

Vulgar Modernism: J.M. Richards, modernism and the vernacular in British Architecture.

In 1946 J.M. Richards, editor of *The Architectural Review* (AR) and self-proclaimed champion of modernism, published a book entitled *The Castles on the Ground* (Fig. 1). This book, which he had written while working for the Ministry of Information (MoI) in Cairo during the war, was a study of British suburban architecture and contained long, romantic descriptions of the suburban house and garden. Richards described the suburb as a place in which ‘everything is in its place’ and where ‘the abruptness, the barbarities of the world are far away’.¹ For this reason *The Castles on the Ground* is most often remembered as a retreat from pre-war modernism, into nostalgia for mock-Tudor houses and privet hedges.² Reyner Banham, who worked with Richards at the AR in 1950s, described the book as a ‘blank betrayal of everything that Modern Architecture was supposed to stand for’.³ More recently the book has been rediscovered and reassessed for its contribution to mid-twentieth-century debates about the relationship between modern architects and the British public.⁴ These reassessments get closer to Richards’ original aim for the book. He was not concerned with the style of suburban architecture for its own sake, but with the question of why the style was so popular and what it meant for the role of modern architects in Britain and their relationship to the ‘man in the street’.⁵

Richards was intrigued by the ‘universality’ of suburban architectural styles and their ability to span the divisions of generation and social class. The suburb had what he described as ‘the one quality of all true vernaculars, that of being rooted in the people’s instincts’.⁶ The links between modernism and vernacular architecture in Britain have been written about extensively.⁷ These links were first articulated in in 1934, in Philip Morton Shand’s series in the AR, ‘A Scenario for Human Drama’,⁸ and then in Nikolaus Pevsner’s *Pioneers of the Modern Movement*, published by Faber in 1936.⁹ Both Shand and Pevsner established a narrative of modernism having developed from the Arts and Crafts movement in England, and this narrative was, for much of the twentieth century, the accepted history and definition of modern architecture in Britain. While Richards was

definitely party to this narrative of modernism as part of the inevitable evolution of British architecture, his approach to and writing about vernacular architecture differed slightly from Pevsner's and his colleagues at the *AR*. Richards coupled the idea that modernism grew out of the tradition of British architecture with an argument that vernacular architecture – meaning that produced by and for ordinary people rather than architects – offered lessons about the place of the architect in culture and how modernism could develop into a universal idiom. I use culture in the sense that Raymond Williams describes it as 'a whole way of life, material, intellectual, spiritual'.¹⁰ Richards was concerned with what role the architect could play in developing the culture of Britain. In *The Castles on the Ground* he aimed to elucidate the values and practices of vernacular architecture (the suburb) in order for modern architects to better understand the needs of the ordinary man and in turn foster a more effective and productive role for architects in developing the culture of twentieth-century Britain. This did not mean pandering to existing tastes, but guiding British culture towards a more authentic form of architecture. Erdem Erten's work on Richards has begun to rediscover this strand of his thinking by exploring the links between Richards' left wing politics and his preoccupation with anonymity in modern and vernacular architecture.¹¹ Building on Erten's work, I suggest that Richards' focus on the relationship between modernism and the vernacular in architecture was based on his ideas about the role of the architect in culture. Richards believed that architects, as specialists, had a responsibility to guide the evolution of culture. He argued that change in architecture could not be imposed by architects but that it had to 'grow, with its roots in the instincts and basic structure of the society that adopts it' - at the pace at which vernacular architecture does.¹²

This article explores Richards' consistent preoccupation, throughout his career, with the role of the modern architect in relation to public taste and existing values in architecture. In 1941 Richards wrote a column in the *AR* that set out his position on this issue. He explained that architecture was divided into two strands: the intellectual (belonging to the educated elite in society) and the vulgar, using 'vulgar' in the sense of being of ordinary people.¹³ Vulgar

architecture was thus vernacular architecture - an unconscious style that lay beyond the taste and individual creativity of architects. Vulgar architecture was the architecture of the 'man in the street'. He argued that historically - particularly during the Georgian period - intellectual architecture had provided rules and codes, which vulgar architecture had used as a pattern, adapting it and producing a spontaneous and vital architecture of ordinary people.¹⁴ However, this relationship had been lost and 'intellectual' modernism was not providing a 'code of behaviour' for vulgar architecture in Britain.¹⁵ As a result, vulgar architecture - the architecture of ordinary people, such as the suburb - was resorting to revivalist styles or cheap imitations of modernism and, in turn, modernism was not achieving its full potential as a universal idiom.¹⁶ Richards insisted that the future of modern architecture lay in cultivating a 'new vulgarity'.¹⁷ This meant forming a modernism that was by and for ordinary people and which re-established the relationship between intellectual architects and ordinary people in Britain. This emphasis on a 'new vulgarity' - architecture by ordinary people, which complemented the work of intellectual architects - was the lynchpin of Richards' career as a journalist, broadcaster and committeeman. Although the column about vulgar modernism was written during the war, it grew out of his pre-war ideas about the relationship between modernism, vernacular architecture and ordinary people. Before, during and after the Second World War, until his retirement in 1971, Richards espoused the role of modern architects to provide guidelines for vulgar architecture.

This article seeks to re-evaluate Richards' place in British modernism by tracing the formation and elaboration of his ideas, revealing his influences and his specific perspectives. Starting from the 1930s, I will explore Richards' arrival at the *AR* and how his writing was part of the wider practice of linking the idea of the *zeitgeist* (which came from European Hegelian philosophy and presented architecture as a reflection of the 'spirit of the age') with British vernacular architecture in order to define modernism. Richards' marriage to the artist Peggy Angus, his friendships with Eric Ravilious, Edward Bawden, Ben Nicholson and John Piper and his working relationship with Nikolaus Pevsner and Hubert De Cronin Hastings in the 1930s all informed his ideas about modernism, as did his

travels to Europe and interactions (through his work at the *AR*) with architects like Le Corbusier, Bertold Lubetkin and Erno Goldfinger. Elizabeth Darling has suggested that the conventional narrative of modernism being imported to Britain from Continental Europe offers only a partial view of the emergence and nature of modernism in Britain.¹⁸ Looking at how Richards formulated his ideas about modernism, within a circle of artists, architects and critics in the 1930s, reveals the overlaps between ideas coming from Europe and an existing culture of modernism in Britain. Exploring the interior spaces that Richards and his friends and colleagues lived and worked in - particularly Peggy Angus's cottage, Furlongs, in Sussex, and the spaces designed for the MARS exhibition - further reveals the roots of Richards' ideas about modernism and vulgar architecture and the origins of his ideas about the role of the architect.

Richards' life and career were divided by the war. The split pivots on the year 1946, the same year that *The Castles on the Ground* was published. It was also the year that he returned to London from Cairo, where he had worked editing an Arabic language magazine for the MoI. On returning Richards found himself cut off from his previous life and circle of friends. He and Peggy Angus had separated in 1942 (they divorced in 1948) and his close friend Eric Ravilious had been killed during the war. Richards never went back to Furlongs. He, along with many of his colleagues, took up new positions of authority within British culture. Richards was employed as the architectural correspondent for *The Times* in 1948 and became a regular contributor to the BBC. In the context of his changed position in post-war culture, I will consider the consistencies in Richards' ideas that link this period with his pre-war life and work.

Richards' work offers an important thread of consistency between the pre and post-war periods of British architecture. The tendency in current histories to focus on the *AR*'s post-war 'Townscape' series - which emphasized the picturesque and the integration of traditional and modern architecture - overlooks Richards' consistent interest in developing a vernacular or 'vulgar' modernism.¹⁹ Tracing the consistencies in Richards' work challenges the conventional narrative that after the war modern architects in Britain sought a

more humanized, even compromised, form of modernism. On the contrary, Richards' consistent focus on the link between 'intellectual' and 'vulgar' architecture suggests that the interest in accounting for and accommodating popular taste in architecture was not a post-war compromise but a consistent aspect of modernism in Britain. Richards' post-war position within the mainstream of architectural culture was because of the consistency of his own ideas about vulgar architecture, rather than these ideas being a stance that he adopted post-war.

1946 was also the year that Hubert de Cronin Hastings (Chairman of the Architectural Press and executive editor of both *AR* and *Architects Journal*) together with Hugh Casson, John Piper, Osbert Lancaster and Nikolaus Pevsner, built a bar in the basement of the *AR*'s offices at Queen Anne's Gate in London (Fig. 2). Built from salvaged remnants of Victorian pubs (damaged during the war), 'The Bride of Denmark' (named in reference to Queen Anne having married a Prince of Denmark) became a centre of post-war British architectural culture. The interior of the pub is often discussed as evidence of the compromised character of post-war modernism.²⁰ A cavern of Victoriana and eclectic memorabilia it has been read as a symbol of a 'conservative world-view that emphasized the importance of tradition'.²¹ While Richards was involved in decorating the pub, and he certainly would have frequented it, 'The Bride' did not represent his approach to post-war modernism as closely as it did that of De Cronin Hastings and Gordon Cullen (who together originated the 'Townscape' series). Although Richards was no longer part of the circle at Furlongs, the ideas that he had established there remained at the heart of his approach to modernism, evidenced by his talks for BBC radio and at the CIAM VI congress.²² Richards was involved in setting up the Institute of Contemporary Art (ICA) in London and worked on the Architecture Committee of the Festival of Britain, which produced the Live Architecture Exhibition in East London for the festival. These two spaces – the ICA building at Dover Street and the exhibition in Poplar – were more pertinent to his post-war work than was 'The Bride'. His interests were increasingly taking him in a different direction to that of Hastings and the rest of the *AR*. However, his ideas were challenged in the 1950s and 1960s by a

new generation of architects and critics, voiced most clearly by the writer and critic Reyner Banham. In 1972 Richards retired from the magazine and a year later *The Castles on the Ground* was republished with a new foreword and also a subheading, 'the anatomy of suburbia'. Although he had left the magazine, Richards' ideas about vulgar architecture remained a constant and he now found common ground with another group of architects and planners.

