

Architecture, like other professions, has been engaged in a century-long struggle for professional turf, social status, financial rewards and control over the labour process through legal monopoly powers (Kostof, 1977). Although the professionalization of architecture was achieved largely among the new technical developments, new ideas about business organization and new opportunities brought by the Industrial Revolution, it was the architect's pretensions to art and aesthetics that clinched the profession's individuality, status and legitimacy (Larson, 1983). Architects' emphasis on the artistic aspects of their work was partly a defensive strategy in the struggle for turf with engineers and other building specialists, but it was also because of the status associated with creativity, the lure of immortality attached to the authorship of important works of art, and the appeal of establishing an inspirational role directed, ostensibly, at social good rather than personal enrichment. Consequently, the lumpen-intelligentsia of architecture has always rated its members on their artistic achievements, the authoritative trade magazines – *Architectural Design*, *Progressive Architecture*, *Architectural Review*, *Domus*, *Werk* – have always stressed the aesthetic over the practical, and schools of architecture have consistently instilled an ethic of aesthetic avant-gardism (Gutman, 1985a; Prak, 1984).

It did not take long, in the cloisters of Modernist idealism, for this orientation to narrow into a vain arrogance. Clients, other professionals and users were systematically excluded, and often patronized. Corbusier, for example, suggested that people would have to be 'reeducated' to appreciate his urban vision, while Walter Gropius felt that it would be useless to consult the beneficiaries of his utopian designs for workers' housing because they were 'intellectually undeveloped'. Mies van der Rohe, asked if he ever submitted alternative schemes to a client, replied:

Only one. Always. And the best one that we can give. That is where you can fight for what you believe in. He doesn't have to choose. How can he choose? He hasn't the capacity to choose . . .
(quoted in Prak, 1984, 95),

Armed with these attitudes, architects were able to maintain a resolute hold on the wrong end of the determinist stick, with consequences that became written into the social as well as the physical fabric of the city (Jacobs, 1961).

But advances in technology and engineering posed dilemmas for an artistically-oriented profession.

American architects, for example, have repeatedly ceded the technical side of the building process to specialists – from engineers to interior designers (Ventre, 1982); yet, in order to maintain their self-appointed role as leaders of the building team, they have had to acquire a wide range of technical skills: in order to coordinate artistic design with code requirements and structural engineering constraints, for example. These skills have come to be reflected in the division of labour within larger architectural practices; but architectural educators and the professional press have persisted with the aesthetics of design to the virtual exclusion of the pragmatic and policy-related issues of building – a trend which Gutman (1985) suggests is linked to the rise of post-Modernism.

Meanwhile, the rise of big business and big government brought further dilemmas. The size of private practices and government departments that came to serve the big corporate and public clients fostered the division of architectural labour (and so effectively restricted opportunities for artistic expression) while drawing more and more architects into managerial and bureaucratic roles (Cullen, 1983). These trends were accentuated both by the property boom of the 1960s and by the political conservatism that accompanied the economic slump of the late 1970s (Saint, 1983). One outcome of the trend towards architect/managers and architect/entrepreneurs, according to Saint, has been a reaction against the influence of the 'prima donna architect'. The erosion of this influence, in turn, has made it easier for the eclecticism of post-Modernism to flourish.

Nevertheless, it was the spell of art that successfully legitimized the profession, and aesthetics remain a major element of architects' education and professional socialization. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that architects have a distinctive set of values that are dominated by a blend of artistic design and environmental determinism (Blau, 1984; Lipman, 1969; Prak, 1984; Salaman, 1974; Valadez, 1984). Blau's survey of New York architects (1984) reveals some interesting detail to this generalization, however. One particularly striking aspect of her findings relates to the differences which exist between the values and orientations of principals and those of rank-and-file architects. Principals, it seems, are much more business-minded, with aesthetic values that weaken rapidly in the face of economic austerity. Rank-and-file architects, on the other hand, are strongly committed to liberal, humanist and socially responsible values, as well as