007): between 1950 and 1970 the suburban population increased from 31.1 to 75.7m (Avila 2004). This process was facilitated by the new universality of the automobile and its supporting infrastructure (Elliott and Urry 2010),

while the low price of oil before the 'oil-shock' of 1973 meant that heating and air-conditioning were not major cost considerations. In addition, the geographical and social space of upstate New York was attractive to top executives: 80% of top executives were already living there before the relocation of their businesses (Whyte 1988). Indeed, in 31 out of the 34 cases of corporate relocations studied by Whyte, the new corporate HQ was close to the CEO's residence, with 12 of the CEOs living close to two country clubs in Connecticut (Whyte 1988/2009).

In this 'flight from the city', symbolic space was inscribed on physical space: the campuses were positioned *outside the city* (Mozingo 2011). But if the 'country' represented a symbolic pole of attraction to CEOs, the 'city' (primarily New York and Chicago) represented a negative pole. In the case of General Foods, flight from the city was prompted by fear of nuclear attack ('catastrophic planning') and a desire to escape from Manhattan's 'discomforts', including 'dust, dirt, noise, and traffic congestion' (quoted in Mozingo 2011:106), and high city centre rents (Pelkonen 2011, 33). Exurban areas also offered a potential workforce in 'places without a prior history of Fordist industrialization' (Scott and Storper 1989, 213), thus 'allowing management better control of labor' (Ellin 1997, 35).

In addition to the city/country dialectic, architects also faced a symbolic choice between visibility and invisibility, ostentation and discretion. The choice here depended on the kind of impact the building was intended to make and on whom (Roche 1985). With Union Carbide, the building employed discretion: after a series of scandals involving silicosis, asbestosis, and dioxin waste, the corporation wished to present itself as a 'good corporate citizen' (Martin 2006). Designed as a massive multi-level car park with fractal-shaped office clusters

depending from it (Roche 1985), the immense building was like ‘a sprawling metallic beast’ (Dunlap 2008) concealed in the midst of an unspoiled natural forest (see Fig 5).

<<<<<< insert Fig 5 about here >>>>>>

In comparison with this powerful yet invisible presence, Saarinen’s glass fortresses for IBM and Bell Labs were highly visible, the massive curtain wall façades acting as mirrors to reflect the landscape and the sky, while discretely concealing the academic-industrial researchers in their cell-like offices (Martin 2006). In contrast, Roche used visible ostentation and historical reference in designing the General Foods HQ and the Bouygues Challenger HQ. For the latter, KRJDA’s brief was to employ visibility, ostentation and historical reference to design an integrated building and landscape that would be ‘steeped in the history of French architecture’, with particular reference to Versailles (KRJDA). Nicknamed ‘*le petit Versailles’*, the Challenger, like the chateau of Versailles itself, is located outside the line of the old Paris city walls (*ultra muros*) and laid out on an east-west axis that exactly mimics the east-west axial procession of the palace of Versailles which lies a short distance to the north west (the Google maps view provides a startling comparison). These ostentatious historical references would constitute symbolic power in material form for the *nouveau riche* founder of the firm, Francis Bouygues, asserting his ambition to found a new corporate dynasty (Barjot 1992).

Finally, Ciudad Santander (Santander City) outside Madrid, designed by Roche for the bank’s President Emilio Botin, outdid its American predecessors (and the Challenger), in resembling a city-state of 6,500 inhabitants with Alhambra-style gardens, central plaza and focal executive building (KRJDA 2014). The Challenger and Ciudad Santander, both in relation to

their respective cities (Paris and Madrid) and in their internal design, make explicit historical reference to buildings that symbolise monarchical power. Both were built for corporate dynasties: Francis Bouygues was succeeded by his son Martin, while Emilio Botin, who had been preceded as President by his father, was succeeded on his death in 2014 by his daughter Ana Cristina (General Foods and IBM were also corporate dynasties of respectively, the Post and Watson families).

Within the buildings there was a hierarchy of symbolic, social and physical space. For Connecticut General, social space was designed according to analyses of workflow:

> 'what we found out… is that in an insurance company there's a key group of executives who make all the policies. From then on, there's paper that moves from one procedure to another' (Bunshaft 1990, 98).

Similarly, for the unbuilt *Time* campus, Saarinen produced a hierarchical plan in which offices were represented as a series of named boxes that 'diminished in size as one heads from executive to assistant' (Saarinen 1961, 278).

Hierarchy was made visible in, and in part constituted by, the arrangement of physical space, often in the form of open-plan offices for non-executives and individual offices for executives (as with College Life, Connecticut General and Bouygues). Even in the Union Carbide building, specifically designed to provide equal individual office space to all the divisional managers, seventeen larger, centrally-located, offices were reserved for the top executives (Dal Co 1985). As might be expected, the 'palaces' (General Foods, Bouygues, Santander) had particularly 'noble' executive spaces referencing the Versailles of Louis XIV. At General Foods:

> ‘the executive offices are on the top floor, set in a semicircle that goes around the top of the dome. It is difficult not to think of the Sun King with his axial bedroom at Versailles when one observes that the chairman of the board and the president are both on the central axis of this building, too - atop the portico and right on line with the entry drive’ (Goldberger 1985).