Vulgarity in architecture was not about style or tradition for Richards, but about the role of architects in culture. It was about reimagining the place of architecture in society and the role of the architect in its culture. Such a perspective fits with the argument that modernism was neither a style nor a singular set of principles in architecture but 'a loose constellation of different elements'²³ or a 'sensibility'.²⁴ In particular, this essay responds to Sarah Williams Goldhagen's definition of modernism as a discourse, or 'an ongoing discussion among practitioners about the ideal role of architecture in modern society and culture', which encompassed 'different styles, movements, genres and media'.²⁵ I would extend Goldhagen's concept to encompass personal relationships, professional networks and interior spaces. The term modernism as it is used in this article, must be distinguished from the Modern Movement and Modernism. The Modern Movement was a group of predominantly European architects who produced a new type of architecture in Europe from roughly the end of the First World War. When 'Modern' appears in this article with a capital 'M' it refers to the work of this group; 'modernism' appears most often with a lower-case 'm', referring to an approach to architecture rather than a distinct movement or group. Like 'conservatism' and the 'Conservative Party', modernism bears a relationship to the Modern Movement but also has broader applications and meanings.

The material explored in this article draws attention to the breadth of Richards' work before and after the war: from publishing and broadcasting to committee work. It contributes to the growing discussion of Richards' role within modernism and, more generally, the role of critics, writers, journalists and editors, not just architects, in forming architectural culture.²⁶ Richards' life and

career reveal the overlaps between different media and organisations, as well as the interrelation of personal and professional relationships, within modernism in Britain. Rediscovering Richards and his persistent discussion of the integral link between ‘intellectual’ and ‘vulgar’ architecture offer a new dimension to our understandings of modernism in British architecture.

The Architectural Review in the 1930s: Zeitgeist and vernacular in architecture.

James Maude Richards (Jim to his friends) trained as an architect at the Architectural Association (AA) in London in the 1920s. During his studies he travelled to Europe with his fellow students and was ‘captivated’ by modernism.²⁷ After graduating in 1929 his career in practice was short lived; he went to work for *The Architect's Journal* in 1933 and in 1935 moved to *The Architectural Review*, in 1937 becoming an editor. As a journalist and editor Richards was a key figure among the group of architects, artists and critics defining modernism in British art and architecture in the 1930s.

The *AR's* sympathy for Modern architecture had begun in the late 1920s, when Hubert De Cronin Hastings became editor. Hastings began to feature examples of new architecture from Europe and employed Philip Morton Shand, who acted as the bridge between the *AR* and the continental Modern Movement. As well as featuring modern architecture from Europe the magazine cultivated a burgeoning culture of modernism in British architecture. John Gloag said of Hubert De Cronin Hastings that ‘he was the first really to introduce modern journalism into trade papers’.²⁸ The *AR* had an agenda in the form of defining and promoting modernism in architecture, an agenda intended to spread beyond the architectural profession as the magazine sought to reach a wider readership, among the public at large. Hastings employed writers, such as John Betjeman, to broaden the appeal of the magazine. In January 1947, looking back over the first half century of the magazine, the editors compared their publication to the BBC, as a vehicle for bringing culture to a broad, interested audience.²⁹

In 1935 John Betjeman left the *AR* and J.M. Richards moved from the *AJ* to replace him. Richards was more than happy with this transfer, as he was 'more interested in architecture as such than in the professional and technical news that it was more the Journal's role to handle'.³⁰ Richards cut a somewhat reserved and quiet figure in comparison to Betjeman's extravagant style and aestheticism. Betjeman's writing was flamboyant and idiosyncratic, while Richards' was pared back. Richards' approach, with his attention to technical and theoretical details and rationalized explanation of ideas and opinions, marked a move towards modernization in the way that architecture was written about at the *AR*. It marked a move away from the amateur dilettante towards the technocrat in architectural journalism - Richards was a trained architect addressing a professional and layman audience.

Richards' writing in the *AR* in the 1930s was part of a magazine's work to delineate what modernism in architecture was and promote it to their professional and layman readership. His work was part of a growing number of articles explaining and promoting architecture's relationship to the *zeitgeist* or the 'spirit of the age'. This was an idea developed from Hegelian philosophy, which understood art as the embodiment of the character and values of the culture of which it was part. For instance Ancient Greek art and culture was explained as the expression of the 'world view' of Ancient Greek society'.³¹ The place of the *zeitgeist* in defining modernism is well rehearsed - it was what differentiated modernism from the mainstream of the British architectural profession in the 1930s. In 1931 Serge Chermayeff wrote in the *AJ* that the only architecture that could be classified modern was that which 'contributed to the expression of this spirit and those ideals which are peculiarly of our time'.³² In 1935 Marcel Breuer, wrote in the *AR* that architecture should 'interrogate that unwritten law of our own convictions, the spirit of our age'.³³ While the role of Hegelian principles in the European Modern Movement is well established, these same principles are often seen as alien to British intellectual or architectural approaches. However, Richards' work suggests that Hegelian principles were compatible with an interest in vernacular architecture as a model for the evolution of culture. His writing during the 1930s emphasises the coexistence of

ideas based on European Hegelian principles and an interest in British cultures of popular, vernacular design.

Richards' first article for the *AR*, published in 1935, was entitled 'Towards a Rational Aesthetic'. Aiming to explain the 'intrinsic connection' between architecture and the specific circumstance of the civilization that produces it,³⁴ this article was based on Lewis Mumford's book *Technics and Civilisation* (1934). Mumford had argued that art changes in response to changing social and cultural factors – in the case of modern times, namely to the machine – saying that with 'machines and instruments' came 'a fresh kind of perception and pleasure' and that 'to interpret this order becomes one of the new tasks of the arts'.³⁵ Following Mumford's idea, Richards' wrote that architecture has to 'reflect the real, essential world of scientific order that underlies our civilization: the world men carry in their heads'.³⁶ The phrase 'the world men carry in their heads', although not attributed in the article, was a quote from Oswald Spengler's *The Decline of the West*.³⁷ Spengler, a German art historian, was described by Nikolaus Pevsner as 'the first to perceive the immensely illuminating parallel between [...] scientific discoveries, which transformed man's view of the universe, and the artistic innovations of the Seventeenth Century'.³⁸ Spengler's influential work rested on the idea of the *zeitgeist*. Richards' article contributed to the definition of modernism in British design and architecture as the natural expression of contemporary British society and part of the evolution of human culture, rather than as a foreign import.

This notion that architecture should express the *zeitgeist* rather than the individual creativity of the architect led to an interest in vernacular architecture – anonymous architecture made by unnamed or non-architects. Vernacular architecture was increasingly valued for being based on principles beyond individual taste, such as functionalism. In his writing Richards increasingly presented vernacular architecture as a model for how architecture could express the *zeitgeist*. This was consistent with the interest in 'primitive' art among modern architects such as Le Corbusier during this period. An exhibition in Le Corbusier's Paris apartment in 1935 entitled 'Les Arts dits primitifs dans la

maison d'aujourd'hui' featured the work of contemporary artists such as Ferdinand Leger, Picasso and Braque alongside ancient and historic artefacts. However, the examples of vernacular design that Richards looked to were often industrial and sometimes mass-produced. Richards' interest in vernacular architecture was spurred by his friendship with John Piper. In the late 1930s Richards joined Piper on several of his drives around Britain,³⁹ trips that occasionally resulted in articles for the *AR*. For instance, one trip in May 1937 resulted in the 1938 article 'The Nautical Style' in the *AR*.⁴⁰ Richards wrote to Peggy during this trip that 'the best thing we have visited is "Start Point Lighthouse" and the "Trinity House buoy store"', both of which would subsequently feature in the published article.⁴¹ Through this 'Nautical Style' article Piper and Richards gently proposed modernism's place within the specific context of British popular and vernacular architecture - among the realms of seaside buildings and traditional pubs.⁴² They were encouraging the reader to see functionalism not as something shocking and alien, but as a continuation of a long history of vernacular architecture in Britain. In 1958 Richards published *The Functional Tradition*, a study of the history of industrial vernacular in Britain, with photographs by Eric de Maré. This book is discussed in detail by Erdem Erten and is evidence of the continuity of Richards' ideas before and after the war.⁴³

Richards' interest in vernacular architecture extended beyond one of mere style or aesthetics; rather, it derived from his understanding of the role of the architect in shaping culture. In his essay for *Circle: an international survey of constructivist art* (1937), he argued that the individual expression of the architect should be subsumed into a vernacular, as it had been in Georgian architecture, when 'architects [...] were anonymous - that is to say, their personalities culturally irrelevant'.⁴⁴ He hoped that modern architecture would once again create a situation in which the personality of the architect was 'culturally irrelevant' and architecture expressed a 'quality of inevitability' based on the spirit of the age (*zeitgeist*), instead of the individuality of the architect.⁴⁵ This was because he believed that the architect's role in forming culture was to

provide anonymous models that were universally understood. In this context vernacular architecture offered an ideal model for the architect's role.

In the same year that *Circle* was published, Richards was commissioned by Allan Lane to write a book about modern architecture for the Pelican imprint of Penguin books.⁴⁶ His book, *An Introduction to Modern Architecture*, was published in 1940. The book further elucidated Richards' ideas about the role of the architect in culture. He argued that architects could not simply force people to accept modernism, but that acceptance would have to evolve over time. Richards insisted that the 'judgment' of architecture 'must be independent of intellectual knowledge', that such 'judgment' must be something that is seen and innately understood, not learnt.⁴⁷ Therefore architects had to engage with the existing needs and values of 'the man on the street', in order for Modernism to become popular and eventually be 'that common style that releases us from consciousness of style'.⁴⁸ For Richards, the ultimate aim for modernism was to become something inevitable, something beyond conscious choice and taste - in other words, to become a vernacular.

This issue of how change would happen in architecture was also related to the influence of Hegelian philosophy on the Modern Movement. Richards understood vernaculars as the existing conditions of architecture. He believed that in order to affect the future of architecture, architects would have to learn from these existing conditions. Hegelian philosophy premises the real and the existing; theory that 'transgresses its time and builds up a world as it ought to be' would have no real world effect because it only existed 'in the unstable element of opinion, which gives room to every wandering fancy'.⁴⁹ Hegel asserted that philosophy had to focus on the existing and the present, rather than the imagined future or the past, that philosophy could only study what was real and that it could not be 'the exposition of a world beyond, which is merely a castle in the air, having no existence except in the terror of a one-sided and empty formalism of thought'.⁵⁰ The title of Richards' 1946 book, *The Castles on the Ground* echoed this idea. Even if Richards never read Hegel - and he almost certainly had not - his work resonates with its perspectives picked up through

friends and colleagues and from the culture surrounding modern architecture in the 1930s. Richards expanded further on his position in the book when he implored modern architecture to anchor itself in the actual:

While continuing to build our castles in the air, let us not ignore those that already exist – somewhat untidily scattered, it is true – on the ground. In addition to searching the horizon for the promise of a new vernacular, let us accept also for what it is worth the one on our own doorstep.⁵¹

The importance of the ‘what is’ in architecture, rather than the ‘what might be’, shaped Richards’ response to vernacular architecture.

