

THE BUNGALOW, 1600 - 1980

A study of the cultural, social, political and
economic factors in the production of a global
house-type

Anthony Douglas King

Volume One : Text

Volume Two : Illustrations

Thesis presented for the degree of PhD

School of Social Sciences
Brunel University
Uxbridge

May, 1982

ABSTRACT

The research, undertaken within the context of recent studies on the mutual relation between society and its built environment, concerns a particular item in that environment - the specialised dwelling form of the bungalow - and the various historical forces which have produced it. It also explores the meaning of that form for, and its influences on, the society where it exists.

The study has two dimensions: 'a cultural history of the bungalow' and a discussion of various themes which the investigation of that history suggests.

The bungalow is probably the only house-type which, both in name (from 'bangla', meaning of, or belonging to Bengal) and form exists in almost every continent. In investigating its origins in India, and later development in Britain, North America, Australia, Africa and Europe, the study explores the historical forces which, in producing it, have also shaped the modern world: colonialism, industrialisation, urbanisation and suburbanisation, and the emergence of a global economy and culture. In different historical contexts, the bungalow has been variously peasant's hut, colonial dwelling, specialised vacation house, country retreat, tropical dwelling, and suburban home.

In tracing these developments, the chapters discuss the economic, political, cultural, social and other influences on dwelling and urban form; the symbolic function of architecture and environments; the relationship between social form and built form, ideology and environment, and dwelling type and property ownership. The role of economic and social power in shaping environments is discussed in relation to 'town and country planning' in Britain. Chapters on India and Africa explore, in the context of debates on 'Westernisation', the transfer of values and standards in housing and planning, as part of a larger transformation of material culture.

In investigating the social production and meaning of the bungalow, the study attempts a comparative, inter-disciplinary approach to the historical study of the built environment, drawing on social and cultural explanations of built form, the political economy of urbanisation and studies of the world system.

CONTENTS

Title Page	1
Abstract	2
Contents	3
Acknowledgements	8
Illustrations	9
INTRODUCTION	11
I <u>The context</u>	12
II <u>The significance of the bungalow as object of study</u>	13
a. as global phenomenon	15
b. in Britain	16
III <u>The research framework</u>	19
The study of urban, building and housing forms	
in relation to society and culture	20
Culture and environment	21
The political economy of urbanisation	22
Urbanisation on a global scale	24
IV <u>Organisation</u>	26
A note on sources and fieldwork	30
Illustrations	32
CHAPTER ONE : THE BUNGALOW IN INDIA, 1600 - 1980	37
Introduction	38
I <u>Bengal origins, 1600 - 1757</u>	39
The context: European settlement in India	39
The ' <u>banggolo</u> '	43
II <u>The Growth of Colonial Power 1757 - 1857</u>	51
The background	51
Theories of origin	54
The Anglo-Indian bungalow, 1810: structure,	
materials and form	57
The bungalow in use	63
Growth and change, 1800 - 1857	66

III	<u>Colonial House-Type, 1858 - 1947</u>	69
	The context: imperial development	69
	The setting: cantonment and civil station	71
	'Moving territory': the dak bungalow	74
	The architecture of empire: the bungalow as colonial dwelling	75
IV	<u>Indian Inheritance, 1900 - 1980</u>	81
	Westernisation and the built environment	82
	Westernisation and the Indian elite	84
	Middle class Houses: changes in style	85
	Middle class houses: changes in form	86
	Conclusion	
CHAPTER TWO:	THE BUNGALOW IN ENGLAND 1750 - 1890	104
	Introduction	105
I	<u>International Context</u>	106
	The international economy and its effects	106
	The word and image	107
II	<u>National Development: Economy and Society</u>	112
	The development of leisure resorts	112
	Masses and classes: segregation at the resorts	115
III	<u>Local Setting</u>	117
	Bungalow development: Phase one	117
	Bungalow development: Phase two	127
	The contemporary response	128
	Architects and innovators	129
	Conclusion	132
CHAPTER THREE:	THE BUNGALOW IN ENGLAND 1880 - 1914	141
	Introduction	142
	The changing function of rural land	143
	The bungalow in the country	146
	The bungalow and the Bohemian	150
	the suburbs	153

The bungalow Prefab on the beach	155
The bungalow as symbol for the simplification of life	163
The bungalow re-exported	167
Back to the land	168
Conclusion	174
CHAPTER FOUR: THE BUNGALOW IN AMERICA 1880 - 1980	183
Introduction	184
I <u>Summer Cottage</u>	185
The bungalow as summer cottage	185
Back to nature: the bungalow as product of Arcadian myth	189
Arts and Crafts and 'The Craftsman' Bungalow	191
II <u>Suburban Home</u>	196
Suburbanisation: the Los Angeles experience	196
The Californian Bungalow	199
The bungalow as suburban mass house	201
The Californian image in Britain	203
The bungalow in decline	206
III <u>Appraisal</u>	208
The American bungalow in social perspective	208
Architectural significance	213
CHAPTER FIVE: BUNGALOID GROWTH: ENGLAND 1918 - 1947	225
Introduction	226
I <u>Bungaloid Growth</u>	227
The setting: the interwar building boom	227
The Californian connection	230
Bungalow types	231
The ideological appeal	232
Economic factors: state subsidies	234
Economic factors: land, materials and labour	237
Bungalows by the sea	245
Weekend retreat	249

II	<u>Environmental Control</u>	252
	The bungalow under attack	252
	The Council for the Preservation of Rural England	259
	The Town and Country Planning Act, 1932	263
	Conclusion	267
CHAPTER SIX: THE BUNGALOW IN AFRICA 1880 - 1980		283
	Introduction	284
	The significance of the bungalow in Africa	286
I	<u>European interest in Africa</u>	287
	Early urban enclaves	289
	The bungalow as tropical house-type	290
	African dwelling and settlement forms	294
II	<u>The impact of colonialism</u>	297
	Colonial settlement: the dwelling	298
	Colonial settlement: social space	304
	The transition fo capitalist urbanisation	307
III	<u>The bungalow as model</u>	311
	From hut to bungalow: the transition to European house	313
IV	<u>Conclusion: urbanisation and 'Westernisation'</u>	316
CHAPTER SEVEN: THE BUNGALOW IN AUSTRALIA, 1788 - 1940		328
	Introduction	329
I	<u>The shape of Australia's urban development</u>	331
II	<u>The early Australian house</u>	338
	The 'tropical bungalow' in Queensland	342
	'Bungalow' as Australian term	344
III	<u>The Californian bungalow in suburban Australia</u>	347

CHAPTER EIGHT: SOME SPECULATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	362
I <u>Counterurbanisation: the bungalow as promoter and product</u>	363
Tenure and dwelling type: the significance of the bungalow	366
The bungalow in continental Europe	370
The proliferation of households and dwellings	372
Bungalow as name	375
II <u>'Suburban sprawl' : the cause and consequences of the British exception</u>	376
The bungalow as second home	379
The bungalow as 'tropical house'	381
III <u>The bungalow as global phenomenon</u>	382
APPENDIX A An architectural note on the term 'veranda'	390
APPENDIX B The bungalow in poetry and song	386
BIBLIOGRAPHY	407

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My interest in the bungalow arose from earlier research on colonial urban development in India. The idea of undertaking a specifically historical study, however, occurred only after my attention was drawn to what turned out to be the first bungalows to be built in Britain. For this, and innumerable other helpful items of information since, I am greatly indebted to Robert Thorne: what was first a joke, and then a hobby, had the potential for what I hope is a serious thesis.

Many other people have given generously of both their time and expertise. I am particularly grateful to friends who have read and commented on various chapters, especially Dr Chris Bayley, of Cambridge (India), Dr Jeremy Eades, Kent (Africa), Clay Lancaster, Kentucky and Professor Robert Winter, California (North America), Dr Donald Johnson and Robert Freestone, of Flinders and Macquarie Universities (Australia). For other valuable advice on these parts of the world I am indebted to Professor Kirti Chaudhuri, SOAS, Professor Arvin Shah, Delhi, Dr Ranajit Guha, Sussex, (India) Professor Roy Wolfe and Dr Deryck Holdsworth, both of Toronto (Canada), Professor Anthony Hopkins, Birmingham and Anthony Kirk-Green, Oxford, (Africa). The content of these particular chapters would have been immeasurably poorer without their comments and generosity which, in many cases, has included sending their own research papers, photocopies of key evidence, and detailed correspondence. I have also received valuable comments from the late Professor Jim Dyos, Dr Jay Edwards, Adrian Forty, Dr Vere Hole, Dr Ronald Lewcock, Peter Newell, Hugh Prince, Dr Alison Ravetz, Ray Sumner and Colin Ward.

Many of the issues I have discussed with Mike Safier, of the Development Planning Unit, University College, London and with Dr David Page; to both of these I owe my sincere thanks. Professor Sydney Urry, of Brunel University, has indirectly provided the opportunity for undertaking the research. To Professor John Burnett, also of Brunel University, I owe a double debt of gratitude, firstly, for his 'Social History of Housing' which appeared opportunely during the course of the research, and more especially, for his many valuable comments on the draft chapters. More indirectly, I have benefitted from the meetings and members' perspectives of various research groups, especially the Working

Group on Urban and Regional Development of the International Sociological Association, the Planning History Group, and more recently, the 'Sociology and Environment' Study Group of the British Sociological Association.