Similarly, at the Bouygues’ Challenger, the P-DG’s *(President-Directeur General)* executive office was situated beneath the cupola and ‘facing the rising sun’ like the Sun King’s chamber at Versailles (Barjot 1992). Finally, at Ciudad Santander, the executive building was the hub of the campus, with the President’s office ‘perched on the top’ (Jenkins 2013). As Jenkins, who visited the campus in 2013, notes: from his office ‘(Emilio Botìn) can see everything’ (Jenkins 2013).

The corporate campuses were also gendered spaces, reproducing forms of masculine domination. As described by Bunshaft (1990,115): ‘the heads of (the corporations) were men who wanted to build something that they’d be proud to have representing their company…the head man was personally involved and personally building himself a palace for his people that would not only represent his company, but his personal pleasure’.

In the case of Connecticut General, the CEO (Frazar Wilde) and the board members were male, whereas the workforce of 1200 was female (Phillips 2006). This meant, according to de Blois (2004, 58), who worked with Bunshaft on the project, that, although Connecticut General ‘was a building that was designed with women employees of the insurance company in mind’, the women’s desks were on open plan floors, while the top floor of a separate building ‘was to be designated for the top management and directors’. As de Blois notes: ‘those conservative men on the board had private offices’, and those ‘who wanted their

Georgian furniture (as opposed to the Modernist furniture in the open plan) got what they wanted' (de Blois 2004, 61). Similarly, in the Union Carbide HQ, the individual offices were for the male managers, and the communal secretarial areas were occupied by women, while amongst other social spaces the building included 'a back room modelled on a men's club and a singles bar' (Martin 2010, 139).

The IBM research centres were also structured as masculine spaces. For IBM Yorktown, Saarinen designed a building 'appropriate to the personality of the users… like university professors, tweedy pipe-smoking men' (Saarinen 1961, quoted in Knowles and Leslie 2013, 246); while at GM, spaces of masculine distinction included chief designer Harley Earl's office, created by Saarinen. This was (according to a contemporary report in an interior design magazine),

> 'like a *Playboy* pad filled with "gorgeous gadgets" and smooth, sensuous surfaces…a command post and an entertainment center that Earl oversaw from behind his custom-built cherry desk. His private dining room … had a "sort of night club expectancy and intimacy" about it; with its black, dark blue, and silver color scheme and its table-side controls used to manipulate music, draperies, lighting, and even to summon the "waitresses"' (*Interiors* 1957, 80-89).

As social spaces, the corporate campuses combined work, leisure and, as the typology developed, shopping and services. However, although the campuses were neither self-sufficient (as with monasteries) nor total institutions (as with prisons or asylums), they nevertheless represented an expansion of the 'domain of work' (Bentmann and Müller 1992, 134), facilitating a diurnal rhythm integrating the workplace and the nearby dormitory suburbs, with employees flowing in and out of the concealed car-parking areas in a seamless transition from home to office (Roche 1985).

<<<<< take in Fig. 5 about here>>>>

The corporate campus typology: the transition from Modernism to Postmodernism.

Architecturally, the campuses of Bunshaft and Saarinen followed the principles of Modernism, but explicitly associated with the celebration of American political and corporate power. According to the US State Department, classical models were 'outdated' and 'too evocative of the architecture of Germany and other totalitarian states' (Tuomi 2006, 288; Loeffler 1998), whereas Modernist architecture, because it broke with previous forms, styles and historical references, provided the best way of projecting America's 'values of democracy, openness, technical innovation, and progress' (Tuomi 2006, 288). At the same time, corporate clients also turned to prestigious Modernist architects for their Post-War projects ('a dialectic of distinction', Lipstadt 2003). For Modernist designers such as Bunshaft, this Post-War period constituted a 'Golden Age', comparable to the Italian Renaissance, with the corporate 'head men' as 'new Medicis' (Bunshaft 1990, 115). Saarinen too saw the period as 'historically great' and 'formative' for Modernism, just as Twelfth Century France had been formative for the Gothic, and Fifteenth Century Florence for the Renaissance (Saarinen 1952). That is, given that 'each age must create its own architecture…one that is expressive of its own Zeitgeist' (Saarinen, quoted in Scully 2006, 15), Saarinen saw his role as interpreting the 'Spirit of the Time' to celebrate American power through Modern architecture (Friedman 2010).

However, in order to understand the subsequent turn to Postmodernism in corporate architecture we need to turn to Jencks (1976, 1991), Harvey (1990) and Jameson (1991). For Jencks (1976), Postmodern architecture involves a 'double coding', a combination of modern techniques with traditional building types that creates, as in the case of Roche, a hybrid

architectural language incorporating 'historical allusions to corporate architecture' (Pelkonen 2011, 10). With Roche, then, corporate Postmodernism gives expression to the client's desire for monumentality in constructing corporate identity. It does this by deliberately referring to examples from history: so, in talking about corporate HQs, Roche notes that 'the castle or the chateau in France is an administrative center for the community, the modern corporation is a kind of administrative center for a different community… it has a presence on the landscape which is very similar' (Roche 1984).