Nikolaus Pevsner, who began writing for the *AR* in 1936 (the year after Richards joined the magazine), also described this perspective on change in 1938, for a special issue of the *AR* (which, however, was never published). In the drafts (which also bear Richards’ handwriting), Pevsner explains:

Architecture is not the product of materials and purposes – nor by the way of social conditions – but of the changing spirits of changing ages [...] the Modern Movement did not come into being because steel frame and reinforced concrete construction had been worked out – they were worked out because a new spirit required them.⁵²

Pevsner’s perspective here on history and architecture influenced Richards. In a letter from October 1939 regarding the special issue that they were working on together, Richards referred to a conversation they had had about the war and said he agreed with Pevsner’s description of the conflict as ‘an interlude between two architectural periods’.⁵³ The two men obviously discussed ideas, but Pevsner was just one of the many people in the group that Richards was a part of and who were involved in the debate about and definition of modernism in Britain during this period.

Popular, vernacular design, modernism and interiors at Furlongs and MARS:

The group of people with whom Richards worked and socialized during the 1930s was pivotal in forming his ideas about modernism and the role of the architect. In 1934 Richards met the artist Peggy Angus (through their mutual friend Eric Ravilious) and the couple married in 1936. In a letter to Angus that year, Richards described an evening in London, which depicts his place amongst this crowd of modern artists and architects:

Ben's sherry party was a good one arranged to welcome some of the abstract artists from Paris who had come over for the opening of the Lefevre show. Serge was there [...] [We] called for Barbara at their house and went to the Russian film [...] the evening I spent with some people called Martin from Hull [...] whom I met at Ben's.⁵⁴

'Ben' was Ben Nicolson, the abstract artist; Richards knew his brother, the architect Kit Nicolson, from Greshams school where they had been pupils together.⁵⁵ 'Serge' was Serge Chermayeff, a modern architect, who worked with Erich Mendelsohn and, with him, designed the De La Warr Pavilion at Bexhill (built in 1935). Chermayeff had visited Richards and Peggy Angus at Furlongs and later built his own modern 'cottage', Bentley Wood, close by. The 'people called Martin from Hull' were Leslie and Sadie Martin (née Speight). Sadie Martin became close friends with Peggy Angus and was involved in the production of the *AR* during the war,⁵⁶ while it was through Leslie Martin that Richards would become involved in the publication of *Circle*. 'Barbara' was Barbara Hepworth, the sculptor who also worked on editing *Circle*, but was not credited in the publication; she married Ben Nicholson in 1938. The exhibition at the Lefevre Gallery was 'Abstract and Concrete', which along with *Axis* magazine, edited by Myfanwy Piper, was the first public articulation of the ideas and aesthetics of modern abstract art in England. That exhibition was organised by Nicolette Gray, Helen Binyon's sister, and Helen was another friend of Peggy Angus (they had shared a flat in London in 1933) and also had a relationship with Eric Ravilious in the 1930s. In addition, Richards was good friends with John and Myfanwy Piper. He had met Myfanwy through people at the AA and she introduced him to John Piper in 1935; later that year John and Myfanwy married and moved into a farmhouse at Fawley Bottom outside Henley-on-Thames, and in that house John had a studio and Myfanwy edited *Axis*.

This snapshot from Richards' social life reveals the overlap of his personal and professional lives and, importantly, the interaction between people and ideas from Europe with an existing culture of modernism in British art and architecture. Richards said that during the 1930s he increasingly found a 'common ground' between his 'social involvement with art and artists' and his 'ideas about modern architecture'.⁵⁷

This common ground was most often found in the homes of Eric Ravilious and Peggy Angus. In his autobiography, Richards describes parties at Ravilious' London home in Hammersmith, but it was the homes outside London that proved the most inspirational.⁵⁸ In 1930 Eric Ravilious and Edward Bawden - who had studied together at the Royal College of Art, where they both met Peggy Angus - travelled to Essex looking for a permanent base in the country.⁵⁹ They found Brick House, a 'square, Georgian house, built of black and red bricks and with a white door in the middle'.⁶⁰ They rented it there and then. Peggy Angus visited Ravilious and Bawden at Brick House in 1934 and in return she invited them down to her house, Furlongs in Sussex; they first went there in the spring of that year and became frequent visitors thereafter.⁶¹

Furlongs was a pair of farmworkers cottages on the Glynde Estate on the South Downs, near Lewes (Fig. 3). Peggy rented one of these cottages and Dick Freeman, a farmer, rented the other. For the years between 1934 and 1939 it was a gathering place for Angus, Richards and their circle of the Raviliouses, the Bawdens and Helen Binyon, and also a collection of other visitors including Oliver Hill, Serge Chermayeff, Barnett Freedman, Moholy Nagy and the Pipers.⁶² It was central to their creative and professional lives. Ravilious described the effect that Furlongs made on him from the moment of his first visit in 1934: 'Furlongs altered my whole outlook and way of painting, I think because the colour of the landscape was so lovely and the design so beautifully obvious' (Fig. 4).⁶³ This idea of 'obviousness' in design linked with Richards' ideas about vernacular architecture as an unconscious, inevitable design, separate from taste. While Ravilious used Furlongs as the object of his art, Richards cultivated

the cottage as an extension to his work in the discussion and promotion of modernism in architecture. In a letter to Peggy (in 1936) that discussed a photography trip for the 'Leisure and Seaside' issue of the *AR* in collaboration with Moholy Nagy, Richards wrote: 'perhaps we shall be able to do it as your guests from Furlongs; that would be lovely'.⁶⁴ Richards even attempted to involve Hastings in Furlongs, writing to Peggy 'one weekend I would like to try and get de Cronin over for tea'.⁶⁵

The building itself, as a vernacular dwelling, appealed to Richards' interest in anonymous architecture, but it was the interior that articulated Richards' and his friends' ideas about modernism. Frances Spalding has interpreted the interior of John and Myfanwy Piper's house at Fawley Bottom as a reflection of the couple's modernism.⁶⁶ Spalding argues that the modern abstract art and design interspersed with traditional English art and artefacts, expressed the Pipers' idea that 'modernist style could be sourced by ancient native traditions'.⁶⁷ The interior decoration of Furlongs (and Brick House) can similarly be read as an articulation of Richards', Peggy Angus' and their group's modernism. It was a modernism rooted in popular, vernacular, anonymous design.

Peggy Angus was 'completely bowled over by the flowering of inventiveness in decorations on every wall, ceiling or floor' on her first visit to Brick House. Ravilious and Bawden paid considerable attention to the decoration of the house, as Charlotte Bawden (Edward's wife) noted in a letter to a friend:

Edward and Rav are at Bardfield this week decorating the 'Victorian' room. They are threatening to paint stag horns and trophies of the chase in suitable positions on the wall and forget-me-nots and pansies round the fireplace.⁶⁸

Richards described the house as 'furnished with treasures of all kinds'; it was, he continued, 'a setting for Edward's inimitable personality, and a receptacle for the fruits of his wide-ranging connoisseurship'.⁶⁹ This idea of 'wide-ranging connoisseurship' supports the idea that modernism was a discourse, or a sensibility, which encompassed a variety of styles. Their interest in Victorian styles at Brick House was consistent with the interest in vernacular architecture,

as both were examples of ordinary design and culture. In 1938 Richards and Ravilious collaborated on the book *High Street*, which celebrated the aesthetics and the traditions of the Edwardian high street. In his foreword to the book Richards praised this link between form and function in shop design. The book can be read as a celebration of the authenticity of vernacular architecture. *High Street* was similar to Barbara Jones' later writing about the 'popular arts' or 'unsophisticated arts'⁷⁰ (Jones had also been at the Royal College of Art with Ravilious, Bawden and Angus).⁷¹ Richards and Jones alike celebrated design and architecture made by ordinary people. The aesthetics of English popular, vernacular culture was central to the spaces being created by Richards and his friends.

The mantelpiece, dresser and walls of the tiny Furlongs cottage were packed with ornaments, found objects, sketches and paintings. The dresser in particular displayed Staffordshire figurines next to a bottle in a basketwork holder, brass lanterns, and enamel mugs commemorating royal coronations (Fig. 5). Peggy Angus described Furlongs as a 'matrix of much strange and inventive creation',⁷² and 'matrix' is a useful word for understanding the array of different objects and artworks that furnished the cottage. Helen Binyon wrote about how Ravilious would go on excursions to junk shops in nearby Lewes and return with objects for the house.⁷³ This sense of bits and pieces, picked up and put together, describes the interior of Furlongs, but there was a unity to the clutter - the objects in Furlongs were all examples of anonymous vernacular or popular design. Despite their differences of aesthetic, material and production the royal memorabilia, the Staffordshire figurines, jugs and wooden bowls, were united by their status as anonymous vernacular designs. Leslie Martin articulated this unity of difference within modernism in his entry for *Circle*, writing that 'the world of appearances has given place to a world in which things unrelated to each other in appearance are united in the completeness of a single system'.⁷⁴ Thus the interior decoration of Furlongs articulated Richards' and his group's understanding of the relationship between modernism and unconscious, popular (in the sense of 'being of the people'), ordinary objects.

Richards and his colleagues not only used their own domestic spaces to explore their approach to modernism but also used models of the domestic interior to promote modernism to the general public in Britain. The Modern Architecture Research Group (MARS) was set up in 1934 as the British arm of the Congrès International d'Architecture Moderne (CIAM, founded in 1928 by Le Corbusier and Sigfried Gideon). Richards was a member of MARS from late 1934. One of the group's key tasks was 'propaganda' for (meaning promotion of) modernism. As part of this remit MARS organised a public exhibition that opened in January 1938 at the Burlington Galleries in London.⁷⁵ The exhibition consisted of two large rooms, linked by a corridor and with a small garden installation in the centre (Fig. 6); off the second room were a model modern living room and nursery. Around the wall of the model living room ran a caption declaring that the domestic interior was 'not a machine' (a reference to Le Corbusier's description of the modern house as 'a machine for living') but rather 'a harbour for relaxation and a background [for modern life]'. The MARS group was addressing what they saw as the misunderstanding of modernism as a rejection of the domestic interior, by presenting instead an image of modernism that embraced 'differentiated needs', history and individuality within the home.⁷⁶ The exhibition used the living room and the garden scene to present modern architecture as compatible with, or even integrally linked to, the everyday life of the middle class, which was the intended audience for the exhibition (Fig. 7). The model living room contained 'electric fire, radio and television sets, bookshelves and a gramophone' and could be the setting for 'some modern abstract painting and sculpture and for an antique Siamese head'.⁷⁷ This not only continued the conflation of modernism with vernacular or 'primitive' art (the Siamese head), but it also, and significantly, presented modern architecture as the background for an educated, cultured, middle-class lifestyle.