The help of Dr Mildred Archer, previously of the India Office Library, was indispensable in researching the drawings, paintings and photographs of the Western Drawings Collection there; I am also grateful to Ken Garfield and Peter Humphries of the photographic sections of Leicester and Brunel Universities. I would also like to extend my thanks to Judith Parkinson for her patience, efficiency and cooperation in typing this thesis.

It is always a pleasure to record the help and professional skills of library staff. Here, special mention should be made of that of the University of Cambridge, where much of the empirical data was gathered and also, the Reading Room of the British Library (Lending Division), Boston Spa, where more general works were consulted, for their excellent service. In addition, I am grateful to the library staff of Brunel University, Leeds University, the Royal Institute of British Architects, the India Office, the British Library, London, the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Australia House, the Church Missionary Society, the Royal Commonwealth Society, Liverpool Reference Library, Kent County Library, Ramsgate, Leeds City Library, and Croydon Public Library.

To all of the above, I owe my thanks and appreciation; needless to say, the responsibility for what follows is entirely my own.

Finally, to Ursula, Frances, Karen, Anna and Dominique Nina, all of whom will be happy to see the last of this, my many thanks for their infinite patience and help.

The study developed from two preliminary articles published in the Architectural Association Quarterly, 1973; other initial ideas were explored in two articles published in Art and Archaeology Research Papers, 1977, and the International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 1980. All of this material, listed in the bibliography, has been revised for this thesis.

ILLUSTRATIONS

Illustrations are included in Volume Two; numbers on the right hand margin of the text refer. As the context of these illustrations is discussed in the text, only brief captions have been added where necessary.

INTRODUCTION

- I The context

- II The significance of the bungalow as object of study
 - a. as global phenomenon
 - b. in Britain

- III The research framework
 - The study of urban, building and housing forms in relation to society and culture
 - Culture and environment
 - The political economy of urbanisation
 - Urbanisation on a global scale

- IV Organisation
 - A note on sources and fieldwork
 - Illustrations

INTRODUCTION

The context

This study is concerned with a particular item in the built environment - a specialised dwelling form - and the various historical factors, economic, social, political and cultural, which have produced it. It is also concerned with the meaning of that dwelling form for, and its influence on, the society in which it exists. Though the particular form discussed is the bungalow, to be defined below, the assumption behind the study is that the method adopted for its investigation is equally applicable to the study of other building forms and types. Hence, the relevance of the investigation is as much in the method adopted as in the object investigated.

The study of, and explanation for, the historical development of building form as well as the larger built environment, and the relation of that environment to the society in which it exists, form the subject matter of many academic disciplines each with its distinctive focus: economic and social history, geography, sociology, anthropology, political economy, architecture, planning and social psychology, to name the more obvious. In the last two decades, many new specialisations have developed whose object of study is the 'urban', the 'built environment', and the relationship between people and buildings, buildings and society, and what might be called the physical and spatial on one hand, and the social and cultural on the other. In history, specialised academic journals exist for urban history, planning history, housing history, architectural history, building history, economic history, social history, as well as specifically-named inter-disciplinary history. In addition to inter-disciplinary urban studies, sociology, geography and anthropology all have their 'urban' sub-disciplines. Focussing particularly on the inter-relationship between two phenomena, namely, people or society on one hand, and the environment on the other, a relationship which, according to some, cannot be conceptualised except as a single and total entity, are other specialisations:

man-environment studies, architectural and environmental psychology, urban and social ecology.

In a very general sense, therefore, these developments provide the context for this study. More particularly, it arises from a commitment to the concept of inter-disciplinarity and the particular disciplinary interests and departmental affiliations of the writer in the last few years: inter-disciplinary social science (at the Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi), economic and social history (University of Leicester), sociology and social anthropology (Brunel University) and building (Brunel), the latter also including interests in architecture and planning. A further interest emerging from experience in India is that of development studies. Although this perspective is not pursued throughout, it informs the chapters on India and Africa and its assumptions about development, inter-dependency and the emergence of a global economy which ultimately provide both the justification and the setting for the study.

The significance of the bungalow as object of study

The choice of a particular form of dwelling, or more accurately, one distinguished by a particular name, is, in a sense, accidental. The attraction of the bungalow as an object of study is that it provides an opportunity for investigating a large number of questions concerning our understanding of the built environment and the relation of that environment to society.

For the purpose of this study, a bungalow is defined as a particular dwelling form known by the term 'bungalow'. If this seems an 'Alice in Wonderland' definition where, 'to quote Humpty Dumpty, a word means 'just what I choose it to mean', it is because, in the three hundred years of its known history, the bungalow has been defined according to varying criteria. In the earliest, seventeenth century use of the term, these were explicitly geographical, and implicitly, economic and cultural: the bungalow or 'banggolo' (with various spellings) was the dwelling of a particular pre-industrial, peasant culture in rural Bengal. Subsequently, the criteria were explicitly racial and implicitly, political and

structural: the 'European bungalow' was a form of dwelling occupied by a racial and cultural group living in India under the political and economic conditions of colonialism.

On the transfer of the term and concept from India to Europe, in the second half of the 19th century, the bungalow was defined by varying criteria: it was a dwelling type distinguished by function (as a specialised building for leisure), by its manner of construction (lightly built, or pre-fabricated) or by its structure or design (of one storey). Subsequently, in combining some or all of these features, it increasingly became defined according to location (country, seaside, riverside); it was a house for a particular place. Transferred to Africa, the bungalow became a house-type 'suitable for European residence in the tropics', the criteria of definition again being both racial or cultural and geographical. And not infrequently, in the early years of its introduction into Britain and the United States, criteria of structure or function were complemented or replaced by those of appearance or architectural style (the 'bungalow style') a meaning which it can retain today. Thus, apart from criteria of location, age and site, how is a single storey cottage to be distinguished from a bungalow?

This last question raises a variety of issues. What images are associated with terms for dwellings? What social meaning do such terms and images have? Why, indeed, has such a complex terminology developed in different societies to differentiate between different dwelling types? None of the criteria suggested above indicate the variety of social meanings attached to the bungalow at various times nor the ideologies with which it has been associated.(1) Notions that 'a cottage is a little house in the country but a bungalow is a little country house' (England 1894) or that a bungalow is 'a house that looks as though it was built for less money than it actually cost' (United States, 1911) are not included in dictionaries. It is because of these images that this study pays as much attention to the term 'bungalow' and the social meaning attached to it as to the reality which the term describes.

To give a simple 'definition' indicating what the term bungalow 'means', therefore, is not easy. In practice it has generally been applied to dwellings with certain characteristics: until the advent

of a 'semi-detached' bungalow, the term referred to a separate or 'detached' dwelling, sometimes with a verandah, generally occupied by one household or family and located on its own plot. Only from the late nineteenth century, and outside Asia and Africa, has the term usually been restricted to dwellings entirely or principally of one storey; and it may be applied to such dwellings whether used for temporary or permanent occupation. Its significance, as both house and property, is that - in contrast to multi-household accommodation (flats, row or terrace housing, 'duplex' or semi-detached) - it is a physically separate dwelling with no-one living above, at the side or below.

It is, however, the various themes suggested by these changing definitions with which this study is concerned. Though discussed in more detail below, these include, for example, the influence of culture and economy on dwelling and settlement forms, the social and political symbolism of building and architecture or the role of housing, whether conceived as dwelling form or property, in the transformation - as part of a larger process of urbanisation - of material culture in Asia or Africa. In this sense then, the bungalow is simply a vehicle for the examination of various themes, two or three of which are taken up in each chapter.

a. The bungalow as global phenomenon

In another sense, however, there are at least three reasons which justify a study of the historical development of the bungalow in its own right. In the first place, it is a dwelling type - possibly the only one - which, both in form and name, can almost certainly be found in every continent of the world. * Where every language has its own set of terms to describe different forms of dwelling, 'bungalow' has been accepted into the principal world languages and also many others. It can be found throughout the English-speaking world (the United States, Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom, South Africa)

* The term 'villa' is also found in many European languages but is probably less widespread.

as well as in ex-colonial or Commonwealth countries. Listed in standard dictionaries as a word of foreign origin, it has been incorporated into French, German, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, Turkish, Dutch, Swedish, Norwegian, Japanese, Polish, Rumanian, Czech, Serbo-Croat, and possibly other languages. Its existence as a term to define a particular type of dwelling, (usually of one storey, sometimes with a verandah) used for leisure or vacation purposes, or for permanent suburban living, is an example of a trend best described by Harvey. 'What is remarkable is not that urbanism is so different but that it is so similar in all metropolitan centres of the world in spite of significant differences in social policy, cultural tradition, administrative and political arrangements, institutions and laws, and so on'. It is the conditions in the economic base of capitalist society which 'together with its associated technology put an unmistakable stamp upon the qualitative attributes of urbanism in all economically advanced capitalist nations'. (2)

One task of the study, therefore, has been to try and explain the global diffusion of a term and a phenomenon and assess what the meaning and significance of this is. This will be taken up later in this Introduction.

b. The bungalow in Britain

Secondly, in certain 'middle class' circles in Britain - including the academic community - the mere mention of the term 'bungalow' is sufficient to provoke amusement, if not ridicule. Among a certain group or generation of architects and planners, the reaction is even stronger, occasionally leading to outright condemnation. Though such attitudes are perhaps less widespread than they were a decade or so ago, a recent study of The Design of Suburbia (1981) suggests they are still very much alive. (3)

That such attitudes can be so widespread among members of a profession who, because of the power they hold in local government, exercise very considerable control over what is built, and where, in the environment around us, is obviously of some importance. Why does the bungalow provoke such a response in Britain, and how

0.1

did such attitudes arise?