But if architecture, as understood by its practitioners and critics, is intimately connected with *period*, then the danger for architects is that they become servants of the powerful (Harvey 1990), with the architect no longer an 'artist', but subordinated to the client's vision: for Owings, SOM had become, by 1973, 'a firm of order takers' (Graham 1998, 251). And this, we argue, is what happened to architecture in the USA during and after the 1960s, the period of transition from the Modern to the Postmodern. That is, architecture moved from the Modernist celebration of America as such to architecture that expressed a corporation's (or its leader's) preferred self-image.

From this perspective, we can see how the first corporate campuses, those of General Motors and Connecticut General (see Fig 1), were expressions of a Modernist aesthetic (Bunshaft 1990), whereas a later generation of campuses, including corporate 'palaces' such as the General Foods headquarters (1979-83), represented a Postmodern turn to ostentation and historical reference. But this embrace of corporate Postmodernism by architects coincided with the imminent obsolescence of the great vertically-integrated American firms and their massive headquarters buildings. Meanwhile, in Europe, Postmodern effects were employed in two campuses that symbolised the foundation of corporate dynasties: Francis Bouygues' 'Challenger' complex near Versailles (1985) and Emilio Botìn's Ciudad

Santander near Madrid (2005). Our argument then is that studying such changes in architectural typology in relation to historical periods provides insights into dominant forms of social and organizational power and how these change over time.

Discussion

Architecture and the corporate: symbolic, economic and social power.

Writers on architecture, e.g., Bentmann and Müller (1992), Ackerman (1986), Williams (1997), and Chamboredon (1997), have identified a historically enduring – or recurring – dialectical tension, between the urban and the rural, with the country as the antithesis of the urban (Vernant 1988). This dialectic of the country and the city reaches back to ancient Athens and the Rome of Petrarch, for whom flight to the pastoral signified retreat from the political (Bentmann and Müller 1992). In architectural terms then, in ancient Rome and later in Venice (Ackerman 1986) withdrawal to the rural represented retreat from social conflict into the Arcadian past (Bentmann and Müller 1992). For Bull (2010), this kind of corporate pastoral represents 'a beautiful relation between rich and poor' and a reconciliation of class contradictions (Bentmann and Müller 1992). The campus therefore presents the client's desired 'image of the world' (Ackerman 1986, 1989), i.e., the corporation is an ideal community, with the building serving to 'integrate the individual as part of the corporation' (Dal Co 1985, 39), working, drinking coffee, eating with colleagues, 'interacting'. This paternalistic power aims to recreate an organic feudal-style society, while rejecting the city as alien, diverse and threatening (Bentmann and Müller 1992). In moving to the rural then, the master can 'deproletarianise' the workforce, and remake the 'common people' as 'a unified work of art' within an hierarchical structure (Bentmann and Müller 1992, 114). This means that, although the social tropes 'community' and 'family' operate at the symbolic level as forms of inclusion, they also act as control, as at Bell Labs, where 'over the years men have

been meticulously selected and precisely trained… men chosen to fit the mold will fall into the desired pattern' (Hawkins 1950, quoted in Mozingo 2011, 62).

In addition, the internal hierarchy of space (the existence of 'noble spaces') physically and symbolically constructs the corporate community as both gendered and non-democratic. The categories *executive* and *non-executive* are socially and spatially distinct within the corporate campuses: the executives *always* have larger offices, placed either at the apex of the corporate pyramid or at the centre of the corporate web. These (now) obvious distinctions in social and physical space serve to perpetuate symbolic violence and domination (Bourdieu 1993), and this taken-for-granted reproduction of corporate hierarchy becomes more evident – ostentatious even - in campuses such as the Challenger, with its evocation of Baroque absolutism. In fact, Versailles provides a continuing model for powerful dynastic 'princes' (Giedion 1970, 138): for example, in the way the building is approached along a linear perspective, an *enfilade* that ends at the inner sanctum, the axis of power (Hillier and Hanson 1984).

In returning to classical types – and in his explicit reference to the Baroque and the Palladian villa – Roche contributed to the creation of a Postmodern corporate architecture that combined visual image with traditional symbols of authority (*auctoritas historiae*). According to Bentmann and Müller (1992:93):

> 'at particular moments and in specific societies, Palladio's forms were reverted to, thus duplicating the historicism that had already been developed in the Cinquecento. This always happens when a society with colonial, imperial, and capitalist tendencies has had to legitimate itself through artistic production… why the typical "colonial style" has generally followed Palladian models'.

But this embrace of Postmodernism in its monumental neoclassical form coincided with the moment that corporate capitalism turned to neoliberalism. As Arrighi (2007,169) notes, 'in the late 1960s, Peter Drucker foresaw that the dominance of big US corporations like General Motors and US Steel was about to end in an era of "turbulence"'. This period of turbulence, in which corporate welfare capitalism was replaced by globalised neoliberalism, called into question the role and function of the corporate campuses.

As a consequence, socio-economic changes such as mergers, downsizing, or indeed corporate collapse (Bell Labs, General Foods, Union Carbide), or changes in corporate focus, including diversification (Bouygues), affected the corporate campuses as symbolic, social and physical spaces (Miller 2010). If, in Bourdieu's framework, symbolic space interacts with and reinforces distinctions inscribed in social space and physical space, then the categories of symbolic space are subject to changes that impact social and physical space. For example, with inner-city redevelopment and gentrification in New York (de Blij 2009), the symbolic polarities switched: the stigmatized inner city of the 1970s became the secure, desirable, corporate address of the 1990s, while the environmental problems that these car-dependent campuses contributed to, began to weigh negatively on the exurban spaces both economically and symbolically.