The tone, content and intended audience of the MARS exhibition rested on a particular understanding of how culture functioned. Maxwell Fry described how the members of the group argued over their different ideas about the level at which the exhibition should have been pitched:

Some of the group wanted a popular exhibition and thought in terms of the Daily Mail [Ideal Homes Exhibitions] and so on. I was violently opposed to that and so was Tolek [Lubetkin] [...] we argued that if you wanted to disseminate information, you had to disseminate it at the highest level and let it disseminate downwards through the schools. To go direct to the public would have been a pure disaster.⁷⁸

Fry and Lubetkin's position was based on a model of culture in which a minority cultural elite at the 'highest level' decided which ideas were culturally valuable and relevant; these were then disseminated down through the rest of society in various ways, including education. This elite was responsible for the maintenance of standards. Therefore, if modernism were to gain legitimacy and relevance, Fry and Lubetkin argued, it had to first convince the cultural elite. Richards also subscribed to this model of culture, but he was particularly interested in the second sentence – the dissemination of the ideas from the cultural elite to the rest of society. He argued that the MARS exhibition had to be clear and accessible to the general public, which meant avoiding things that 'though quite clear and ordinary to us "cranks" may sound a little highbrow to the people whose interest we want to catch'.⁷⁹ Richards was anxious for modernism in architecture to make the transition from the 'adolescent stage as the conscious cult of an intelligentsia' to the mature stage of being 'the unconscious expression of culture'.⁸⁰

Richards' early writing in the *AR* (about the *zeitgeist* and vernacular architecture), his work with *Circle* and MARS, the influence of his circle of friends and the interior of Furlongs culminated in his work on 'vulgar modernism'.

Vulgar Modernism:

In 1940, Richards took over writing the 'Criticism' column in the *AR*, under his pseudonym, James MacQuedy. His articles of January 1940 and June 1941, combined with his writing in *An Introduction to Modern Architecture*, set out his approach to the development of modernism. He advocated a form of 'vulgar modernism' that expressed the needs and values of ordinary people.

In *An Introduction to Modern Architecture*, Richards argued that because architects depended on support from outside the profession (in order to commission and build their designs), modern architecture had to find a visual language that communicated with ordinary people, not just with architects and intellectuals.⁸¹ Modern architecture had so far failed to do this, and as a result the 'man in the street' was resorting to revivalist styles or, even worse, 'bogus modernism'.⁸² 'Bogus modernism' was the 'jazz-modern shop-fronts in chromium plate and glass [...] angular furniture and [...] nasty "modernistic" villas' that imitated 'genuine' modernism and exploited it for commercial gain.⁸³ Bogus modernism was architecture that had 'no basis beyond itself'; it was style for style's sake.⁸⁴ It relied on 'the taste' of those that produced them, rather than the needs of the building.⁸⁵ Richards argued that bogus modernism's imitation and exploitation did 'great harm to the cause of good modern architecture'.⁸⁶ He was arguing that modern architecture's failure to win the appreciation of the British public was threatening the progress of culture.

In his final 'Criticism' column in June 1941 (before he left the *AR* to work of the publication department of the MoI), Richards returned to the issue of the relationship between 'bogus' and 'genuine' modernism. He blamed 'genuine' modern architects for the rise of bogus modernism because they failed to account for the complexity of ordinary people's relationship with style and architecture.⁸⁷ He described bogus or 'modernistic' architecture as the skeleton in the family cupboard of modernism.⁸⁸ Richards posited that architecture was divided into the intellectual and the vulgar. Intellectual architecture was concerned with 'aesthetic satisfaction', while the 'vulgar' responded to demands beyond 'aesthetic satisfaction', to feelings such as 'romanticism and sentimentality'.⁸⁹ He criticised modern architecture for neglecting the vulgar values in architecture and allowing 'modernistic' architecture to take over the role of catering for the 'need for vulgar freedom and naturalness'.⁹⁰ Richards was arguing that modernism could not simply ignore the 'vulgar' aspect of architecture, that it had to mature beyond the focus on intellectual taste and cater for a fuller range of needs; it had to develop an alternative form of vulgar architecture – a vulgar modernism.

This was a process of 'evolution not compromise'.⁹¹ He argued that 'in the long run, it is [...] vernacular that matters'.⁹² Any period of time could produce talented architects whose work 'reflects the tastes of its educated minority', but the real key to an authentic aesthetic was to develop an 'idiom that functions automatically' and 'independently of the talents of the particular designer concerned'.⁹³ Richards insisted that architecture could not afford to 'depend on conscious good taste being exercised at every point', which is why it had to evolve beyond taste.⁹⁴ Modern architecture should then 'build up' its own authentic 'parallel vernacular idiom', which he described as having the 'same relation to Le Corbusier as a Georgian farmhouse had to William Kent'.⁹⁵ Vulgar modernism was not a specific style; it was rather an approach to the architect's role in forming culture.

This discussion of 'vulgar' and 'intellectual' architecture articulated Richards' belief in the relationship between the future of modernism and the existing architectural vernacular in Britain. These ideas were the bedrock of *The Castles on the Ground*, in which Richards argued that architects must:

Pay some attention to the expressed preference of the majority, to what people themselves want, not what we think they ought to want. We may despise what they want. We may think they should be educated to want something different, or at least to know they could have something different if they wished, instead of their choice being limited by their ignorance of the alternatives; but we can only progress democratically at a speed which does not outpace the slow growth of the public's understanding, in particular its assimilation of social and technical change.⁹⁶

Richards was arguing that 'intellectual' modern architects had to understand the values of 'vulgar' architecture - the values of ordinary people - in order to offer models for architecture that appealed to ordinary people. This was not about compromising to appease popular taste, but about offering appropriate rules that would be used by ordinary people to create an authentic vernacular architecture, a 'vulgar modernism'. This discussion of architecture's relationship

with ordinary people's tastes and the role of the architect within culture became a key topic in post-war discussions of modern architecture.

1946: Richards' return from the war and the changing status of modernism in British architecture

In 1942 Richards left the *AR* to take up a position at the Ministry of Information, first in London and later in Cairo. He was replaced as editor, on his own suggestion, by Nikolaus Pevsner.⁹⁷ Richards had a real affinity for the work of a civil servant, 'positively enjoying' the 'bureaucratic procedures'.⁹⁸ His conception of society, in which groups of specialists organised and led the evolution of culture, was well suited to a position within the State. In fact, driven by his belief in the guiding role of expertise in culture, Richards actively sought positions of influence within the State. When he returned to London in 1946, his position in British culture had changed from what it had been pre-war. He was appointed to the Architecture Committee for the Festival of Britain along with several of his colleagues from MARS, and he became a regular on BBC Radio and the architectural correspondent for *The Times* newspaper (from 1948). He also helped organise the 1947 CIAM congress – the first in Britain - and was a member of the organising committee for the ICA. He was no longer on the periphery of culture but increasingly part of the establishment. The position of modernism in British architecture was also very different after the war. It was no longer an avant garde movement, but part of the mainstream of architectural culture. Richards articulated this shift in a report to CIAM in 1947, where he explained that much of the work that the MARS group (the British arm of CIAM) had been doing before the war, was now 'being done officially and with much greater resources by Government Departments', and that many of the group's members had taken up 'key positions' in government and 'other influential organisations'.⁹⁹

Richards' ideas about modernism and the role of the architect in culture, which had been forged through his personal and professional connections in the 1930s, continued into his work in the post-war period. Although he was no longer part

of the group at Furlongs, the ideas formulated there during the earlier period constituted a thread linking the interior of Furlongs to Richards' work at the BBC, CIAM and the ICA. His ongoing writing in the *AR* likewise represented this continuity. Richards even kept the cups from Furlongs commemorating the royal coronations, accumulating quite a collection by the 1980s.

When Richards returned to the *AR* in 1946 he was a member of an editorial board that included Nikolaus Pevsner, Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Gordon Cullen and Ian McCallum. That same year De Cronin Hastings assembled 'The Bride of Denmark' pub in the basement of the Architectural Press's offices (home to the *AR* and the *Architects Journal*). The interior of the pub, which was lost when the building demolished in the early 1990s, is remembered as a symbol of post-war British architecture in which modernism combined with a concern from traditional values and aesthetics.¹⁰⁰ It is associated with the interest in the picturesque that preoccupied sections of the *AR* – Pevsner's articles on 'Sharawadgi' and 'Townscape' series by Hastings and Cullen. However, Richards' ideas were diverging from the rest of the board. He remained preoccupied by the role of the modern architect and his responsibility for relating modernism to the values of ordinary people – the vulgar modernism he had written about in 1941. Richards was less concerned with the aesthetics of British towns (which was the theme of 'Townscape') than with how architects could defend their position in British culture.

Post-war discussions of modernism in architecture and the role of the architect: Architecture and Taste

The task of reconstructing British towns and cities after the war put architects at the centre of post-war British society and culture. Consequently discussions of architecture and role of the architect in the media increased. Furthermore, architects were now more aware of and concerned about their relationship to the general public, particularly the status of their expertise in relation to public taste, which remained suspicious of modern architecture. A 1943 Mass Observation Survey had revealed that public opinion held a 'very genuine

prejudice' against the style of Modern architecture, one that could not be overcome simply in terms of aesthetics.¹⁰¹

In 1946 Richards gave a series of radio talks for the BBC about 'English Architectural Tastes', which again returned to the 'intellectual' and the 'vulgar' values of architecture.¹⁰² Richards was arguing that ordinary people's taste was never determined by purely aesthetic considerations, and therefore any attempt to impose a new aesthetic, without any reference to these factors that formed popular taste would fail. He outlined three concerns, independent of aesthetic matters, which shaped ordinary people's judgment of architecture: 'the charm of what is familiar, the influence of what one might call literary associations, and the appeal of fashion'.¹⁰³ He explained how each of these factors had its causes. 'Charm of the familiar' resulted from the fact that, for the majority, 'life is largely a search for economic security', meaning that when people retreated into their homes they did not want 'the excitement of novelty', which 'by its strangeness' would only add to 'their feeling of insecurity'.¹⁰⁴ Linked to this were the 'literary associations' of certain styles, which meant that people liked the styles that 'called to mind' historical periods associated with feelings of comfort and security.¹⁰⁵ The final factor was the 'successive waves of fashion', in which particular styles of decoration or particular materials were taken up by 'the cultivated aristocracy', or later by 'scholar architects', and then gradually made their way down to the work of speculative builders.¹⁰⁶ The common man's taste for these fashions was based on an aspiration to emulate the upper classes; fashions therefore only 'maintained their authority' for as long as 'the social structure they reflected hung together'.¹⁰⁷ Richards insisted that modern architects had to analyse and understand these factors that shaped ordinary people's response to architecture and then carefully negotiate these factors in order to persuade people of the value of modernism as the authentic expression of the time and as a model for vulgar architecture.