Finally, despite the fact that the bungalow is known in many parts of the world, and in Britain, is one of the most popular dwelling types whose numbers are constantly increasing, there is no comprehensive history of its development. (4)

One reason for the absence of research is that, unlike the tower block or city centre re-development, the bungalow is not a 'problem': the strict application of planning legislation in Britain since the war has largely deprived it of the problematic status it had some fifty years ago.

More particularly, however, the reasons for its neglect as a subject of research would seem to stem directly from the attitudes indicated above, and provide an interesting case study in the sociology of knowledge. Why are some aspects of social life investigated and others not? Who undertakes research into particular academic fields and what social values and parameters govern both the choice of that research as well as the way in which it is undertaken?

It would, for example, be possible to list a large number of academic monographs on urbanisation, housing, architecture and other aspects of the built environment where some discussion of the bungalow as a separate and socially significant form of dwelling might be expected: yet for whatever reasons, there is little or no mention of it. For example, in studies of the housing system (5), building in Britain between the wars (6), the development of pre-fabrication (7), 'Arts and Crafts' architecture (8), the survey of 'Buildings of England' (9) or suburban housing (10), there is practically no mention of the bungalow. Its role in the historical development of mass vacation or second homes, or in the emergence of specialised housing for the elderly has equally been overlooked. (11) In many official statistics, where dwellings are classified according to type, no distinction is generally made between bungalows and other detached housing. (12) Only in social policy studies has serious attention been given to the bungalow as a specialised housing form. (13)

It would seem, therefore, as if a conspiracy had existed among academics and others which has resulted either in the bungalow being

ignored or, where it was mentioned, for derogatory 'asides' to be made to de-value it. (14) The most plausible explanation for this is to be found in class attitudes towards the bungalow which developed in Britain in the years between the wars and which have persisted since then.

Yet this lack of knowledge concerning its history highlights a major gap in our understanding of long term trends in the supply of housing and their relation to the economy, namely, the changing distribution of households over time, not only between different types of tenure (owner-occupation, local authority and private renting) but between different types of dwelling (terrace, semi-detached, detached, houses or flats). The economic, social, political and, not least, land use significance of these trends can be seen especially in comparison to both the Australian and American experience discussed in this thesis. This question is explored in the final chapter.

Over the last ten or so years, the attitudes described above have changed. In this context, some of the arguments stated here, first explored some years ago (15), are now 'old hat'. The suburban experience, the anathema of inter and post-war architects and planners, has been reassessed, largely as a result of a public revolt against the domination of professional control. Cowburn's article on 'Popular Housing' (1966) was an early pointer to these changes, and Wilmott has recently drawn attention to his own defence of the suburb in the 1950s and 60s (16). Other architectural writers have taken a more specifically proselytising stance in favour of suburban housing (17). From the 1970s, a growing body of research in urban and housing history has adopted an objective, rather than normative approach to these issues. (18)

Equally important have been changes in attitudes to housing and architectural standards in Britain not unconnected with developments in 'Third World' experience. Terms such as 'self-build' have been introduced into the British housing vocabulary, legitimising alternative solutions to housing problems, previously impeded by the rigid application of 'professional' criteria. (19)

The research framework

These comments, concerning the bungalow as a form of popular housing in Britain, relate only to two of the seven chapters in this thesis which also pursues a variety of other issues. The chapters on India and Africa, for example, focus on the transformation of social and cultural life, both represented by and contained in dwelling and urban form, as a result of the impact of colonialism. That on the United States explores the role of ideology in influencing architectural and landscape forms, and particularly, the expression of that ideology, in the form of the bungalow, in large scale suburbanisation. In tracing the bungalow idea, whether as specialised vacation house or as suburban home, to California and Australia, or discussing its introduction into England, and subsequent 're-export' to Africa, the study is also concerned with examining economic and cultural processes operating on a global scale. In short, the history of the bungalow is bound up with some of the major developments in the history of the modern world - colonialism, industrialisation, urbanisation, 'Westernisation' and the global diffusion of capitalism as well as the implications of these for development and under-development.

The scope of these issues is clearly far too large to indicate an appropriate literature for each, beyond what is indicated in the chapters themselves. What follows is a relatively brief discussion of the three areas of scholarship which have been seen as particularly relevant to this study. In mentioning these, it should be made clear that no attempt has been made to undertake a detailed, let alone comprehensive, survey of work in them. It is rather that they provide a background or perspective against which this present study has been undertaken:

1. The study of building and housing forms in relation to society and culture.
2. The political economy of urbanisation
3. Urbanisation and the world economy

The study of building and housing forms in relation to society and culture

The historical study of individual building types and their relation to forms of economic and social organisation is a relatively recent field of research. This is not to suggest that precedents do not exist. Yet in recent years, a number of studies have appeared which, focussing on specific types of building, have aimed to demonstrate what may be termed the 'social production of the built environment', investigating the way in which particular systems of economic organisation, or modes of production, and the ideologies associated with them, give rise to specific social institutions and activities which are then embodied in physical form. (20) The degree to which these forms then help to maintain social and cultural forms, whether by structuring images or in other ways, is a continuing source of controversy.

Other research, perhaps less grounded in studies of social process, has nonetheless demonstrated the relationship between economy, forms of social organisation and stratification and the actual built form which results. Thus, monographs exist on the prison, hospital, factory, asylum, as well as specific types of housing in Britain such as working, middle and upper class housing, the semi-detached house, and multi-storey flats (21) . Such studies vary in respect to the amount of attention each devotes to the economic, political and social phenomena - the institutions, activities, values, beliefs, ideologies - on one hand, and the resultant physical, spatial and architectural forms on the other. In addition, a substantial body of literature, too large to discuss, exists relating towns and cities to the economy and society which produced them. (22)

There are also numerous studies, both in Britain and elsewhere, on the economic and social history of housing, a principal object of which has been to produce empirically accurate descriptions of housing which are related to the social structure and ways of life in industrial, or industrialising society. (23) The explicit or implicit comparisons in these studies are, by necessity, economic and social, within one geographically defined society differentiated

according to income, occupation and class. Housing is defined according to class ('upper', 'middle' or 'working') and/or region (Scotland, Wales, London).

What is not always evident in such studies, however, is the influence of two other variables, culture (understood in the 'anthropological' sense as a 'way of life' or 'worldview') and form of political economy. For example, to grossly oversimplify, and ignore questions of regional variation, whilst the British observer may be interested in knowing what distinguishes the average middle class from the average working class house at any particular time, the Frenchman or Italian may be more interested in knowing, firstly, what it is which is common to all British (or at least, English) housing forms and, also, how such English housing differs, both in general, and at particular social levels, from housing in his own society.

Moreover, though French culture and experience may be different from that of Britain, both societies share a common European, Christian-Judaic tradition and have a more or less comparable industrial base. What explanation of English housing forms could be offered, for example, when compared to that of a Yemeni arab nomad, or a Hindu village cultivator?

Finally, were our observer from Cuba or the Soviet Union, it would also be necessary to make explicit that such housing forms result not simply from a particular economic base or mode of production, with a particular set of class relations, and from a particular cultural tradition, but also, from the specific conditions in the historical development of capitalism. In brief, how are urban and housing forms affected not simply by 'industrialisation' but by industrialisation under different forms of political economy - capitalism, socialism, colonialism, the 'mixed economy'?

Culture and environment

The transformation of landscape and the physical environment as a product of culture is the particular province of cultural geography. Additionally, though with a different intention and focus, studies in social and cultural anthropology have shown, for example, how

forms of social organisation are expressed in spatial forms on the ground, how buildings carry symbolic meanings, or how the world view of particular social groups is represented in dwelling and settlement form.

This approach has been particularly associated with the work of Rapoport, whose aim has been to explore the socio-cultural, psychological and related aspects of the built environment, leaving to others questions of 'political process and economic matters' (24)

Yet explanations of buildings, and especially particular forms of housing, in terms of an all-embracing notion of 'culture' have also been criticised. In particular, ideas that the preference for separate, single family, houses in the United States result from some generalised 'cultural ideal' are seen as naive. Such an explanation 'not only fails to deal with supply factors, it misrepresents the basis of demand, obscuring all the social, ideological, political and economic factors underlying demand'. (25)

The political economy of urbanisation

The influence of political economy has been central to the immense growth of literature which has arisen since 1970 in the 'new urban studies'. In this area, the paradigms of urban sociology have been re-drawn by Harvey, Castells and others represented, for example, by the International Journal of Urban and Regional Research or the recently published collection of essays on Urbanization and Urban Planning in Capitalist Society. (26)

The principal characteristics of these new trends were usefully summarised some years ago. They included

1. Examining the larger social, economic, political context of cities
2. Using an historical perspective to study urban problems and phenomena, meaning a strong emphasis on the process of social change over time in urban systems; and
3. Exploring the critical role of the economic system in shaping the nature of urban systems.

'More specifically, a fundamental postulate which underlies these new approaches is that a given element of an urban system cannot properly be isolated as a separate object of study, meaning it cannot appropriately be removed from the economic, social and historical context of which it is inextricably a part'. (27)

While these statements accurately characterise the new approaches, and also define the intention of this present study on the bungalow as 'an element of the urban system , * other characteristics should be mentioned. Much of the work has been theoretical, and written from an explicit Marxist perspective; much has been on European and North American urbanism, and there have been relatively few historical studies. And with particular reference to this thesis, the object of research has been, in general, on the city as such, or on urban social movements, and the actual physical and spatial form of the built environment has, with some rare exceptions, not been considered in detail.