The campuses now occupy physical space whose social and symbolic meanings have altered over time. With changes in technology and in organizational ideology and practice – downsizing, outsourcing, offshoring - there is no longer a need for such physical spaces: leaders now rule over a core of valued employees, while peripheral workers are excluded from the community, and middle managers are no longer needed (Mozingo 2011). These changes are particularly evident in the corporate HQs: with the disappearance of the great corporate bureaucracies and the decline of the 'benign capitalism' of the Cold War period

(Mozingo 2011), the original social function of the buildings also disappears in a period of disintegrated and disorganized capitalism.

So what follows the collapse or disappearance of these corporations? In some cases 'struggles over the appropriation of space' (Bourdieu 1993), i.e., over the symbolic meaning of the campus in the absence of the context that gave it its original meaning. Examples include the struggle over plans to convert the Union Carbide building into a casino (Miller 2010), and proposals by property developers to demolish Saarinen's Bell Labs, against the opposition of societies seeking to preserve the building as a monument to – or perhaps mausoleum of - American Post-War scientific and technical invention (Shearn 2008).

In some cases, the campuses remain as symbols of modernity and industrial power stranded within post-industrial, postmodern, societies: mausoleums of corporate power and vanity – as with the 'darkened floors' of Union Carbide (Miller 2010), or the empty halls and dead greenery of Bell Labs, where 'vines stretch across the carpet in the building's atrium and a sole security guard walks around puddles of water when doing his rounds' (Shearn 2008; Medina 2014). In other cases, e.g., General Foods, Union Carbide, campuses are now multi-occupancy office buildings owned by property companies, converted into prestigious addresses that small businesses can use to acquire symbolic capital or into destinations for tourists and wedding parties (Miller 2010).

The Postmodern and architecture: historicising the a-historical

As we have noted, the Postmodern involves a 'loss of historicity' (Jameson 1994), i.e., using history in a-historical ways. This 'depthless present' can be addressed by re-historicising

Postmodernity through its architecture, that is, by relating changes in the design of corporate buildings to changes in global capitalism.

In this way, historicisation provides a way of making us question our presuppositions with regard to the organization of space, using our spatial and temporal concepts to question the spatial arrangements of corporate buildings that reproduce modes of domination, e.g., class, gender, which are invisible and taken-for-granted, but become visible over time, as modes of domination change.

But we are also forced to surface questions related to what philosophy of history is implicit in our study. Can the periods that we discuss in this paper be considered as linear progress, or as Hegelian negations in which the Postmodern negates and overcomes the Modern? Or as Hindu (or Schumpeterian) cycles of creation and destruction? Perhaps history operates as recurrent sequences or successions in which the Postmodern is to the Modern as the Baroque is to the Renaissance: a Nietzschean philosophy of history in which 'Baroque style' is a 'timeless phenomenon that periodically recurs' (Newman 2009:24; see also d'Ors 1935)?

For Ackerman (1990), the villa is such a constant, evidence of an enduring – or recurring – tension between the urban and the rural – between withdrawing from the city and returning. Walter Benjamin writes that 'every epoch not only dreams the next, but while dreaming impels it towards wakefulness…With the upheaval of the market economy, we begin to recognize the monuments of the bourgeoisie as ruins even before they have crumbled' (Benjamin 1939/1999: 898). Following Benjamin, we can perhaps see these great corporate campuses, not quite as the immanent ruins that Benjamin imagines, for they are still monumental buildings in physical space, but rather, like deconsecrated churches, as surviving memorials of Bunshaft's now vanished 'golden age'. The belief systems, the symbolic and

social power that supported them, have gone and these monuments to the confidence of post-WW2 corporate capitalism are left stranded amid the uncertainties and precarity of contemporary neoliberalism and postmodernity: 'the reflex and the concomitant of yet another systemic modification of capitalism itself (Jameson 1994: xii).

Perhaps, then, another period is starting, that of the great 21st Century IT corporations, those established powers of neoliberal capitalism, building their own vast corporate campuses for their core creative staff: the 'shining ring' headquarters planned by Apple (designed by Foster), the 'futuristic greenhouse' planned by Google (designed by Heatherwick), and Facebook's 'Facebook West' (designed by Gehry) (Goldberger 2011; Wainwright 2015).

These new campuses, we might argue, demonstrate a renewed 'dialectic of distinction' between prestigious architects and powerful clients, a desire to project corporate identity, and a need to promote the integration of a corporate community (understood as domination): in this way constituting another reification of social life under capitalism, in which 'everything must change so that everything can remain the same'.

Conclusions

In this paper we addressed the following questions. What can a study of the post-WW2 architectural typology of the corporate campus headquarters in the US and Europe tell us about how corporate ideologies are realised during a given period? What does historicising the corporate campus typology through the architectural transition from Modernism to Postmodernism, tell us about changes in corporate capitalism? And what does the fate of these monumental buildings tell us about the changing symbolic, economic and social power of such corporations in the period 1945-2005?