This discussion of public taste and how modern architects should respond to it was adopted as the subject of the first post-war CIAM congress. Richards, as a leading member of the MARS group, was involved in organising this congress in

Bridgewater, Somerset, in 1947. It was the first ever held in Britain and took place in Britain's first Arts Centre set up by its new Arts Council. Under its title 'Architecture and the Common Man' the congress explored the relationship between 'modern architectural forms and the desires and aspirations of ordinary men and women'.¹⁰⁸ The key issue at stake was the status of architectural expertise in relation to public taste.

Letters from 1946 between Sigfried Giedion and the architect (and MARS member) Mark Hartland Thomas demonstrate that the key terms of the debate were whether modern architects should 'follow the present aesthetic demands of the common man' or whether they as 'specialists' had a responsibility to develop the common man's 'better ego'.¹⁰⁹ Hartland Thomas explained the position of the MARS group:

We do not mean to let him [the Common Man] have it all his own way [...] but a rapprochement is needed. We must study his emotional needs and try to find good architectural forms that will satisfy them.¹¹⁰

Between September 1946 and January 1947 the MARS group frequently debated the relationship between architectural expertise and the tastes of ordinary people. Rough notes from one of the group's meetings during this period record the various issues raised by the members around the subject. They ranged from questions such as 'Has the title Common man a political connotation?', 'Need we fear the esoteric?', 'Does the common man only need something diagrammatic from the architect [...] should architect look further and provide something more?', and 'Do we suggest modern architecture falls short of the common man?' to statements such as 'we must not bow down to the common man' and 'architecture is not an ideal medium for self expression'.¹¹¹ There was no consensus among the group on this issue.

Richards set out his ideas on the subject in his paper at CIAM VI, delivered on 13 September 1947. He opened with the dilemma as to whether the modern architect should 'regard the public as the passive recipient of the benefits he has

to offer' or whether, 'in the special circumstances of today', he should 'make a special effort to enable the ordinary man – who is for the first time in history, the real patron of architecture – to share somehow in the creative process'?¹¹²

Richards was quick to add that he was not suggesting that the public be involved in 'the actual designing of buildings', but that perhaps it would be possible for architects to establish 'visual standards' which might fit into the public's existing experiences, so that the common man's 'appreciation can be based on what already means something to him emotionally'.¹¹³

These two contrasting scenarios pivoted on an understanding of the causes of change in society: In the first, the architect 'can produce what he, for his own reasons, believes to be good architecture' and then just wait and 'hope that people will come to like it by habit'; in the second, the architect has some direct part to play in preventing the new architecture from frightening the public.¹¹⁴ In the first scenario, architecture played a 'minor part' in changing society, because architecture relied on a situation in which 'the rational philosophy on which it is based is accepted in other fields' before it could 'serve the public fully'.¹¹⁵ In the second scenario, architecture acted as an 'educative medium', helping the common man to understand 'what modern architecture can do on his behalf', thus affecting the present and helping to bring about change in the future.¹¹⁶ Richards' position was that 'architecture is always subject to the influence of public demand' but that people are active participants in the process of change, and are not simply dragged along with tide.¹¹⁷ Richards was asserting the architect's expertise and its role in guiding the evolution of culture, while acknowledging that the 'common man' needed to be respected as a potentially active participant.

This was consistent with the model of culture that Richards had adhered to in the pre-war period: one in which cultural decisions were made by specialists and disseminated – in accessible forms - among the rest of society through various media, eventually becoming a vernacular idiom. This position was articulated in T.S. Eliot's 1948 essay, *Notes Toward a Definition of Culture*. Eliot argued that, in order for culture to flourish, society needed elites: small groups of 'superior

individuals', in all areas of culture and government, including the arts, science and philosophy, who would 'direct the public life of the nation'.¹¹⁸ According to Eliot, 'the ablest artists and architects rise to the top, influence taste, and execute the important public commissions'.¹¹⁹ Richards subscribed to this model of meritocracy based on specialist expertise and would have agreed with Eliot's point that 'all positions on society should be occupied by those who are best fitted to exercise the functions of the positions'.¹²⁰ Richards identified modern architects as the 'ablest', who would lead British architecture through a process of development until modernism became a vernacular, independent of taste and choice. Richards's post-war work was orientated towards reinforcing this belief in the specialist role of the architect in society.

The specialist contribution of the architect: the ICA, Festival of Britain and 'The Next Step?'

The responsibility of those in positions of cultural authority to offer suitable guidance to the rest of society was the basis of Richards' work in founding the ICA, in working for the Festival of Britain, and his article for the *AR* on 'The Next Step?' for modern architecture (1950). In January 1946 a small group of men – all artists or critics - began meeting to discuss the formation of an organisation to promote modern art. Two of the principal founders were Herbert Read and Roland Penrose, both of whom had simultaneously been artists, writers and organisers among the British avant-garde in the 1930s; Penrose had been closely involved with Surrealism while Read had worked with the contemporary art group Unit One (with Paul Nash). Penrose, who was friends with Barbara Hepworth and Ben Nicholson, had known Richards before the war and invited him to join this new group as its representative for architecture. Its Organising Committee wanted to provide a space for the public to engage with 'experimental manifestations which are outside the scope of commercial enterprise and not yet given official public recognition'.¹²¹ This would come to be called the Institute of Contemporary Art.

The ICA's *Statement of Policy and Aims*, published in 1948, was dominated by two issues, first, the importance of cultural institutions in the development of a national culture, and second, the relationship between artists and the general public in Britain. They listed the organisations that currently exerted power in British culture – 'The BBC, The British Council, The Tate Gallery, the Arts Council of Great Britain, various architectural bodies, musical, literary, film societies' – explaining that there was no 'prominent contemporary artist' that was not indebted to one or more of these bodies for 'first encouraging the British public to appreciate his work'.¹²² However, the committee felt that recently these organisations had neglected lesser-known and younger artists 'in favour of the accepted and recently dead'.¹²³ These existing organisations were thus failing in their responsibility to guide public culture and were instead simply pandering to current public taste – and this was damaging the evolution of culture. As a result, the 'progressive artist' was left isolated and his or her art was 'branded as incomprehensible, or even 'degenerate', and quickly dismissed.¹²⁴ The general public was not to blame for this situation in art, the failure being instead the fault of those responsible for displaying art and organising education.¹²⁵ The public had not been taught the language of the modern idiom because its dissemination had 'been left to the unsponsored efforts of a few individuals and informed sympathisers'.¹²⁶ The ICA was intended to rectify this situation by providing a space that would offer a 'coherent programme of exhibitions and other educational facilities', to act as 'an active museum of the contemporary arts'.¹²⁷ It should bridge the divide between artists and the public and reinvigorate the responsibilities of specialist institutions in culture.

Richards' involvement in the founding of the ICA stemmed from his belief in the unique contribution and responsibility of cultural specialists in the evolution of culture. In 1950 the ICA moved into permanent premises at 17-18 Dover Street, having previously mounted exhibitions in a temporary home, the Academy Cinema on Oxford Street. The gallery, library and members lounge at Dover Street, designed by Maxwell Fry and Jane Drew, were intended to provide a new home for avant garde artists, architects and critics. It had none of the clutter of the pre-war interiors of Furlongs, being instead a space for the new, and now

established, modernism. The member's lounge, in particular, was intended to serve as a 'congenial place' where the artistic elite could formulate their ideas, which would be gradually disseminated to the general public. In this sense, the ICA at Dover Street was consistent with Richards' model of culture, in which intellectual experts guided the evolution of vulgar (meaning ordinary people's) culture.

In 1950 Richards wrote an article for the *AR* entitled 'The Next Step?' which set out his opinions on the future of modernism and, specifically, the contribution of the modern architect to the development of culture. Richards opened the article by explaining that the role of the architect in culture had been 'uncertain' ever since the Arts and Crafts movement had undermined the architect's traditional role as 'high priest' of art by arguing for 'common sense' rather than doctrine.¹²⁸ Richards determined that the task facing architects in the coming decade was to define their place in culture once again, so that they could 'enter fully and fruitfully into the life of their time for civilisation's sake'.¹²⁹ He then presented the four paths to the future that were available to the modern architect: the maximum exploitation of mechanization, conscious humanism, particularization, and social realism.¹³⁰ Richards critiqued each of these paths for their effect on the role of the architect. Even the 'social realist' approach, in which architecture is said to be a reflection of society – which Erdem Erten has argued was closest to Richards' vision for the future of modernism – was criticised for presenting architecture as 'an effect not a cause'.¹³¹ It neglected the 'specialist contribution of the architect' to changing society; Richards insisted that architecture 'as well as being made by circumstances, makes them'.¹³²

Richards argued that the future of modernism lay in understanding this 'specialist contribution' of architects, and this began with understanding the character of the architectural profession; just as culture was structured by expertise, with the ablest at the top, so too was the architectural profession. Richards described the profession as split into two types: the 'ordinary'/'rank and file' and the 'genius'/'pioneer'.¹³³ The latter were leaders and a law unto themselves, while the former needed 'routine', 'principles', 'rules' and 'discipline'

to guide their work.¹³⁴ This 'routine', Richards argued, was the means that allowed architecture as a whole to function, as without it the rank and file architects were left to 'make do with the nearest thing to hand'.¹³⁵ He criticised the 'pioneers' for failing in their responsibility to provide a 'suitable routine' for the rank and file, thus leaving the latter to fall back on historical styles. This was the same argument as he had put forward in 1941 about the division of architecture into 'intellectual' and 'vulgar', criticizing modern architects for ignoring the 'vulgar' needs of architecture and thereby causing the rise of bogus modernism.¹³⁶

This structure of the architectural profession was, to some extent, articulated by the organisation of the Festival of Britain. From 1948 Richards was a member of the Architecture Committee for the festival, along with several other members of the MARS group, not least Hugh Casson, who chaired the committee, and Frederick Gibberd.¹³⁷ As well as being responsible for the buildings on the festival's main site at the South Bank, the Committee organized the 'Live Architecture' exhibition in Poplar, East London (Fig. 8). The exhibition took the form of a real community, the Lansbury Estate, designed according to the County of London Plan devised by Forshaw and Abercrombie in 1943. The 'live' aspect of the exhibition related to the fact that the buildings were under construction during the exhibition so that the visitors could see how they were built, but also that these buildings were to be used after the exhibition to house and serve local citizens. This estate was intended to provide a model for the standards of working-class housing and community provision in post-war Britain and the exhibition was meant to act as a template for construction throughout the country in the coming years.

