being favourably disposed (somewhat ambiguously) towards both artistic approaches and technical solutions.

This cleavage is reflected in the relative autonomy of architects. Many rank-and-file architects, according to Blau (1984), feel that they have little or no 'voice' because of their specialization in routine tasks outside the realm of decisions about design. The voice of principals and senior architects, meanwhile, is often closely circumscribed by the conservatism of other urban managers (Halper, 1967; Prak, 1984). Goodman (1972) wrote that

> *our economic system has reduced the architect to the role of providing culturally acceptable rationalizations for projects whose form and use have already been determined by real-estate speculation.*

Yet the relative autonomy of design itself, noted above, leaves architects with a significant influence on urban outcomes. Moreover, architects effectively act as arbiters, in many circumstances, between developers and builders (Dickens, 1979); and those – like Richard Siefert, John Portman and the notorious John Poulson – who have been able to make the transition to architect/entrepreneurs have been able to act as master coordinators of urban change and redevelopment, with profound implications in terms of 'who gets what, when and where'.

With the crisis of Modernist architecture, the role of architects as urban managers is in flux:

> *As the forces of late capitalism make themselves increasingly felt, profit for the professions becomes a motive more compelling than status or class, and the interest of architects falls into line with that of the construction industry (Saint, 1983, 160).*

At the same time, of course, competition from engineers, building programmers, construction managers, facilities managers, interior designers, home-builders and package dealers has become more intense, fostering the transition of the architect from a principled professional into a hustler (Banham, 1982). The internationalization of the economy under advanced capitalism, meanwhile, appears to have become as much a threat as an opportunity for architects: between 1980 and 1983, design services imports to the US grew by 300 per cent (Ventre, 1986). Some architects, in response to these pressures, have sought to capitalize on the 'contextual' emphasis of post-Modernism to stake a claim on urban design, only to find themselves in a new turf conflict with planners and landscape architects (Knack, 1984).

The outcome of such trends is important not only for the profession itself but also for the form and dynamics of the post-Modern city. As Gottdiener (1985) emphasizes, the design of the built environment is an important element of the productive forces of society, not just a reflection of them. 'The question of control over spatial relations and design', he asserts, 'represents the same revolutionary importance to society as the struggle over the control of the other means of production, because both ownership relations and relations of material externalization – that is, the production of space – are united in the property relations which form the core of the capitalist mode of production' (1985, 124–25). The economic and social operation, as well as the aesthetics, of the post-Modern city will thus depend in part on the interactions between the profession and the opportunities and constraints, stimuli and deterrents, of the postaffluent phase of advanced capitalism.

References

Agrest, D. 1977: Architectural anagrams: the symbolic performance of skyscrapers. *Oppositions* 11, 26–51.

Allen, J.A. 1983: *The romance of commerce and culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Allsopp, B. *A modern theory of architecture*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Ankerl, G. 1981: *Experimental sociology of architecture*. New Babylon: De Gruyter.

Appleton, I. 1979: The urban political context of architecture. *Edinburgh Architecture Research* 6, 98–98.

Appleyard, D. 1979: The environment as social symbol. *Ekistics* 46, 272–81.

Banham, R. 1975: *The age of the masters*. London: Architectural Press.

1982: The architect as gentleman and the architect as hustler. *RIBA Transactions* 1, 33–38.

Barthes, R. 1967: *Elements of semiology*. London: Cape. 1973: Seminology and urbanism. *Via* 2, 155–57.

Baudrillard, J. 1981: *For a political economy of the sign*. St Louis, Missouri: Telos Press.

Blau, J. 1984: *Architects and firms*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

1987: Where architects work: a change analysis, 1970–1980. In Knox, P.L., editor, *The design professions and the built environment*, Beckenham: Croom Helm.

Bloch, E. 1977: *Der geist der utopie*. Frankfurt a/M: Suhrkamp.

Blonsky, H. 1985: *On signs*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bontinck, I. 1978: Cultural dimensions of architecture and town planning in Europe: town planning, architecture and the quality of life. *International Social Science Journal* 30, 560–90.

TEAM LinG