In order to address these questions, we used Bourdieu's conceptual model of symbolic/social/physical space along with *typology* and *periodization* from architectural historiography to explore the historical development of the corporate campus. Our study contributes to management and organizational history at theoretical and methodological levels. At the theoretical/ontological level we show how the researching the history of corporate spaces generates knowledge about corporate strategies and organization. Our methodological contribution is to show how history can be used as a way of analysing the same type of object (here, the campus) at different periods. In so doing, we demonstrate how reading architecture through our conceptual synthesis can shed light on the rise and fall of individual corporations.

Bourdieu hoped that in the future 'history would be a historical sociology of the past and sociology would be a social history of the present' (Bourdieu 1995, 111). This paper is intended to investigate an under-researched subject and map out a research area, and, in employing Bourdieusian concepts and approaches, to bring together organization studies, sociology, social history, and architectural historiography to explore questions regarding buildings, organizations and forms of corporate power in relation to space and time.

References

Ackerman, J.S. 1986. 'The Villa as Paradigm. *Prospecta* 22: 10-31.

Ackerman, J.S. 1990. *The villa: form and ideology of country houses*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Albrecht, D. 2006. 'The Clients and their Architect'. In *Eero Saarinen: Shaping the Future* edited by E-L. Pelkonen, E-L. and D. Albrecht, 8-54. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

Arrighi, G. 2007. *Adam Smith in Beijing*. London: Verso.

Avila, E. 2004. *Popular Culture in the Age of White Flight*. Oakland, CA: U. of California Press.

Barjot, D. 1992. 'Francis Bouygues. L'ascension d'un entrepreneur (1952-1989'. *Vingtième Siècle. Revue d'histoire* 35 : 42-59.

Benjamin, W. 1928/1998. *The Origin of German Tragic Drama*. London: Verso.

Benjamin, W. 1939/1999. *The Arcades Project*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bentmann, R. and Müller, M. 1992. *The Villa as Hegemonic Architecture*. London: Humanities Press.

Berg, P.O. and Kreiner, K. 1990. 'Corporate Architecture: Turning Physical Settings into Symbolic Resources'. In *Symbols and Artefacts: Views of the Corporate Landscape* by P. Gagliardi, 124-45. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Booth, C. and Rowlinson, M. 2006. 'Management and Organizational history: Prospects'. *Management & Organizational History* 1/1: 5-30.

Bourdieu, P. 1967. Postface to E. Panofsky, *Architecture gothique et pensée scholastique*, Paris : Les éditions de minuit.

Bourdieu, P. (ed) 1993. *La Misère du monde*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.

Bourdieu, P. 1995. 'Sur les rapports entre la sociologie et l'histoire en Allemagne et en France', *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales* 106–7: 108–22.

Bourdieu, P. 2012. *Sur l'état.* Paris: Raisons d'agir/Seuil.

Buci-Glucksmann, C. 1996. *Baroque Reason: The Aesthetics of Modernity*. London: SAGE.

Bull, M. 2010. 'Green Cabinet, White Cube'. *The New Left Review* 62: 84-97.

Bunshaft, G. 1990. 'Oral history of Gordon Bunshaft', Interviewed by B.J. Blum. Chicago: The Art Institute of Chicago.

Burckhardt, J. 1860/1951. *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*. London: Phaidon Press.

Calhoun, C. 1996. 'The Rise and Domestication of Historical Sociology'. In *The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences* edited by T.J. MacDonald, 305-366. Detroit: U of Michigan Press.

Calhoun, C. 2013. 'For the social history of the present'. In *Bourdieu and Historical Analysis* edited by P.S. Gorski, 36-66. Durham: Duke UP.

Chamboredon, J-C. 1977. 'Introduction to R. Williams, Plaisantes perspectives, Invention du paysage et abolition du paysan'. *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, 17-18: 450-452.

Charle, C. 2013. 'Comparative and Transnational History and the Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu'. In *Bourdieu and Historical Analysis,* edited by P. S. Gorski, 67-88. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Clark, P. and Rowlinson, M. 2004. 'The Treatment of History in Organization Studies: Towards a 'Historic Turn'? *Business History* 46/3: 331-352.

Craven, D. 1992. Introduction to Bentmann, R. and Müller, M. *The Villa as Hegemonic Architecture*. London: Humanities Press.

Dal Co, F. 1985. *Kevin Roche*. New York: Rizzoli.

Dal Co, F. 1990. *Figures of Architecture and Thought.* New York: Rizzoli.

Dale, K. 2005. 'Building a Social Materiality: Spatial and Embodied Politics in Organizational Control. *Organization,* 12: 649.

Dale, K. & Burrell, G. 2003. 'The Spaces of Organisation and the Organisation of Space: Power, Identity and Materiality at Work'. In Carr, A. & Hancock, P. (Eds) *Art and Aesthetics at Work.* Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Dale, K. & Burrell, G., 2011. 'Disturbing Structure: Reading the Ruins'. *Culture & Organization*, 17:2, 107-121

De Blij, H. 2009. *The Power of Place*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dilthey, W. (1883/1985). *Introduction to the Human Sciences: Wilhelm Dilthey: selected works volume 1*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press

Dovey, K. 1999. *Framing Places. Mediating Power in Built Form*. London: Routledge.