The housing estate – including its schools, churches and market-square - built for the exhibition were designed by members of the Architecture Committee and built in collaboration with the Architecture Department of the London County Council. The intended audience for the exhibition included both professionals and the interested public. This aligned the exhibition with Richards' vision for the structure of the architectural profession that he set out in his article 'The

Next Step?'. The exhibition was thus putting into practice the idea that modern architects (the Architectural Committee) should provide guidelines for the rank and file of the profession, in order to develop a new 'vulgarity' in modernism – a modernism for ordinary people.

If the ICA was the home for the cultural and intellectual elite to establish their ideas, then the 'Live Architecture' exhibition was the means for their dissemination of these ideas to the rest of the profession and to the general public – presenting their guidelines for vulgar (ordinary) architecture in material form. In terms of Richards' analogy from his June 1941 'Criticism' column, the ICA was William Kent and the Live Architecture exhibition was the Georgian farmhouse.

Challenges to Vulgar modernism:

Two years after Richards had stated his position on the future of modern architecture in his article 'The Next Step?' and a year after the Festival of Britain, Reyner Banham joined the staff at the *AR*. Banham, who had studied under Nikolaus Pevsner at the Courtauld Institute, was critical of Richards' model of 'vulgar' modernism and of the 'specialist contribution' of the architect in culture. While both Richards and Banham subscribed to the idea that architecture should reflect the *zeitgeist* – the spirit of the time – they differed dramatically in their definition of what and where the *zeitgeist* was in contemporary society.

Richards' definition of vernacular or 'vulgar' architecture differentiated between everyday experiences based on commercial choices and broader, more abstract cultural values (the *zeitgeist* of British society and culture). However, this distinction would lose credibility in the context of 1960s commercial culture. Reyner Banham embraced the commercial as the 'live culture' of the age; he was concerned with the popular rather than the vernacular. Richards, on the other hand, labelled commercial culture as dumbed-down, devalued and lacking in authenticity.¹³⁸ Such a kind of 'popular' was based on choice and conscious taste - which was the opposite of the unconscious vernacular that Richards sought.

This contrast between Richards and Banham was played out over the next two decades on the pages of the *AR*. It was evident in the different types of articles that they wrote for the magazine. On the one hand, Richards spent a lot of time in the 1950s and 1960s travelling and writing about traditional vernacular architectures in Japan, in Stockholm, Romania and Moldova.¹³⁹ In 1970 he produced a special issue based on a trip to New Gournā (Hassan Fathy's neo-vernacular village in Egypt) and the lessons that 'basic architecture' could offer the contemporary architect.¹⁴⁰ New Gournā was significant because Fathy used local people to build in vernacular styles rather than importing international builders and styles. Fathy's book, *Gournā: A Tale of Two Villages*, published in 1969, was part of the growing interest in vernacular architecture, along with Richards'. On the other hand, Banham wrote about the Pirelli Building in Milan – an example of the merging of architecture and commercial branding – and he also wrote positively about obsolescence, speed in cities and even Las Vegas.¹⁴¹ While Banham located the *zeitgeist* in the commercial, Richards saw it in the anonymous vernacular. In 1962, in an article in a series for the *AR* called 'On Trial', Banham directly criticised the argument that vernacular or 'folk' art and architecture were 'popular' in the same way as 'pop' art and architecture.¹⁴² The difference between 'pop art and folk art' was, he explained, money. Folk art did not have 'the imagery of dreams that money can buy that characterises pop art, desirable possessions and accessible gratification, handily packaged, seductively displayed, mass produced, ubiquitously available'.¹⁴³ Banham argued that in order to be popular architecture had to engage with the 'sensitivity' of popular taste by engaging with commercialism.¹⁴⁴

This disagreement about the value of commercial interests in culture was part of Richards' and Banham's broader disagreement about the 'specialist contribution' of the architect to culture. In 1960 Banham edited a series of articles for the *AR* called 'Stocktaking', which broadly explored the impact the technology on architecture.¹⁴⁵ Banham emphasised how the new role of the architect was as a member of a design team responding to commercial taste, rather than as a specialist guiding culture. In the fifth article in this series Banham discussed this

issue with Richards and his other colleagues at the magazine.¹⁴⁶ Responding to a question about the architect's role within a 'design team', Hugh Casson (who had worked with Richards' both in MARS and on the Architecture Committee of the Festival of Britain) dismissed architecture produced by 'a team of specialists' as akin to 'the cornflake packet – efficient, sales worthy, disposable and to me, without any interest or value whatsoever'.¹⁴⁷ Casson was defending the unique role of the architect. Banham challenged Casson's dismissal of the cornflake packet design, stating that it took 'a bold, convinced (or complacent) man to brush off the cornflake packet';¹⁴⁸ he countered Casson's suggestion that these mass- and industrially-produced objects were 'of no interest or value', arguing that buildings should be thought about as cornflake packets - buildings were after all just 'long term expendables'.¹⁴⁹

In the 'On Trial' series Banham then argued that Richards' opposition to commercial culture was based on the competition it posed to middle-class efforts to 'educate' the working class public.¹⁵⁰ He accused these 'architectural pedagogues' of using architecture to order 'the masses about for their own good'.¹⁵¹ Banham labelled this fixation with 'hieratic culture' as outmoded, saying that it was no longer relevant for aesthetic decisions to be made by 'a few experts at the top' as opposed to 'the mass of consumers at the bottom'.¹⁵² Rather than architectural aesthetics being dictated by a cultural elite, he argued that they should originate in commercial choice.

Humility and Participation:

The 1970s brought further challenges to the authority of the architect. In a programme for BBC radio in November 1969, the architectural journalist John Donat (who had been a contributor to the *AR*) interviewed American architects about the new directions in architecture and planning in America. One such direction was 'Advocacy planning', where the architect worked with communities, working on their behalf; this was described as a new form of 'democratic architecture'.¹⁵³ Among those interviewed were Robert Venturi and Denise Scott Brown, who discussed their project 'Learning from Las Vegas'.¹⁵⁴

Scott Brown insisted that if architects were to have any influence on the physical environment they had to understand that it was not architects but rather 'but forces within the society' that formed the environment.¹⁵⁵ They dismissed the contribution of the architect's expertise in guiding the evolution of culture. This was a challenge to Richards' position. However, another contributor to the programme, Hugh Hardy, criticised the advocacy model, as Richards would have, for only ever producing 'what everybody has always known' and not contributing to the evolution of architecture.¹⁵⁶

These new directions had their roots in the ideas that Richards had been putting forward since 1941, about learning from the existing conditions of architecture and the non-aesthetic values that shaped architecture. However, contrary to Venturi and Scott Brown, Richards had consistently defended the architect's unique and specialist contribution to culture. In response to these new threats to the role of the architect Richards urged architects be humble about their expertise and to develop a more participatory role. His article 'Retrospect', to mark his retirement from the *AR* (in 1971), and his 1972 speech to the RIBA entitled 'The Hollow Victory', both articulated his concerns over challenges to the role of the architect in contemporary culture. He warned that 'the world is in process of deciding' that the built environment 'is too important to be left at the mercy of architects'.¹⁵⁷ He blamed architects' 'arrogance', the lure of 'the brass plaque' – meaning self-gratification and self-aggrandisement – and the urge to 'indulge in the pleasures of self expression' for the public's mistrust of the profession.¹⁵⁸

In 1973 Richards' book *The Castles on the Ground* was republished with a new subheading and a new introduction, in which Richards argued that in order to preserve their position in society architects would have to 'exchange their customary arrogance for a becoming humility'.¹⁵⁹ Richards proposed a role for the architect that was consistent with the ideas he had promoted throughout his career, one based on anonymity and vernacular. He argued that architects and critics 'must not expect people to settle down contentedly and immediately to find fulfilment, in an environment designed from outside and on the basis of

someone else's idea of what they ought to be given'.¹⁶⁰ Instead, Richards argued, architects should aim to understand what people want and need from architecture and should provide a flexible plan that allows for change over time and for expressions of individuality from inhabitants.¹⁶¹ There was no place for 'monuments' to architects, because the quality of vernacular architecture consisted of interactions between people and building - what Richards called 'happy accidents'.¹⁶²

In the 1970s Richards was not alone in seeking such a direction for architects. Comparable ideas were voiced in Nicholas Taylor's book *Village in the City*, also published in 1973. Taylor had worked under Richards at the AR, but was also a Labour Councillor for Lewisham. Taylor's work, more so than Richards', was led more explicitly by his politics. Taylor objected to the architect's insistence on designing everything so as to 'create his own private ideal environment', leaving nothing to will or whim of the 'ordinary man, or woman or community'.¹⁶³ Taylor insisted that popular taste and public opinion would not be changed simply by architect's insistence that it should; he described the proper relationship between the architect and the public:

If a man asks you for a philistine fig, you do not satisfy him by pressing upon him a beautiful architect designed thistle. You need instead to find out more about that fig: why was it needed, what kind of satisfaction was it hoped to give, and how can it be more perfectly ripened?¹⁶⁴

There was a climate of discussion in the 1970s that sought to maintain a role for the architect in society, but where he/she worked from within society, rather than as an external force.¹⁶⁵ This was to some extent the *rapprochement* between the architect and public taste that Hartland Thomas had suggested to Sigfried Giedion in 1946.¹⁶⁶ Richards was once again championing a 'vulgar modernism' that responded to the existing needs of people - an architecture in which the individual personality of the architect was 'culturally irrelevant', but the specialist role of the architect remained intact.

Conclusion

In 1960 Reyner Banham said that a man who insisted on the specialist contribution of the architect in the face of technology and commercial interests must be 'bold, convinced or complacent'. I would argue that J.M. Richards was convinced, but far from complacent. Throughout his career Richards pursued a model of architecture dependent upon the expertise of the architect, working with the existing needs and values of the public towards the evolution of culture. While some of his writings - such as *The Castles on the Ground*, 'Retrospect' and 'The Hollow Victory' - have been interpreted as rejections of modernism, they were actually defences of it but in the form of the 'vulgar modernism' that he championed throughout his career. The consistency throughout Richards' writings of his concept of 'vulgar modernism', the challenges posed to it by Banham, and the changing direction of the *AR* taken together offer a window onto the definition of modernism in Britain in the mid-twentieth century.