Whatever the impact of these new approaches, the overall outcome has been well stated by Smith. In much of the earlier writing on urban society 'urbanization is often confused with capitalism. The effects of capitalist economic development are often mistaken for effects of urbanization . . . The concentration of the working population in large cities is itself a consequence of the economic necessities of Western capitalism at a particular point in its historical development'. (29)

Assumed in many of these studies is an implicit or occasional explicit comparison with non-capitalistic forms of industrial urbanisation which, by the very nature of historical circumstances, are difficult to test. Nevertheless, studies of urbanisation and urban planning under socialism indicate that different forms of built environment, especially in relation to housing, obviously result. (30)

These Marxist 'structuralist' perspectives, however, have - like 'cultural' explanations - been similarly criticised for seeing Man as 'a passive agent of an external force'. In this case, the

* It is of incidental interest that the classic analysis of the ecological zones of the city produced by Chicago sociologist, Burgess, in 1925 included among the 'Commuters Zone' a 'Bungalow Section'. (28)

active variable, instead of being 'culture', is 'the mode of production', 'the logic of capitalism' or something similar. (31) Despite this criticism, the contribution of these approaches has been valuable. It is difficult to ignore the real observable difference between modern Soviet cities where planners have 'in all cases' had a preference for multi-family (and state-owned) apartment houses (32) and the privately-owned, separate family dwelling houses of the United States. Whatever other explanations are offered, it is obvious that public or private ownership of land and the 'means of production' is fundamentally important.

By tracing the development of the bungalow in the very different historical contexts of pre-capitalist, pre-industrial India, of capitalist, industrial England, and of the United States and Australia in the twentieth century, and by examining the economic and political conditions in which it was introduced into West Africa, with its own peasant economy and forms of shelter and settlement, the study, therefore, is both implicitly and explicitly comparative. In this way, it is hoped to bring out the influence of various factors important in explaining the form of dwellings, settlements and the larger built environment.

Urbanisation on a global scale

As suggested earlier, the most significant fact about the bungalow is that the term, the ideology it represents, and the physical reality in which that ideology is expressed, can be found in many quarters of the globe. A framework is therefore needed to explain this fact. The most suggestive is provided by so-called 'World System studies'. Again, no pretence is made that this study makes systematic use, either empirically or theoretically, of such studies. It is rather that they provide a useful perspective.

Wallerstein defines the world-economy as 'a single division of labour within which are located multiple cultures' (33). His major task has been to trace the development of the capitalist world economy since the sixteenth century when its elements were first established in Europe. What Wallerstein makes clear is that

the present global economy emerges not simply from 'the expansion of Europe' but from 'the expansion of the capitalist mode of production'. (34)

The connections between an emerging capitalist world system and global urbanisation have, as yet, not been clearly demonstrated despite various explorations. Harvey notes that 'contemporary urbanism . . . is embodied in a global form of economic imperialism' (35); the development of industrial urbanisation in Britain has been linked to the particular economic, urban and regional underdevelopment of Latin America (36), West African urbanisation related to capitalist industrialisation in Europe (37) and the role of specifically colonial cities examined in the development of global urbanisation (38). However, where much of this work has concentrated on political and economic processes, the material and cultural expression of these has not been fully explored, though again, suggestions have been made.

Hobsbawm, for example, notes that the term 'world economy' was already in use in 1880 when the processes it describes were making for 'an international standardisation which goes beyond the purely economic and technological'.

'The railroads, telegraphs and ships of 1870 were not less recognizable as international "models" wherever they occurred than the automobiles and airports of 1970. What hardly occurred then was the international, and interlinguistic standardization of culture which distributes, with at best a slight time-lag, the same films, popular music styles, television programmes and indeed styles of living across the world . . . The "models" of the developed world were copied by the more backward in the handful of dominant versions - the English throughout the Empire, in the United States and to a much smaller extent, on the European continent, the French in Latin America, . . . A certain common visual style . . . could be discerned'. (39)

Fundamental to these developments was the transfer of the physical and spatial environment, the forms and images of dwellings and cities, in which everyday life was to be increasingly contained. Some attention has been given to the transplantation of these forms in earlier work, and especially, the role of urban planning

in this process (40); and a more detailed account of the way in which these ideas and mechanisms were diffused within Europe and North America has been offered by Sutcliffe. (41)

It is within this context, that the global diffusion of the bungalow needs to be considered.

Organisation

The study is in seven main sections and a final chapter in which issues arising are discussed. The seven chapters are ordered according to the geographical regions important for the historical development of the bungalow and also, chronologically, roughly according to its development and diffusion in the regions considered.

Although each chapter pursues particular themes, described below, the major issues on which the study focuses are fourfold:

- 1) large scale suburbanisation, both historical and contemporary.
- 2) the phenomenon of 'dual residence' or the 'second home', whether conceived geographically as 'seasonal suburbanisation'(42) or economically, in terms of property ownership and the accumulation of capital
- 3) the relationship between capitalism, as an economic system, property-ownership and the expression of this in the built environment as particular dwelling and settlement types
- 4) the global scale of economic, social and cultural processes affecting urban and residential forms

The choice of the chapter themes has, to a considerable extent, been determined by the type of primary and secondary sources available, and in some cases themes pursued in one chapter could equally be pursued in others. This also applies to the explanations given for the development and diffusion of the bungalow in each country. Thus, although each chapter can be read independently, explanations explored in the earlier chapters of the study are also carried over, and apply to, the later chapters. To make for easier

reading, the early chapters are more descriptive with greater attention given to analysis and explanation in the later ones.

Themes

Chapter One: India, 1600 - 1980

Against a background of European expansion in Asia, the chapter discusses evidence relating to a Bengali peasant dwelling known as a 'bungalow' and the way in which this was adapted and adopted by the European community in India. In doing so, it focuses on the relation between economy, culture, social organisation and dwelling form.

Related to this is the second theme, of how economic and political change gives rise to distinctive building and urban forms. With the growth of industry and capitalism in Britain, and the exploitation of colonies abroad, the bungalow - and the architecture in which it is expressed - becomes a symbol of the new imperial power.

Finally, the chapter explores the way in which architecture and urban form not only result from social change but also help to bring it about. It examines the process by which traditional Indian culture and the dwellings in which it was contained were influenced and transformed by an international market economy and the influence of European lifestyles and ideas.

Chapter Two: England, 1750 - 1880

The contribution of mercantile profits from India to the genesis of the Industrial Revolution in Britain provides the background for tracing the introduction of the bungalow, as a purpose-built leisure or holiday dwelling, into England. The first theme of this chapter concerns the connection between industrialisation, the accumulation of surplus capital and the specialisation of building form.

The second theme is an exploration of the way in which the values, beliefs and activities of a society, as well as its social structure, are reproduced in the built environment. The first bungalows and their urban setting were the products of a society

increasingly divided, both socially and spatially, according to class.

Chapter Three: England, 1880 - 1914

In this period, the bungalow was developed as a specialised dwelling form for country and outer suburban use. Its introduction at this time suggests the first theme: the changing use of rural land, from one of production (for agriculture) to that of consumption (for recreation) as it became subject to the influence of the world economy.

The second theme, touched on in Chapter One, concerns the symbolic meaning of architecture. As the bungalow was, by definition, simply constructed, of one storey, and physically distanced from city and town, it acted as a metaphor for various social and intellectual trends at the turn of the century - the revolt against convention and a search for alternative life styles by a growing bourgeoisie.

Finally in this period, whether in Britain, Australia and the United States, the bungalow became a prototype for the modern concept of the mass vacation or holiday house. Inherent in this development were technological changes, both in transport and the pre-fabrication of building, which encouraged this social and environmental change.

Chapter Four: North America, 1880 - 1980

The chapter examines the introduction of the bungalow into North America, first as vacation house (and apparently linked to the fluctuations of investment in the Atlantic economy) and then, in the form of the 'Californian bungalow', as a purpose-built dwelling produced by large-scale suburbanisation. In both these contexts, the first theme is the relation of ideology to architecture: how do social and intellectual beliefs mould the dwellings and landscapes in which people live? The second theme explores the relation between dwelling and settlement forms, and particularly, the 'suburban sprawl' which technology, cheap energy and the free play of market forces brought about.

The final theme considered is the role of the bungalow in America in the emergence of modern architectural design.

Chapter Five: England, 1918 - 1948

As world developments in agriculture brought depressed land and farm prices in Britain, now an industrial nation largely dependent on overseas food, rapid urbanisation occurred in rural areas. With extensive growth in home and car ownership, and a parallel fall in household size, the bungalow was a prominent feature in this 'urbanisation of the countryside' which traditional class interests attempted to control.

In this chapter, the main themes are the influence of economic, technological and especially demographic change on the built environment and the way in which changes in that environment give rise to new institutions and ideas. It explores the question of control over the aesthetic quality of that environment, highlighting the conflict of interest between people with different ideas and the power to carry them out.

Chapter Six: Africa, 1880 - 1980

The changing position of Britain in the late nineteenth century world economy, vis-a-vis other industrialising powers, caused her to turn her attention to 'underdeveloped' areas of the world both as sources of raw materials and as providing new markets for her goods.

The bungalow, defined in this chapter as a dwelling suitable for European occupation, was introduced into Africa in the last years of the nineteenth century as part of the new colonial urban and residential forms as a basically peasant economy was incorporated into the metropolitan, and world capitalist economy. The main theme of this chapter, then, is the transfer of norms, standards and domestic lifestyles from Europe to Africa, as part of the colonial process, and the relevance of this for present day economic and social development.