Duffy, F. 2000. 'New Ways of Working – A Vision for the Future'. In Clements-Croome, D. (Ed) *Creating the Productive Workplace*, London: E. and F.N. Spon.

Dunlap, D.W. 2008. 'The Office as Architectural Touchstone'. *The New York Times*, 2 March 2008.

Elias, N. 1987. 'The Retreat of Sociologists into the Present'. *Theory, Culture & Society* 4:223-247.

Ellin, N. 1997 (Ed). *Architecture of Fear*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.

Elliott, A. and Urry, J. 2010. *Mobile Lives*. London: Routledge.

Friedman, A. T. 2010. *American Glamour and the Evolution of Modern Architecture*. Yale: Yale University Press.

Gabriel, Y. 2003. 'Glass Palaces and Glass Cages: Organizations in Times of Flexible Work, Fragmented Consumption and Fragile Selves'. *ephemera*, 3/3: 168-184.

Gagliardi, P. 1990. (Ed.) *Symbols and Artefacts: Views of the Corporate Landscape*, New York: Walter de Gruyter, pp.129–146.

Giedion, S. 1970. *Space, Time and Architecture*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Goldberger, P. 1983. ‘Architecture View: A Corporate Equivalent of the Classical Villa’. *The New York Times*. pp. 2–19.

Goldberger, P. 1989. ‘A Corporate Palace that Louis XIV Might Envy’. *New York Times* http://www.nytimes.com/1989/05/14/arts/architecture-view-a-corporate-palace-that-louis-xiv-might-envy.html

Goldberger, P. 2011. ‘Apple’s New Headquarters’. *The New Yorker*, 20 Sept 2011, at http://www.newyorker.com/online/blogs/newsdesk/2011/09/apple-new-headquarters.html

Gorski, P.S. 2013. Introduction, *Bourdieu and Historical Analysis*, 1-18. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Graham, B.C. 1998. Oral History. Interview with B. Blum. Chicago: Art Institute of Chicago.

Gropius, W. 1937. *The New Architecture and the Bauhaus*. London: Faber & Faber.

Guillén, M.F. 1997. ‘Scientific Management’s Lost Aesthetic: Architecture, Organization, and the Taylorized Beauty of the Mechanical’. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 42: 682–715.

Hancock , P. and Spicer, A.. 2011. ‘Academic Architecture and the Constitution of the New Model Worker’. *Culture & Organization*, 17/2: 91–105.

Harris, N. 1996. ‘Architecture and the Business Corporation’. In *The American Corporation Today* by C. Kaysen, 436-468. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harvey, D. 1990. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. London: Blackwell.

Hatch, M.J. 1990. The Symbolics of Office Design: an Empirical Exploration. In Gagliardi, P. (Ed.): *Symbols and Artefacts: Views of the Corporate Landscape*, New York: Walter de Gruyter, pp.129–146.

Hillier, B. and Hanson, J. 1984. *The Social Logic of Space*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hofbauer, J. 2000. ‘Bodies in a Landscape: On Office Design and Organization’. In Hassard, J., Holliday, R. and Willmott, H. (eds), Body and organization. London: SAGE, 166-192.

Interiors. 1957. ‘What’s Good Enough for General Motors: Interiors of the Styling Building in GM’s Technical Center’. *Interiors*, January 1957, 80–89.

Jameson, F. 1991. *Postmodernism; or the Cultural logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Jencks, C. 1976. *The Language of Post-modern Architecture*. Pennsylvania: Rizzoli.

Jencks, C. 1991. ‘Modern vs. Postmodern’. In I. Hoesterey (Ed.) *Zeitgeist in Babel: the postmodernist controversy*, 4-21. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Jones, R. 2013. ‘AD Classics: College Life Insurance Company Headquarters/Kevin Roche John Dinkeloo and Associates', 13 Oct 2013. *ArchDaily*, http://www.archdaily.com/?p=436672

JDN (Journal du net). 2014. ‘Détail des bureaux alvéolés de Challenger’. http://www.journaldunet.com/management/diaporama/bouygues-challenger/4.shtml

Kersten, A., and R. Gilardi. (2003). ‘The Barren Landscape: Reading US Corporate Architecture’. In *Art and Aesthetics at Work*, ed. A. Carr and P. Hancock. Basingstoke: Palgrave, pp138–54.

Kerr, R. and Robinson, S. 2015. ‘Architecture, Circuits of Capital and Elite Mobilizations: The Case of the Royal Bank of Scotland Corporate Campus’, *Organization*, early view, Oct 2015.

Kersten, A., and Gilardi, R. 2003. ‘The Barren Landscape: Reading US Corporate Architecture’. In *Art and aesthetics at work* by A. Carr and P. Hancock, 138-54. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Kieser, A.1994. ‘Crossroads - Why Organization Theory Needs Historical Analysis - And How this should be Performed’. *Organization Science*, 5/4: 608-620.