'Vulgar modernism' is a thread that linked the interior decoration of Furlongs cottage in the late 1930s with the content and form of the MARS exhibition, letters between Peggy Angus and Richards, and Richards' work as editor for the *AR*, for the ICA, the Festival of Britain and CIAM, and the content of his radio broadcasts. 'Vulgar modernism' highlights Richards' consistent contribution to British architecture, which was not unique but representative of the culture of modernism in Britain.

¹ J.M. Richards, *The Castles on the Ground* 2nd edn (1st edn London, 1946; all citations from 2nd edn London, 1973), p. 13.

² J.M. Richards, *Memoirs of an Unjust Fella* (London, 1980), p. 188.

³ Reyner Banham, *New Brutalism* (London, 1966), p. 13.

⁴ See Alan Powers, *Britain: Modern Architectures in History* (London, 2007); and Erdem Erten, 'The Hollow Victory of Modern Architecture and the Quest for the Vernacular: J.M. Richards and "the Functional Tradition"', in *Built from Below: British Architecture and The Vernacular*, ed. Peter Guillery (London, 2011), pp. 145-68.

⁵ This phrase 'the man in the street' is used repeatedly in Richards 1940 book, J.M. Richards, *Introduction to Modern Architecture* (London, 1940).

⁶ Richards, *The Castles on the Ground*, p. 19.

⁷ See for example William Whyte, 'The Englishness of English Architecture: modernism and the making of a national International Style', *The Journal of British Studies*, vol. 48 no. 2 (2009), pp. 441-65.

- ⁸ Philip Morton Shand, 'Scenario for Human Drama' *The Architectural Review*, (July, 1934), p. 9-15.
- ⁹ Nikolaus Pevsner, *Pioneers of the Modern Movement: from William Morris to Walter Gropius*, (London, 1936).
- ¹⁰ Raymond Williams, *Culture and Society, 1970-1950*, 3rd edn (1st edn London, 1958, all citations from 3rd edn London 1963), p. 17.
- ¹¹ See Erten, 'The Hollow Victory', p. 150.
- ¹² Richards, *The Castles on the Ground*, p. 57.
- ¹³ J.M. Richards, 'Criticism', *The Architectural Review* (January, 1941), pp. 132-36 (p. 132).
- ¹⁴ Richards, 'Criticism' (January, 1941), p. 132.
- ¹⁵ Richards, 'Criticism' (January, 1941), p. 132.
- ¹⁶ Richards, 'Criticism' (January, 1941), p. 132.
- ¹⁷ Richards, 'Criticism' (January, 1941), p. 132.
- ¹⁸ See for example Elizabeth Darling, *Reforming Britain: Narratives of Modernity before Reconstruction* (London, 2007), p. 3.
- ¹⁹ Richard J. Williams, *The Anxious City: British Urbanism in the late 20th Century* (Oxford, 2004).
- ²⁰ Williams, *The Anxious City*. p. 34.
- ²¹ Williams, *The Anxious City*, p. 34.
- ²² GTA Archive, Haefeli, Moser, Steiger Papers, J.M. Richards, 'Architectural Expression', CIAM 6 Congress (September, 1946). Reading, BBC Written Archive [hereafter BBC Written Archive], J.M. Richards, 'Vision and Design: English Architectural Taste – 2', on BBC Far Eastern Service (July 1946).
- ²³ John Gold, *The Experience of Modernism: Modern Architects and the Future City, 1928-1953* (London, 1997), pp. 12-13.
- ²⁴ Richard Morphet, in Helen Binyon, *Eric Ravilious: memoir of an artist*, 3rd edn (1st edn London, 1983, 3rd edn Cambridge, 2007), p. 8.
- ²⁵ Sarah Williams Goldhagen, 'Something to Talk About: Modernism, Discourse, Style', *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 64.2 (June 2005), pp. 144-67 (p. 161).
- ²⁶ See Erten, 'The Hollow Victory'; Powers, *Britain*; and Andrew Higgott, *Mediating Modernism: Architectural Cultures in Britain* (London, 2006).
- ²⁷ Richards, *Memoirs*, p. 43.
- ²⁸ Interview with John Gloag, in Susan Lasdun, 'H. de C Reviewed', *The Architectural Review* (September, 1996), pp. 68-74 (p. 69).
- ²⁹ The Editors, 'The First Half Century', *The Architectural Review* (January, 1947), pp. 150-165.
- ³⁰ Richards, *Memoirs*, p. 117.
- ³¹ *The Origins of Modern Critical Thought: German Aesthetic and Literary Criticism From Lessing to Hegel*, ed. by David Simpson (Cambridge, 1988), p. 357.
- ³² Serge Chermayeff, 'A New Spirit and Idealism', *The Architects' Journal* (November, 1931), pp. 619-20 (p.619).
- ³³ Marcel Breuer, 'Where do we Stand?', *The Architectural Review* (April, 1935), pp. 134-40 (p. 136).
- ³⁴ J.M. Richards, 'Towards a Rational Aesthetic', *The Architectural Review* (December 1935), pp. 211-20 (p. 211)
- ³⁵ Lewis Mumford, *Technics and Civilisation* (New York, 1934), in J.M. Richards, 'Towards a Rational Aesthetic', p. 211.
- ³⁶ Richards, 'Rational Aesthetic', p. 216.
- ³⁷ Karen Anne Bearer, *Irene Rice Pereira: Her Paintings and Philosophy* (Texas, 1993), p.15.
- ³⁸ Nikolaus Pevsner, 'Early and High Baroque' in Steven Games, *Pevsner the Early Life: Germany and Art* (London, 2011), p. 182.
- ³⁹ J.M. Richards, *The Functional Tradition in Early Industrial Buildings* (London, 1958), p. 14.
- ⁴⁰ John Piper, 'Nautical Style', *The Architectural Review* (January, 1938), pp. 1-14. London, Tate Archive (hereafter Tate Archive), TGA 200410/3/2/17, John and Myfanwy Piper Papers, Myfanwy Piper, 'Writing About Jim'.
- ⁴¹ Lewes, East Sussex Records Office [hereafter ESRO], uncat, Peggy Angus Archive, letter dated May 1937.
- ⁴² John Piper, 'Fully Licensed', *The Architectural Review* (March, 1940), pp. 87-101.
- ⁴³ See for example Erten, 'The Hollow Victory', p. 150.

-
- ⁴⁴ J.M. Richards, 'The Condition of Architecture and the Principle of Anonymity' *Circle: International Survey of Constructive Art*, ed. by J. L. Martin, Ben Nicholson and Naum Gabo (London, 1937), pp. 184-191 (p. 185.)
- ⁴⁵ Richards, 'The Condition of Architecture and the Principle of Anonymity', p. 185.
- ⁴⁶ Bristol, The Penguin Archive, DM1843/15/4, Letters from Allan Lane to J.M. Richards, 1938.
- ⁴⁷ Richards, *An Introduction to Modern Architecture*, p. 79.
- ⁴⁸ Richards, *An Introduction to Modern Architecture*, p. 79.
- ⁴⁹ G.W.F. Hegel, 'Preface', in, *Philosophy of Right*, trans. by S. W. Dyde, 10th edn (1st edn 1986, 10th edn New York, 2005), p. xviii.
- ⁵⁰ Hegel, 'Preface', p. xix.
- ⁵¹ Richards, *The Castles on the Ground*, p. 20.
- ⁵² Los Angeles, Getty Research Library (hereafter GRL), uncat, Nikolaus Pevsner Papers, 'The Elements of Contemporary Architecture in Britain - Historicism and Traditionalism', 1939.
- ⁵³ GRL, uncat, Nikolaus Pevsner Papers, letter from J.M. Richards to Pevsner dated October 1939.
- ⁵⁴ ESRO, uncat, Peggy Angus Archive, letter from J.M. Richards to Peggy Angus, April 1936.
- ⁵⁵ Richards, *Memoirs*, p. 36.
- ⁵⁶ See Jill Seddon, 'The Architect and the "Arch Pedant": Sadie Speight, Nikolaus Pevsner and "Design Review"', *The Journal of Design History*, 20.1 (2007), pp. 29-41.
- ⁵⁷ Richards, *Memoirs*, p. 96.
- ⁵⁸ Richards, *Memoirs*, p. 96.
- ⁵⁹ Binyon, *Eric Ravilious*, p. 58, and Richards, *Memoirs*, p. 101. Richards gives 1932 as the date that they first rented Brick House.
- ⁶⁰ Binyon, *Eric Ravilious*, p. 58.
- ⁶¹ It was at Furlongs that Eric Ravilious met Helen Binyon and they began their affair, which lasted until 1938. Binyon, *Eric Ravilious*, p. 64.
- ⁶² ERSO, uncat, Peggy Angus Archive, letter from Richards to Peggy Angus, undated.
- ⁶³ ESRO, *Report of the County Archivist* (April 2006-March 2007), p. 7.
- ⁶⁴ ESRO, uncat, Peggy Angus Archive, letter from Richards to Peggy Angus, undated.
- ⁶⁵ ESRO, uncat, Peggy Angus Archive, letter from Richards to Peggy Angus, undated.
- ⁶⁶ Frances Spalding, *John and Myfanwy: a life in art* (Oxford, 2009), p. 72
- ⁶⁷ Spalding, *John and Myfanwy*, p. 72.
- ⁶⁸ Charlotte Bawden to Gwyneth Lloyd-Thomas, 1932, letter, Binyon, *Eric Ravilious*, p. 60.
- ⁶⁹ Richards, *Memoirs*, p. 101.
- ⁷⁰ Barbara Jones, *The Unsophisticated Arts* (London, 1951).
- ⁷¹ James Russell at <http://jamesrussellontheblogspot.co.uk/2013/05/the-unsophisticated-genius-of-barbara.html> (accessed 31 April 2015).
- ⁷² Tanya Harrod, 'Peggy Angus Obituary', *The Independent*, 2 November, 1982, p. 78.
- ⁷³ Binyon, *Eric Ravilious* p. 66.
- ⁷⁴ Leslie Martin, 'The State of Transition' *Circle*, p. 108-218 (p. 217).
- ⁷⁵ For more details see Gold, *The Experience of Modernism*.
- ⁷⁶ 'MARS the Pictorial Record', *The Architectural Review* (March, 1938), pp. 99-112 (p. 109).
- ⁷⁷ 'MARS the Pictorial Record', p. 109.
- ⁷⁸ Gold, *The Experience of Modernism*, p. 125.
- ⁷⁹ London, Royal Institute of British Architects Archive [hereafter RIBA Archive], SAG /92/1/(2/2), Godfrey Samuel Papers, letter from J.M. Richards to MARS group, 26 November 1936.
- ⁸⁰ J.M. Richards, 'Architecture and The Public', *The Architectural Review* (May, 1937), pp. 200-205 (p. 203).
- ⁸¹ Richards, *An Introduction to Modern Architecture*, p. 10.
- ⁸² Richards, *An Introduction to Modern Architecture*, p. 11.
- ⁸³ Richards, *An Introduction to Modern Architecture*, p. 11.
- ⁸⁴ Richards, *An Introduction to Modern Architecture*, p. 11.
- ⁸⁵ J.M. Richards, 'Criticism', *The Architectural Review* (June, 1941), pp. 132-136 (p. 132).
- ⁸⁶ Richards, *An Introduction to Modern Architecture*, p. 12.
- ⁸⁷ Richards, 'Criticism' (June, 1941), p. 132.
- ⁸⁸ Richards, 'Criticism' (June, 1941), p. 132.
- ⁸⁹ Richards, 'Criticism' (June, 1941), p. 132.
- ⁹⁰ Richards, 'Criticism' (June, 1941), p. 132.