A second theme, only partly explored, is the history of 'tropical architecture' for Europeans.

Chapter Seven: Australia, 1788 - 1980

The case of Australia is useful as a 'control group' to test some of the propositions advanced earlier. As Australia was, for much

of its history, a dependent economy and culture bound by political, economic and cultural ties to Britain, it provides a useful context to examine the influence of political economy and culture on housing and urban form. Departing from the criteria used to define the bungalow in earlier parts of the study, this chapter attempts to explain why the modal form of dwelling in Australia has, from the inception of the nation in 1788, been a 'bungalow' in form (i.e. single family, single storey detached house on its own plot) if not in name.

Themes touched on in earlier chapters, namely, the question of explaining architectural change, as well as others, are considered.

Chapter Eight: Speculations and conclusions

The final chapter speculates on a number of issues prompted by the research and suggests further areas for investigation. These include, 1) The economic, social, political and spatial significance of the bungalow as a distinctive form of dwelling or property. 2) The bungalow as second or vacation home and the wider implications of this phenomenon. 3) Questions raised by the study for the understanding of global urbanisation and development.

A note on sources and fieldwork

Apart from the secondary sources used for the framework of the research, the study is based on empirical library research and intermittent fieldwork.

For the early history of the bungalow in India, information comes from travel literature, historical ethnographies and accounts of British social life in India. In the later phase of this development, material is from official government publications on architecture and urban development of the Government of India.

For much of the remainder of the study, building, architecture and planning monographs and articles, and professional journals, have been used as primary source material, supplemented, in the case of the United States and Australia, by secondary articles on the bungalow by Lancaster, Winter, Johnson and other scholars, as

indicated in the bibliography. Fairly extensive correspondence has been undertaken with these and other authors and this is referred to both in the acknowledgements and in the footnotes to the chapters.

Literary sources (novels and poems) have been used to a limited extent and, with the help of the Record Archives of the BBC, the words and music of some dozen popular songs on the bungalow, published between 1920-80, obtained. Pictorial material (especially postcard views and photographic records since c 1905) has also been utilised.

Any research on the built environment depends on fieldwork. In the case of the present work, this has been undertaken in both a systematic as well as haphazard manner. Much of this is connected to the writer's personal experience, which also partly explains both the origins and completion of the study.

This includes five years' residence in India and first hand acquaintance with the bungalow in its various settings - civil station, hill station, cantonment, as well as the capital of New Delhi and innumerable Public Works Department and dak bungalows. Subsequently, living in South London, and later in Cambridge and Leeds, and sharing the typical situation of parents with young children in Britain, it includes numerous visits to seaside resorts on the south, east and west coast of Hampshire, Sussex, Kent, Yorkshire, Lincolnshire, Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Lancashire and Wales, as well as Scotland, and considerable car mileage in the countryside areas in between. Some half dozen visits have been made to Birchington and Westgate, Kent (within 20-30 minutes drive of the Hovercraft Port at Ramsgate) and Dormans Land, Surrey, the sites of the earliest bungalow settlements in England (and Europe). Though of a slightly different variety, (as discussed in the conclusion), bungalows have been studied in Germany, Switzerland and the south of France. Living in the suburbs of a large industrial city of some three quarters of a million inhabitants (Leeds) has also provided an opportunity to explore the phenomenon both in the early tramway-and-motor car phases of suburban expansion (c. 1900) and in later (1920s, 30s) inner and outer suburbs and commuter villages.

Finally, commuting by train, occasionally by car, and infrequently by coach between Leeds and London for some years, and especially by Underground between King's Cross Station and Uxbridge on the Piccadilly and Metropolitan lines has provided additional insights into the urban morphology of London and the specific location and role of the bungalow within this.

Illustrations

The illustrations in Volume Two are included primarily as additional data. They do not 'illustrate' the themes of the thesis; it is clear that this would require totally different material.

Introduction Footnotes

1. On the link between housing, identity and social worlds to which this pertains see J.S.Duncan, ed., Housing and Identity. Cross-Cultural perspectives, Croom Helm, London, 1981.
2. D.Harvey, Social Justice and the City, Edward Arnold, London, 1973, p.278.
3. A.E.Edwards, The Design of Suburbia. A critical study in environmental history. Pembridge Press, London, 1981.
4. For studies of the bungalow in the USA and Australia, see notes in relevant chapters. See also note below.
5. A.Murie, P.Niner and C.Watson, Housing Policy and the Housing System, Allen & Unwin, London, 1976.
6. D.Aldcroft and H.W.Richardson, Building in the British Economy Between the Wars, Allen & Unwin, 1968.
7. G.Herbert, Pioneers of Pre-fabrication. Princeton University Press, 1978.
8. P.Davey, Arts and Crafts Architecture, Architectural Press, London, 1981.
9. N.Pevsner, The Buildings of England, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1954 -
10. P.Oliver, I.Davis & I.Bentley, Dunroamin: the suburban semi and its enemies. Barrie and Jenkins, London, 1981.
11. J.T.Coppock, ed., Second Homes. Curse or blessing. Pergamon Press, London, 1977. This aspect has been explored in A.D.King, 'A space for time and a time for space. The social production of the vacation house' in ibid., ed., Buildings and Society. Essays on the social development of the built environment, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1980; also, E.Steinfeld, 'The place of old age: the meaning of housing for old people' in Duncan, op.cit., pp. 198 - 246.
12. e.g. Department of Environment, National Dwelling and Housing Survey, as quoted in Social Trends, HMSO, no.10, 1980, Table 9.12.
13. V.Karn, Retiring to the Seaside, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1977.
14. 'the worst type of shack bungalows', H.S.Thurston, 'The urban regions of St Albans', Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 19, 1953, pp. 107-21, quoted in H.Carter, The Study of Urban Geography, Edward Arnold, London, 1981 (3rd edition), p.242.

15. A.D.King, 'The Bungalow. The development and diffusion of a house-type', Architectural Association Quarterly, 5,3, 1973; and 'Social process and urban form: the bungalow as indicator of social trends', Architectural Association Quarterly, 5,4,1973.
16. W.Cowburn, 'Popular housing', Arena. Journal of the Architectural Association, September-October, 1966. P.Willmott, 'Support for suburbia', The Times Higher Education Supplement, 12 March, 1982, p.13. A review of Edwards, op.cit.; Oliver, et al., op.cit. and P.Dunleavy, The Politics of Mass Housing in Britain, 1945-75, Oxford University Press, 1981.
17. Oliver et al., op.cit.; also N.Taylor, The village in the City, Maurice Temple Smith, London, 1973.
18. King, 1973, op.cit., A.A.Jackson, Semi-detached London. Allen and Unwin, 1973; J.Burnett, A Social History of Housing, 1815-1970, David and Charles, Newton Abbott, 1978.
19. See especially the writings of J.F.C.Turner; also C.Ward, Housing. An anarchist approach, Freedom Press, London, 1976; I.Illich, The Right to Useful Unemployment, Marion Boyars, 1978. Also P.M.Ward, ed., Self-help Housing. A critique. Mansell, 1982.
20. D.Melossi & M.Pavarini, The Prison and the Factory, Hutchinson, London, 1982. See especially the articles on the asylum, hospital and vacation house by A.Scull, A.Forty and A.D.King, in A.D.King, ed., Buildings and Society. Essays on the social development of the built environment, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1980.
21. R.Evans, The Fabrication of Virtue. English Prison Architecture, 1750-1840. Cambridge University Press, 1982 (forthcoming) (a revised version of the author's PhD thesis University of Essex, 1975); J.Tann, The Development of the Factory. Cornmarket Press, London, 1970; N.Johnstone, The Human Cage. An introduction to prison architecture. Walker, New York, 1973; J.D.Thompson & G.Goldin, The Hospital. A social and architectural history, Yale University Press, London, 1975. S.D.Chapman, ed., The History of Working Class Housing, David & Charles, 1971; J.Tann, Working Class Housing in Nineteenth Century Britain, Lund Humphries, London, 1971; ibid., Five Per Cent Philanthropy, Cambridge University Press, London, 1973; M.Girouard, The Victorian Country House, Country Life, London, 1975. A.A.Jackson, op.cit.; A.Ravetz, Model Estate, Croom Helm, London, 1974; A.R.Sutcliffe, ed., Multi-Storey Living. The British Working Class experience, Croom Helm, London, 1974, are some of the principal British studies. M.Swenarton, Homes fit for Heroes. The politics and architecture of early state housing in Britain. Heinemann, London, 1981.