Kipping, M., Wadhwani, R.D and Bucheli, M. 2014. 'Analyzing and Interpreting Historical Sources: A Basic Methodology', in M. Bucheli, R.D Wadhwani (Eds.) *Organizations in Time: History, Theory, Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Knowles, S.G. and Leslie, S.W. 2013. '"Industrial Versailles": Eero Saarinen's Corporate Campuses for GM, IBM and AT&T'. In *Science and the American Century: Readings from 'Isis'* by S.G. Kohlstedt and D. Kaiser, 235-268. Chicago, ILL: U of Chicago Press.

Le Corbusier.1927/2007. *Towards a New Architecture.* Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute.

Lefebvre, H. 1991. *The Social Production of Space.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Lipstadt, H. 2001. 'Learning from St. Louis'. *Harvard Design Magazine* 14: 4–15.

Lipstadt, H. 2003. 'Can "Art Professions" be Bourdieuean Fields of Cultural Production? The Case of the Architecture Competition'. *Cultural Studies*, 30: 390–419.

Loeffler, J.C. 1998. *The Architecture of Diplomacy: Building America's Embassies.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton Architectural Press.

Luce, H. R. 1941. 'The American Century', *Life*, February 17, 1941, 61–65.

Lupton, J. R. 1996. *Afterlives of the Saints. Hagiography, Typology, and Renaissance Literature.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Maravall, J.A. 1986. *Culture of the Baroque: Analysis of a Historical Structure.* Manchester: University of Manchester Press.

Markus, T.A. 1993. *Buildings and Power*. London: Routledge.

Martin, A. 2006. 'Pastoral Site of Historic Inventions Faces the End', *The New York Times*.

Martin, R. 2006. 'What is Material?' In *Eero Saarinen: Shaping the Future* by E-L Pelkonen and D. Albrecht, D. New Haven & London: Yale University Press

Martin, R. 2010. *Utopia's Ghost: Architecture and Postmodernism, Again*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Marzano, A. 2007. *Roman Villas in Central Italy: A Social and Economic History*. Lieden, Neth.: Brill.

Medina, S. 2014. 'Eero Saarinen's Bell Labs, now devoid of life'. *Metropolis*, Jan 2014, http://www.metropolismag.com/Point-of-View/January-2014/In-Photos-Eero-Saarinens-Bell-Labs/

Miller, R. 2010. 'Union Carbide's Days in the Sun'. *Newstimes.com*. March 2, 2010.

Mozingo, L.A. 2011. *Pastoral Capitalism: a History of Suburban Corporate Landscapes*. Cambridge, MASS: MIT Press.

Mutch, A. 2011. 'Modernist Architecture and Scientific Management: Owen Williams, the Boots "Wets" Building and the Importance of Practice'. *Management & Organizational History*, 6/3: 328-344.

Newman, J.O. 2011. *Benjamin's Library: Modernity, Nation, and the Baroque.* New York: Cornell University Press.

d'Ors, E. 1935. *Du Baroque.* Paris: Gallimard.

Panofsky, E. 1939/2010. *Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Panofsky, E. 1957. *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism.* New York: Meridien Books.

Pelkonen, E-L. and Albrecht, D. 2006. Introduction. In *Eero Saarinen: shaping the future* by E-L Pelkonen and D. Albrecht, D., 10-22. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

Pelkonen, E-L. 2011. *Kevin Roche: Architecture as Environment.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Pelkonen, E-L. and Albrecht, D. (Eds) 2006. *Eero Saarinen: Shaping the Future*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

Phillips, M. 2006. *White Metropolis: Race, Ethnicity, and Religion in Dallas, 1841-2001*. Austin: U of Texas Press.

Pimlott, M. 2007. *Within and Without: Essays on Territory and the Interior*. Amsterdam: Episode.

Prasad, A. 2002. 'Hermeneutics as an Interpretive Methodology for Understanding Texts'. *Organizational Research Methods* 5/1: 12-33.

Prasad, A., and Mir, R. 2002. 'Digging Deep for Meaning: A Critical Hermeneutic Analysis of CEO Letters to Shareholders in the Oil Industry'. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 39: 92-116.

Resnick, S. and Wolff, R. 2002. *Class Theory and History*. NY: Routledge.

Ricoeur, P. 1971. 'The Model of the Text: Meaningful Action Considered as Text. *Social Research***,** 38: 529-562.

Ricoeur, P. 2004. *The Conflict of Interpretations.* London: Continuum, 2004.

Robinson, S., and Kerr, R. 2009. 'The Symbolic Violence of Leadership: A Critical Hermeneutic Study of Leadership and Succession in a British International Organization in the Post-Soviet Context'. *Human Relations*, 62: 877–905.

Robinson, S. and Kerr, R. 2015. 'Reflexive Conversations: Constructing Hermeneutic Designs for Qualitative Management Research'. *British Journal of Management 26* (4): 777–790

Roche, K. 1984. *Statements for History*. London: Pidgeon Audio Visual.

Roche, K. 1985. Interview, in *Kevin Roche*, by F. Dal Co. New York: Rizzoli.

Ross, D. 1991. *The Origins of American Social Science.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rowlinson, M. and Hassard, J. 2013. 'Historical Neo-institutionalism or Neo-institutionalist History?' *Management & Organizational History* 8/2: 111-126.