-
- ⁹¹ Richards, 'Criticism', *The Architectural Review* (February, 1940), pp. 66-70 (p. 67).
- ⁹² Richards, 'Criticism', *The Architectural Review* (June, 1941), p. 132.
- ⁹³ Richards, 'Criticism' (June, 1941), p. 132.
- ⁹⁴ Richards, 'Criticism' (June, 1941), p. 132.
- ⁹⁵ Richards, 'Criticism' (June, 1941), p. 132.
- ⁹⁶ Richards, *The Castles on the Ground*, p. 20.
- ⁹⁷ Richards, *Memoirs*, p. 158.
- ⁹⁸ Richards, *Memoirs*, p. 160.
- ⁹⁹ Zurich, Institute of History and Theory of Architecture, GTA Archives (hereafter GTA archive), Haefeli, Moser, Steiger Papers, J.M. Richards, Report on MARS Group: war and post-war (1947).
- ¹⁰⁰ Williams, *The Anxious City*, p. 32.
- ¹⁰¹ Sussex, Mass Observation Archive [hereafter MO Archive], (1/6/D), 'Liking/disliking own home', p. 30.
- ¹⁰² BBC Written Archive, Richards, 'Vision and Design: English Architectural Taste - 2', p. 2.
- ¹⁰³ BBC Written Archive, Richards, 'Vision and Design', p. 2.
- ¹⁰⁴ BBC Written Archive, Richards, 'Vision and Design', p. 2.
- ¹⁰⁵ BBC Written Archive, Richards, 'Vision and Design', p. 3.
- ¹⁰⁶ BBC Written Archive, Richards, 'Vision and Design', p. 5.
- ¹⁰⁷ BBC Written Archive, Richards, 'Vision and Design', p. 3.
- ¹⁰⁸ GTA Archive, General Secretariat Papers, Minutes from Meeting of CIRPAC in London (July 1946), p. 2.
- ¹⁰⁹ GTA Archive, General Secretariat Papers, Letter from Sigfried Giedion to Hartland-Thomas (25 July 1946).
- ¹¹⁰ GTA Archive, General Secretariat Papers, Letter from Sigfried Giedion to Hartland-Thomas.
- ¹¹¹ GTA Archive, General Secretariat Papers, Notes of Discussion at MARS Group Meeting, Undated.
- ¹¹² GTA Archive, Haefeli, Moser, Steiger Papers, Richards, 'Architectural Expression', p. 1.
- ¹¹³ GTA Archive, Haefeli, Moser, Steiger Papers, Richards, 'Architectural Expression', p. 1.
- ¹¹⁴ GTA Archive, Haefeli, Moser, Steiger Papers, Richards, 'Architectural Expression', p. 2.
- ¹¹⁵ GTA Archive, Haefeli, Moser, Steiger Papers, Richards, 'Architectural Expression', p. 3.
- ¹¹⁶ GTA Archive, Haefeli, Moser, Steiger Papers, Richards, 'Architectural Expression', p. 3.
- ¹¹⁷ GTA Archive, Haefeli, Moser, Steiger Papers, Richards, 'Architectural Expression', p. 3.
- ¹¹⁸ T.S. Eliot, *Notes Toward a Definition of Culture* 2nd edn (1st edn London, 1948, 2nd edn London 1962), p. 36.
- ¹¹⁹ Eliot, *Notes*, p. 44.
- ¹²⁰ Eliot, *Notes*, p. 37.
- ¹²¹ London, Tate Archive, TGA 955/1/1/10, ICA Papers, 'Minutes of the Second Meeting of the Organising Committee' (20 February 1946).
- ¹²² Tate Archive, TGA 955/1/1/10, ICA Papers, *ICA Statement of Policy and Aims*.
- ¹²³ Tate Archive, TGA 955/1/1/10, ICA Papers, *ICA Statement of Policy and Aims*.
- ¹²⁴ Tate Archive, TGA 955/1/1/10, ICA Papers, *ICA Statement of Policy and Aims*.
- ¹²⁵ Tate Archive, TGA 955/1/1/10, ICA Papers, *ICA Statement of Policy and Aims*.
- ¹²⁶ Tate Archive, TGA 955/1/1/10, ICA Papers, *ICA Statement of Policy and Aims*.
- ¹²⁷ Tate Archive, TGA 955/1/1/10, ICA Papers, *ICA Statement of Policy and Aims*.
- ¹²⁸ J.M. Richards, 'The Next Step', *The Architectural Review* (March, 1950), pp. 164-169 (p. 165).
- ¹²⁹ Richards, 'The Next Step', p. 165.
- ¹³⁰ Richards, 'The Next Step', p. 165.
- ¹³¹ Richards, 'The Next Step', p. 168.
- ¹³² Richards, 'The Next Step', p. 168.
- ¹³³ Richards, 'The Next Step', p. 165.
- ¹³⁴ Richards, 'The Next Step', p. 165.
- ¹³⁵ Richards, 'The Next Step', p. 165.
- ¹³⁶ Richards, 'Criticism' (June, 1941), p. 132.
- ¹³⁷ Hugh Casson first appeared on MARS members list in March 1945.
- ¹³⁸ Reyner Banham, 'Stocktaking, 5' *The Architectural Review* (June, 1960), pp. 380-92 (p. 381).
- ¹³⁹ J.M. Richards, 'Hats Off - Watney Lettering' *The Architectural Review* (November, 1960), pp. 376-80; J.M. Richards, 'Criticism: Stockholm, New Commercial Centre' *The Architectural Review*

(August, 1961), pp. 105-07; J.M. Richards, 'Report From Romania', *The Architectural Review*, (September, 1965), pp. 189-99; J.M. Richards, 'The Painted Churches of Moldavia', *The Architectural Review* (March, 1966), pp. 183-90.

¹⁴⁰ J.M. Richards, 'Gourna: a lesson in basic architecture', *The Architectural Review* (February, 1970), p. 10-22.

¹⁴¹ Reyner Banham, 'Criticism: Pirelli Building Milan', *The Architectural Review* (March, 1961), pp.195-98; Reyner Banham, 'The obsolescent airport', *The Architectural Review* (October, 1962), pp. 252-58; Reyner Banham, 'Speed the Citizen, urban rapid transit and the future of cities', *The Architectural Review* (August, 1964), pp. 103-10; Reyner Banham, 'Towards a million-volt light and sound culture', *The Architectural Review* (May, 1967), pp. 331-38.

¹⁴² Reyner Banham, 'On Trial: 5', *The Architectural Review* (July, 1962), pp. 42-49 (p. 43).

¹⁴³ Banham, 'On Trial: 5', p. 43.

¹⁴⁴ Banham, 'On Trial: 5', p. 45.

¹⁴⁵ 'Stocktaking 1', in, *The Architectural Review*, (February, 1960), p. 93-98.

---. 'Stocktaking 2', in, *The Architectural Review*, (March, 1960), p. 183-190.

---. 'Stocktaking 3', in, *The Architectural Review*, (April, 1960), p. 253-260.

---. 'Stocktaking 4', in, *The Architectural Review*, (May, 1960), p. 352-261.

---. 'Stocktaking 5', in, *The Architectural Review*, (June, 1960), p. 381-291.

¹⁴⁶ Reyner Banham, 'Stocktaking 5', *The Architectural Review* (June, 1960), pp. 384-94 (p. 386).

¹⁴⁷ Banham, 'Stocktaking 5', p. 386.

¹⁴⁸ Banham, 'Stocktaking 5', p. 386.

¹⁴⁹ Banham, 'Stocktaking 5', p. 386.

¹⁵⁰ Banham described these efforts at 'education' as nothing more than attempts 'to equip the working classes with middle-class responses'. Banham 'The Atavism of a Short Distance Mini Cyclist', *Living Arts*, no. 3 (1963), pp. 91-97 (p. 87).

¹⁵¹ Banham, 'Zoom Wave hits architecture', *New Society* (3 March 1966), pp. 64-69.

¹⁵² Banham 'The Atavism of a Short Distance Mini Cyclist', p. 87.

¹⁵³ London, BBC Video Archive, John Donat, 'American Architecture' (aired November, 1969).

¹⁵⁴ BBC Video Archive, Donat, 'American Architecture'. This was three years before the book *Learning from Las Vegas* was published.

¹⁵⁵ BBC Video Archive, Donat, 'American Architecture'.

¹⁵⁶ BBC Video Archive, Donat, 'American Architecture'.

¹⁵⁷ J.M. Richards, 'RIBA Discourse: The Hollow Victory', *The Journal of the RIBA* (May, 1972), pp. 189-99 (p. 197).

¹⁵⁸ Richards, 'The Hollow Victory', p. 194.

¹⁵⁹ Richards, *The Castles on the Ground*, p. 10.

¹⁶⁰ Richards, *The Castles on the Ground*, p. 10.

¹⁶¹ Richards, *The Castles on the Ground*, p. 10.

¹⁶² Richards, *The Castles on the Ground*, p. 9

¹⁶³ Nicholas Taylor, *The Village in the City* (London, 1973) p. 21.

¹⁶⁴ Taylor, *The Village in the City*, p. 19.

¹⁶⁵ Taylor, *The Village in the City*, p. 220.

¹⁶⁶ GTA Archive, General Secretariat Papers, Letter from Sigfried Giedion to Hartland-Thomas.