22. An important example would be P.Abrams & E.Wrigley, eds, Towns in Societies, Cambridge University Press, 1978; also R.G.Johnston, City and Society. An outline for urban geography, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1980.
23. See especially Burnett, op.cit.
24. A.Rapoport, Human Aspects of Urban Form, Pergamon, London, 1977, p.6; see also ibid., House Form and Culture, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1969.
25. N.Duncan, 'Home ownership and social theory' in Duncan, ed., op.cit., pp. 98-134, p.102.
26. M.Dear and A.J.Scott, eds., Urbanization and Urban Planning in Capitalist Society, Methuen, London, 1981; other key works in this genre are M.Castells, The Urban Question, Edward Arnold, 1977; ibid., City, Class and Power, Macmillan, London, 1978; M.Harloe, ed., Captive Cities, John Wiley, Chichester, 1977; C.G.Pickvance, Urban Sociology. Critical Essays, Tavistock, London, 1976; K.R.Cox, ed. Urbanisation and Conflict in Market Societies, Maroufa Press, Chicago, 1978.
27. M.Aiken & M.Castells, 'New trends in urban studies. Introduction', Comparative Urban Research, 4, no's 2,3, 1977, pp.7-10,p.7.
28. E.W.Burgess, 'The growth of the city', in R.E.Park, et al. The City, University of Chicago Press, reprinted 1967.
29. M.P.Smith, The City and Social Theory. Blackwell, Oxford, 1980, p.235.
30. R.A.French and F.E.I.Hamilton, eds., The Socialist City. Spatial structure and urban policy, Wiley, Chichester, 1979.
31. N.Duncan, op.cit., p.103.
32. R.G.Jensen, 'Urban environments in the United States and the Soviet Union; some contrasts and comparisons', in B.J.L. Berry, ed., Urbanization and Counter-Urbanization, Sage, London, 1976, pp.31-42, p.34.
33. I.Wallerstein, The Capitalist World-Economy, Cambridge University Press, London, 1979, pp. 152-64, p.159.
34. ibid. 'The three stages of African involvement in the world economy, in P.C.W.Gutkind & I.Wallerstein, eds., The Political Economy of Contemporary Africa, Sage, London, 1976, pp. 30-52, p.30. See also ibid. The Modern World System. Academic Press, London, & New York, 1974 and L.Brockway, Science and Colonial Expansion. Studies in the World System, Academic Press, London, 1979.
35. Harvey, op.cit., p.228.

36. B.Roberts, Cities of Peasants, Edward Arnold, London, 1978.
37. A.L.Mabogunje, The Development Process. A spatial perspective, Hutchinson, 1980.
38. R.Ross and G.Telkamp, eds., Colonial Cities. University of Leiden Press, Leiden, 1983. (forthcoming)
39. E.J.Hobsbawm, The Age of Capital, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1975, p. 65.
40. A.D.King, Colonial Urban Development. Culture, social power and environment. Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976; *ibid*, 'Exporting planning: the colonial and neo-colonial experience', in G.E.Cherry, Shaping an Urban World, Mansell, London, 1980; *ibid*., 'Colonial cities: global pivots of change', in Ross and Telkamp, *op.cit*.
41. A.Sutcliffe, Towards the Planned City. Germany, Britain, the United States and France, 1780 - 1914. Blackwell, Oxford, 1981.
42. H.D.Clout, 'The growth of second home ownership: an example of seasonal suburbanisation', in J.H.Johnson, ed., Suburban Growth. Geographic processes at the edge of the Western city, Wiley, London, 1974.

CHAPTER ONE

THE BUNGALOW IN INDIA, 1600 - 1980

Introduction

- I Bengal origins, 1600 - 1757
 The context: European settlement in India
 The 'banggolo'
- II The Growth of Colonial Power 1757 - 1857
 The background
 Theories of origin
 The Anglo-Indian bungalow, 1810:
 structure, materials and form
 The bungalow in use
 Growth and change, 1800 - 1857
- III Colonial House-Type, 1858 - 1947
 The context: imperial development
 The setting: cantonment and civil station
 'Moving territory': the dak bungalow
 The architecture of empire: the bungalow
 as colonial dwelling
- IV Indian Inheritance, 1900 - 1980
 Westernisation and the built environment
 Westernisation and the Indian elite
 Middle class houses: changes in style
 Middle class houses: changes in form

Conclusion

CHAPTER ONE

THE BUNGALOW IN INDIA, 1600 - 1980

Introduction

The bungalow, both in name and form, originated in India, a fact more easily recognised since the creation of Bangla Desh. Yet though the name was given by India - from the Hindi or Mahratti bangla meaning 'of , or belonging to Bengal' (1) -the dwelling it came to describe was primarily European. In the first period of its development, the era of mercantile capitalism of the seventeenth century, the bungalow was a product of cultures in contact, an indigenous mode of shelter adopted and adapted for Europeans living in India.

In tracing these and later developments, this chapter pursues three themes. The first concerns the influence of economy and social organisation on building form: it shows how the simple hut of the Bengal peasant was transformed to meet the requirements of a European commercial and governing class. The Anglo-Indian bungalow which resulted was a product of the cultural and social expectations of its new inhabitants.

The second theme, related to the first, shows how economic and political change gives rise to distinctive buildings and urban forms. With the growth of industry and capitalism in nineteenth century Britain and the exploitation of colonies abroad, the bungalow in India became a symbol of new imperial power.

Finally, the chapter looks at the way in which architecture and urban form not only result from social and cultural change but also help to bring it about. It examines the process by which traditional Indian ways of life and the dwellings in which they were contained, were transformed by an international market economy and the influence of European life-styles and ideas.

I Bengal Origins, 1600 - 1757

The context: European settlement in India

The arrival of Vasco da Gama on the southwest coast of India in 1498 marked the beginning of a century-long Portuguese monopoly of the spice trade, the pursuit of which was the stimulus for European interest in Asia. The rise of this trade was to give a whole new dimension to economic activities on a global scale. As Chaudhuri has written, European trade with Asia was part of a much larger movement of expansion, responsible for forging entirely new forms of economic ties between Europe and the areas peripheral to it. It was also part of the steady growth in commercial capitalism which was to have repercussions on a world scale. The products of Indian land and labour, raw cotton converted into cloth, ended up on the slave plantations of America and the West Indies, producing tobacco and sugar for Europe, just as the silver reales from the mints of Mexico City found their way into the major trading towns of India and China. (2)

These economic changes were to bring cultural changes, also on a world scale. Though these were only to occur at a mass level with industrialisation, colonialism and the maturing of the world economy from the late nineteenth century, it is the beginnings of this system which provide us with the starting point of our study.

The Portuguese monopoly was broken at the end of the sixteenth century by the Dutch and subsequently, by the British, Danes, Swedes and French, all of whom were to establish trading posts in India. The earliest architectural manifestations of this trade were the so-called 'factories', a term used to describe both the trading settlement itself as well as the building (factory-house) in which its activities were pursued. The grounds of a factory, situated on an enclave of land granted as a concession from the local ruler, formed a 'compound', an enclosed and generally fortified piece of territory.

Dutch commercial interests were focussed less on India than elsewhere in the East Indies. Yet because of their superior sea and military power, the English, whose East India Company had been founded

in 1600, were obliged to accept a minor role in the East Indies and settled on India as 'second best'. (3)

1.1

The earliest of the Company's factories was established at Masulipatam, north of present-day Madras, in 1611. The following year, a second was set up at Surat, north of what later became Bombay. Here, in the reign of James I, simultaneously with the founding of New Amsterdam (later, New York) by the Dutch and with the emperor Jahangir on the Moghul throne at Delhi, the main English trading centre was to develop. Subordinate agencies in the north of India were soon to follow as well as a third major factory, and the building of Fort St George, at Madras in 1639.

The extension of operations to Bengal probably arose as a result of widespread famine in Western India in 1630 - 2. Yet though the Company obtained permission from the Moghul court to trade there about this time, it was only in 1651 that a factory was established at the Moghul town of Hugli on the main tributary of the Ganges. By then, there were some twenty-three English factories in India with about ninety English employees. (4) The establishment of other major factories at Patna and Qasimbazaar (Bengal) was soon to follow.

The picture of these and other European settlements which emerges from descriptions is of enclaves containing storehouses, barracks, a Director's house and other accommodation lying within a walled and possibly defensible compound or, as at Madras, or after 1700, Calcutta, a newly-constructed fort. However, at the English factory at Surat, itself a large Moghul town, some twenty-five merchants lived a 'collegiate' existence in an indigenous house in the town. (5) In A New Account of the East Indies and Persia, 1672 - 81, Fryer writes

'Before President Andrews time, they always lived in tents, but since, wooden houses tiled with pantiles have been raised in an enclosure allotted by the Governor, in which compound are included warehouses, stables and other out-houses, with as good a garden as this sandy soil will allow.' (6)

1.2

The 'factory house', was installed in an existing Muslim building in the city, and consisted of a two-storey, flat-roofed, courtyard-type building with an upstairs balcony and a garden in the centre. The ground floor was used for trading purposes, general stores and 'godowns' or warehouses; the upper storey, for living accommodation,

council and entertainment rooms and a bathing room. (7) Similarly, in the Moghul capital of Agra, the Company officials adopted much from the Indian way of life, living in a house in the city, 'the rooms in general covered with carpets and great high cushions' on which to lean. (8) In Calcutta, founded in 1690, Fort William had been constructed as

1-3
1-4

'an irregular Tetraon (sic) of brick and mortar called Puckah which is a composition of Brick dust, Lime MoTasses and cut Hemp and is as hard and tougher than firm Stone and Brick and the Town was built without order as the Builders thought most convenient for their own Affairs, everyone taking in what ground most pleased them for Gardening so that in most houses you must pass through a Garden into the House, the English building near the River's Side and the Natives within Land . . . About fifty yards from Fort William stands the Church built by the Pious Charity of Merchants residing there . . . The Governor's house in the Fort is the most regular piece of architecture that I ever saw in India. And there are many convenient lodgings for Factors and Writers within the Fort and some storehouses for the Company's Goods and the Magazine for their Ammunition. The Company has a pretty good hospital at Calcutta . . . also a pretty good garden that furnishes the Governor's table with Herbage and Fruit'. (9)

In 1689, Bombay consisted of a fort situated on an island which a contemporary thought was 'beautified with several elegant Dwellings of the English and neat apartments of the Portuguese'. Between 700 and 800 English lived in the fort at this time. (10)

Somewhat later (1710), Madras was said to present

a great variety of fine Buildings that gracefully overlook its walls, with straight and wide, paved streets, the walls of the fort penetrated with five gates. The public buildings included a Town Hall, St Mary's Church, The College, New House and Hospital with the Governor's lodgings in the inner Fort'. (11)

With their main factories on the coast and smaller ones inland,

the various European companies despatched agents, generally travelling by river, into the interior. In the unstable conditions of India, with fighting frequent between local rulers, such traders were constantly at risk. Responsible for negotiating with Indian merchants, they led uncertain lives 'up country', depending on the 'safe conduct' of the Moghul ruler whose authority was frequently not recognised. It is from one of these agents, Edmund Foster, that the earliest - albeit scanty - information on the bungalow derives.