Saarinen, E. 1958/2006. Selected writings. In *Eero Saarinen: shaping the future* by E-L Pelkonen and D. Albrecht, 341-355. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

Schulze, F. and Windhurst, E. 2013. *Mies van der Rohe: A Critical Biography*. Chicago: U of Chicago Press.

Scott, A.J. and Storper, M. 1989. 'The Geographical Foundations and Social Regulation of Flexible Production Complexes'. In *The power of geography* by J. Wolch and M. Dear, 21-40. London: Routledge.

Scully, V. 2006. 'Rethinking Saarinen'. In *Eero Saarinen: shaping the future* by E-L Pelkonen and D. Albrecht. New Haven & London: Yale University Press

Shearn, I.T. 2008. 'Abandoned Bell Labs could make history again'. *New Jersey Real Time News*, 3 Aug 2008, at

http://www.nj.com/news/index.ssf/2008/08/abandoned_bell_labs_could_make.html

Spencer, D. 2011. 'Architectural Deleuzism: Neoliberal Space, Control and the 'Univer-city'. *Radical Philosophy*, 168:9-21.

Steinmetz, G. 2011. 'Bourdieu, Historicity, and Historical Sociology'. *Cultural Sociology*, 5/1: 45-66.

Suddaby, R. Foster, W. and Mills, A. J. 2014. 'Historical Institutionalism'. In *Organizations in Time* by M. Bucheli and D. Wadhwani, 100-123. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swartz, D. L. 2008. 'Bringing Bourdieu's Master Concepts into Organizational Analysis'. *Theory and Society* 37: 45–52.

Swartz, D.L. 2013. ‘Metaprinciples for Sociological Research in a Bourdieusian Perspective’. In *Bourdieu and historical analysis* by P.S. Gorski, 19-35. Durham and London : Duke University Press.

Susen, S. 2015. ‘Towards a Critical Sociology of Dominant Ideologies: An Unexpected Reunion between Pierre Bourdieu and Luc Boltanski’, *Cultural Sociology*, 1-52.

Tafuri, M. 1985. *Venice and the Renaissance*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Thompson, J.B. 1981. *Critical Hermeneutics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Time. 1956. ‘The Maturing Modern’. July 2, 1956, 50–57.

Tuomi, T. 2006. ‘Embassies and Chanceries: the Necessity of Unity. *Eero Saarinen: shaping the future* by E-L Pelkonen and D. Albrecht. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

Üsdiken, B. and Kieser, A. 2004. ‘Introduction: History in Organisation Studies’. *Business History* 46(3): 321-330.

van Marrewijk, A.H. and Yanow, D. 2010. (eds.) *Organizational Spaces: Rematerializing the Workaday World.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Vernant, J-P. 1988. *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece*. New York: Zone Books.

Wainwright, O. 2015. ‘Google's new headquarters: an upgradable, futuristic greenhouse’. *The Guardian,* http://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2015/feb/27/googles-new-headquarters-upgradable-futuristic-greenhouse

Wasserman, V.and Frenkel, M. 2011. Organizational aesthetics: caught between identity regulation and culture jamming’, *Organization Science*, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp.503–521.

Weber, M. 1949. Critical Studies in the Logic of the Cultural Sciences, part II: Objective Possibility and Adequate Causation in Historical Explanation. *The Methodology of the Social Sciences.* New York.

Whyte, W.H. 1988. *City: Rediscovering the Center*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Williams, R. 1977. 'Plaisantes perspectives, Invention du paysage et abolition du paysan'. *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, 17-18 : 450-452.

Yates, J. 2007. 'The Taylorized Beauty of the Mechanical: Scientific Management and the Rise of Modernist Architecture'. *Business History*, 49: 945-6.

Zald, M. N. 1993. 'Organization Studies as a Scientific and Humanistic Enterprise - Toward a Reconceptualization of the Foundations of the Field. *Organization Science* 4/4: 513-528.

APPENDIX: chronology of key campuses

1950s	1960-64	1965-69	1970-75	1975-79	1980-84	1985-89	1990-1994	1995-1999	2000-2005
General Motors (Saarinen), IBM Rochester (Saarinen), Connecticut General (SOM), Reynolds Metals (SOM),	IBM Yorktown (Saarinen, John Deere (Saarinen), Bell Labs (Saarinen), Upjohn (SOM)	College Life (Roche), Boots Nottingham (SOM), Heinz Park, Hillingdon (SOM)	Pepsico (E.D. Stone 1970), Richardson-Vicks (Roche), American Can (SOM), Weyerhauser (SOM), Wills, Bristol	Deere extension (Roche), Bell (Roche),	Conoco (Roche), General Foods (Roche), Union Carbide (Roche), Cummins (Roche), IBM,	Bouygues (Roche), Volvo (Roche), SAS (Torp), TRW (Lohan), Becton Dickinson (Kallman, McKinnell	Borland (Roche), Merck (Roche), Corning (Roche)	Total Systems (Roche), Lucent Tech (Roche), BA Waterside (Torp)	Santander (Roche), RBS, Lucent Nuremberg, GlaxoSmithKline

General Foods, White Plains (Vorhees 1954).			**(SOM) Baxter Int, Johns Manville (TAC)**		**Purchase, NY, 1984, (IM Pei).**	**& Wood), Codex (Kotter, Kim & Assoc)**			