In 1659, Foster was in Qasimbazaar, one of the Company's main Bengal factories. Whilst skirmishes between rival armies continued in the region, Foster was arranging the transport of saltpetre down the Ganges, from Patna to Hugli. The invading army, under Mir Jumla, set up camp in the vicinity.

They have begun to make bunguloues and some houses within nine course (kos - a Moghul unit of measurement) of this place, by a great tank called Sheck Tanke'

wrote Foster to his Company colleague. (12)

This first reference clearly distinguishes between 'bunguloues' and 'houses' and, as in an account of three decades before, suggests some form of quickly-built and temporary shelter. In that case, a party of French merchants had been trading, in 1633, in the region of Satganaur, north of Patna on the Ganges; according to a contemporary account, they had established themselves close to the town, famous for its silks, and 'under the pretence that a building was necessary for their transactions in buying and selling . . . erected several houses in the Bengali style'. (13)

In trading along the tributaries of the Ganges, the European merchants were probably accompanied by members of the local Bengali community. Staying for a few days or even longer, it is likely that, between towns and villages, when not sleeping in the large, barge-like boats or budgerows in which they travelled, they set up camp and were accommodated either in tents or in quickly-built shelters, made from material at hand and constructed by local peasants. In 1676, Streysham Master, the East India Company's agent at Madras, travelled up from there to Bengal to inspect the warehouse and buildings at Hugli and to supervise trading activities. He arrived late in November. 'There being a plott of ground, part of the Compound of the Company's Factory', he wrote in his diary,

'which lies conveniently neare the river side, it was thought fitt to repaire and enclose it, and to set up Bungaloes or Hovells for a habitation for all such English in the Company's service as belong to their sloopes and vessells . . . and those that now live out in houses of their owne, by degrees, to be brought within that Compound, and all others that shall come hereafter to live within the same, and to be allowed to build such accommodation as they shall desire, if they be marryed; and all persons soe living to be under the inspection of the purse marine and to live under such orders as they shall receive from time to time from the Chiefs and Councell . . . No Englishman was to be permitted to reside or buy or build houses in India except in Factors or those places where we have a garrison'. (14)

This more detailed passage confirms the makeshift nature of the structures; it also suggests the 'territorial' nature of early trading settlements with the incoming English being limited to living within the enclosed area of the compound.

These assumptions are confirmed by the Comte du Modave, travelling in India in the mid eighteenth century. 'A bangla is a pavilion of bamboo covered . . . with thatch or leaves from trees which one constructs for some special occasion, like a marriage, a big fête, a meeting place during the hunt or simply a meeting place'.(15) Where the Frenchman preferred the local term, the Dutch slightly adapted it, noting on one of their navigation charts of the Hoogli estuary, 'Bangaelaer op Speelhuys', apparently referring to a place for rest or recreation. (16) According to a later authority, the local seerky grass from which these shelters were made, 'being remarkably light', when doubled or trebled was completely waterproof and enabled itinerant Bengali peasants to construct 'a very comfortable cabin in a few minutes'. (17) Similarly, Bishop Heber travelling in the early nineteenth century, describes how temporary huts were put up for his party 'made of frames of bamboo, each something like a hurdle in shape and size, well thatched and light and easily carried from place to place and supported on props when they were wanted'. (18)

The indigenous banggolo

The 'Bangala' was also used more permanently. In the later nineteenth century, the term described the common hut of the Bengal peasant which

had 'a sloping roof on two sides and two gable ends'. (19) It is probably this type of dwelling which is described at greater length by Francis Buchanan in 1810. (20)

'The style of private ediface that is proper and peculiar to Bengal, consists of a hut with a pent roof constructed of two sloping sides which meet in a ridge forming the segment of a circle so that it has a resemblance to a boat when overturned . . . This kind of hut, it is said, from being peculiar to Bengal, is called by the native Banggol . . . Among the natives, the poor man has one hut for himself and cattle, the richer men increase the number without altering the plan of the building'.

A wealthy Hindu family had a group of ten such huts, for various purposes and family members, the average size of each being about ten by eight cubits ; a 'common labourer', with a wife and two children, had only one, eight by six cubits.*

'Where the materials admit, the walls of the hut are made of mud and the floor is always raised a foot or two above the level of the plain, but not always so high as to be above water in the rainy season; so that a platform of bamboos is then constructed at one end of the hut and upon this the family sit and sleep while they must wade through the mud to reach the door'.

Where the soil was too loose for making walls, the sides of the hut were formed of hurdles made of straw grass or reeds confined between sticks or split bamboos, tied together. In the better kind of houses, in place of straw, hurdles made of mats were used, or those of straw were plastered with cow dung and clay. The frame of the house consisted entirely of bamboos tied together. Only in the houses of the very wealthy were wood posts and beams used and these were neither polished nor painted, nor were they fastened with nails. The door to the hut was usually the only aperture, 'crevices excepted', and was usually shut by a hurdle (jhangp), tied to the upper part of the door which fell down, like a valve, to close. Wooden doors which folded from the side were used only by the very wealthy. Very few houses had any window openings to admit air or light.

*cubit - 'ancient measure of length, 18 - 22 inches. From Latin, cubitus, elbow, length of forearm' (OED)

If the house was intended for a shop, one side of the roof was extended four or five feet beyond the wall and was supported by a row of bamboos to form a gallery.

The number of huts depended on the size and social standing of each family. At the top of Buchanan's scale, the ten huts of the 'Hindu family of high rank and station' consisting of a man, wife and child, a married dependent relative, another male dependent relative and four servants (ten persons in all), included a small brick house, 14 by 7 cubits (the following dimensions are all in cubits), with wooden doors and small, shuttered windows, where the man, wife and child slept; a hut (8 by 6), of bamboo posts and walls of clay or hurdle, where the male relative and his wife slept; a hut similar to this for a servant and store room; three more huts of similar size, one for a temple, the other for accommodating friends or religious mendicants; a larger hut (12 by 8), the baitokkhana, for receiving company, with wooden door and windows shut by jhangp. Here, the male relative slept with his servants; a further hut (8 by 6), was for cattle. The tenth hut (10 by 7), for the watchman, also formed the entrance to the 'compound' which was surrounded by a mud wall or fence.

Buchanan implies that very few people occupied such extensive accommodation. Possibly more representative of the wealthier inhabitants of Dinajpore was the family 'of some consideration' of eight people occupying eight structures: a clay-walled house (15 by 8), a kitchen, where the cook slept, and other huts for a store house, cattle, a temple, baitokkhana, and the watchman.

The material wealth of such a group at this time is suggested by their furniture and equipment, as well too as their ornaments, clothing, food and number of servants which Buchanan also lists. Durable furniture for the temple included three copper cups, a plate, a brass salver, tripod, pot and plate, conch shell, stone for grinding sandal wood, grass mat for prayer, a bell metal plate for ringing, brass lamp and wooden throne (singhasan) for the gods. For household use, eleven various water vessels of brass, betel salvers and two pairs of betel nut cutters, four plates, six cups, two lamp stands, two rice pots (all of brass); one pot for boiling milk and frying, ladle and hook, iron rod for cleaning the Hungka (pipe for smoking tobacco); a hoe, hatchet, bill hook, two sickles, two kitchen knives,

scissors, three plates and two cups of stone, stone for rubbing curry, two bedsteads for the master and mistress, one large and one small wooden chest, bamboo trunk, six wooden stools, wooden mortar, instrument for beating rice, four rattan stools (Mora), two wooden plates for cakes, two pairs of wooden shoes. Less durable furniture included, for the bed, two pairs of cotton curtains, two cotton-filled mattresses, two quilts, five pillows, four sheets, two blankets; for the floor, two cotton carpets, two woollen carpets, two split reed mats, and one umbrella.

At the lower end of the scale, the family of an 'artist' (artisan?), a man, wife and two children, owned two huts, one for sleeping (7 by 5) and another shared between the cow and for cooking purposes. Finally, for a 'common labourer', his wife and two children, the dwelling consisted of one hut (8 by 6) with very little furniture or possessions: two stone plates, a sickle, one metal plate, earthen or bamboo pots for drinking water and one hungka. Perishable goods included three pieces of sack cloth for bedding, three rugs and some few mats and straw pillows.

In other regions of India, single households are frequently accommodated in single dwellings, separated into rooms or spaces according to function, the status of family members or other social and cultural criteria. Whether the multiplication of the single, simple hut in the Bengal peasant household resulted from structural limitations of bamboo building materials or other cultural factors is not clear.

Building material and techniques

These comments on Bengali huts, the degree of economic differentiation in the village and the relation of household structure to the number and utilisation of huts are supplemented by Captain Thomas Williamson, writing about the same time. (21) Williamson, as an engineer, was primarily interested in building materials and techniques. Though not identifying the location described, his account is interesting for its detail and the sympathy he manifests for indigenous building methods. Moreover, at a time when industrialisation had not yet affected building methods and materials in the remoter parts of rural England, his comparative comments are more easily understood.

The walls of permanent building were usually constructed of mud laid in strata of 18 - 20 inches in depth, each stratum being allowed to dry before the next was added. Walls were between 26 to 30 inches thick at the base, tapering to about three quarters of this breadth at the top. Williamson reports seeing some 'native bungalows' with mud walls which, after being chipped down to a uniform thickness, were then plastered with a mixture of fine sand and chaff.

Few of the peasants carried their walls more than 8 or 10 feet high. Windows in the front of the hut were rare. In those which had enclosed areas ('compounds' or, in Bengali, 'ungnahs'), a low door was usual in some part of the environing wall, partly concealed by an angle so as to preclude the possibility of seeing into the interior.

On top of the mud wall of the hut, a stout piece of timber was laid to which rafters were fastened, each by one or more nails; rafters projected at least a foot beyond the exterior in order to sustain the thatch which hung over the edge of the wall to throw off heavy rains. Thatches were made of kuss or common wild grass. The manner of making these, especially for larger huts, Williamson found particularly intriguing. The side of the building to be covered was first measured. This measurement was then represented on level ground by means of four cords fastened to four stakes. Each side of a quadrangular or other building was marked out in this way. Then, large bamboos or bundles of three or four smaller ones were laid down, in parallel lines, about one foot apart, at right angles to the base line. These were then crossed, at five or six inch intervals, by battens of split bamboos which are tied on with fine grass (moonje). This frame was then lifted by the joint efforts of fifty or sixty men, by hand and with forked poles, onto the ready-laid rafters on the walls. When the frames had been placed on each roof slope, they were tied down and a scaffolding fixed under the eaves to enable the thatchers to begin.

The eaves were first completed by placing large, well-compacted bundles of grass, squared at their ends, in a line between the frame, each bundle being pressed closely to the next, till the lower tier was completed. The rest of the thatch was laid on in small portions,

each bundle being spread open and having the lower ends compressed between two bamboo laths which were tied in several places so as to secure the contents. The bundles were laid in such a way (described in great detail by Williamson) to give the appearance of overlapping ridges, of about one inch high, running parallel across the roof. When the whole was complete, the angles of the roof and the ridge, sometimes the whole roof, were overlaid with layers of fine seerky grass, a technique which Williamson reports seeing gipsies use in Essex.

The wooden doors were made of a few vertical planks held together by horizontal battens; fastenings were by staples and hooks in which strong wooden bars slipped. Where windows existed, they were not more than two feet square and closed by wooden shutters with a jhangp outside made of bamboo battens and mats; these were suspended at their upper borders by hooks or rings fastened into the wall or wooden plate covering the aperture and could be raised to any elevation and kept there by bamboo stilts. They also kept sun and rain off the doors and, when lowered close to the wall, kept out rain and dust. Windows were high up 'scarcely allowing a person to look in'. According to Williamson, this was done for the sake of privacy and coolness, as the 'rarified air' could escape better when the windows were high. Chimneys were 'utterly unknown among the natives' though sometimes an aperture was left for the escape of smoke. However, food was generally cooked outside or, more usually, in a small shed.

The outside of the wall was preserved rough so that the large cakes of cow dung, used for fuel, could more easily be stuck on to dry in the sun. Interior walls were smoothed for some three feet from the floor and smeared with cow dung, as was the floor, made from rammed clay. In some instances, a slight kind of flooring of rough planks or bamboo laths was installed. Joists of rough wood were occasionally placed from the top of one wall to the other. On here, brushwood, bamboo poles, nets, mats or utensils might be kept; occasionally, it also provided sleeping accommodation. Whatever the flooring, it was always smeared with cow dung which 'certainly gives a freshness and may probably tend to salubrity; nor is it so devoid of neatness as a European would imagine'. Some people ornamented both the interior and exterior of their house by dipping the palms of their hands into solutions of red ochre and then imprinting the walls with their coloured hands. According to Williamson,

this was 'to typify the infinite power of the Creator whose hands are supposed to be innumerable and perpetually in action'.

It was usual for a separate building to be set apart for the female members of the family; cattle were generally kept outside during good weather but during the great heat or rains, they had their own separate sheds where also any dooly or other vehicle was kept. Such dwellings had few possessions. Instead of candles, simple oil lamps (churraug) were placed in niches in the walls; although charpoys or small cots were in use among all classes, most people slept on mats; the whole contents of a dormitory included a red durmah mat, a small cotton carpet (satrinje), a sheet to wrap round the body (chudder), a pillow (tuckeah), a quilt (goodry), and a spitting pot (peek-daun) for use when chewing betel nut. (22)

Graphic and photographic evidence

Many of these details are confirmed by three drawings made by the English artist, George Chinnery, travelling in the Barrackpore region outside Calcutta in 1813. (23) These suggest banggolos of the poorer peasant with walls of matting and of mud. A few metal vessels can be seen as also an up-ended charpoy. The extension of the roof structure for a 'shop', mentioned by Buchanan, are also visible. Hungkas, umbrellas, the thatch framework and jhangp, can also be seen.

Three basic roof-types can be seen in these drawings. That with a curved ridge (discussed in more detail below) is described by a later source as the 'curvilinear hut': 'a rectangular building with a special roof structure; wooden ribs are bent and jointed together to form a grid which is then covered with straw. This roof protrudes over the walls and forms curves resembling a crescent moon on its sides. At the front, the protruding part of the roof may be supported by wooden poles, thus forming a gallery'. (24)

This very striking type of Bengali hut is well illustrated in a drawing of 1786 and even more so, in a photograph taken by Samuel Bourne, probably in the later 1860's. (25) This clearly shows the

1.5

1.6

1.7

1.8

1.9

raised plinth, two or three feet high, the crescent-shaped roof and supporting pillars, an extended roof section as well as woven mat walls.

In the early 1850's Frederick Fiebig, one of the earliest photographers in India (26) recorded what he described as 'a native hut, Bengal'; this is bamboo-framed, with matting walls, a detachable hurdle door, thatched roof and raised on a low, one-foot high plinth. Another photograph by Bourne from the 1870's illustrates the 'upturned boat' analogy of Buchanan of some sixty years before. These dwellings, situated at the edge of a tank in rural Bengal show the layered mud walls described by Williamson.

*1.10**1.11*

Muslim architecture and the Bengali hut

If these nineteenth century accounts and illustrations reveal a fascination for the bamboo technology and forms of Bengal peasant housing, it is a reaction which had earlier precedents. Long before the Moghuls ruled in Bengal, other Muslim overlords had settled there, adapting in their own brick and stone buildings the characteristic forms of the simple peasant's hut.

Dani somewhat oversimplifies the variety in these dwellings in suggesting that the bamboo huts with curved roofs and long-drawn eaves basically takes two shapes, the chauchala type, having four sides, and the dochala type, having two sides with gable ends and a central curved ridge. (do = two; chau = four) He writes that the chauchala roof has a covering on four sides which are 'more or less curved, in some domical, in others, flatter, but they never make a straight pyramid; secondly, the coverings have eaves drawn out lower down to a point at each corner, thus making the roof-base curved like the segment of a circle'. (27) This form was copied in brick to cover a rectangular space. Dani refers to examples of Muslim building, dating from the mid fifteenth century, such as the Chota Sona Masjid, at Bagherat, where this occurred. Subsequently, the curvilinear form was spread throughout northern India by the Moghuls and in the eighteenth century, was adopted from them and used in Rajput buildings too. (28)

1.12

The dochala hut, Dani refers to as the 'bungalow roof'. This 'has coverings on two sides, which are joined at the top thus making a curved ridge with gable ends. The eaves are curved as before and the ridge is generally crowned with finials in imitation of the knots found in the original roof'. The adaptation of this particular constructional form was first made during the Moghul period, an early example being the mausoleum of Fath Khan (d. 1657) at Gaur. (29)

1.13

These Muslim buildings confirm the existence of the curved thatched roof hut in Bengal at least in the fifteenth century and, in all probability, for many centuries before. With Gaur within miles of the early English factory at Englishbazaar ('Angrezabad'), this region may be seen as one of the 'cultural cross-roads' of Asia. From here, the cultural influence of a modified simple Bengali hut was to be diffused, via India and Europe, throughout the world.

The adaptation and use of the many forms of the Bengali hut, by Bengalis building under European supervision in rural areas, continued well into the nineteenth century as Grant's account of the small European settlement at Mulnath shows. (30)

*1.14**1.15*

II The Growth of Colonial Power, 1757 - 1857

The background

The dearth of evidence about the Anglo-Indian bungalow in the early period of settlement contrasts with its abundance later on. The explanation lies not simply in the growing number of Europeans in India but in their changed political position.

The death of the Emperor Aurungzeb in 1707 began the gradual decline of Moghul power in India. Throughout the Empire, the provinces successively established their independence. Increasing rivalry for the spoils between the English and French came to a head in a series of conflicts. The defeat of the Nawab of Bengal and his French allies at Plassey in 1757 is usually taken as the symbolic beginning of the British Empire in India. (31) Where the operations

of the East India Company in the seventeenth century had been those of trade, though increasingly armed trade at that, (32) after Plassey, they rapidly turned to plunder. During this second period in capitalist development, according to the Parliamentary Report on the East India Company (1813), 'the importance of that immense Empire to this country is rather to be established by the great annual addition it makes to the wealth and capital of the kingdom, than by any eminent advantage which the manufacturers of the country can derive from the consumption of the natives of India'. (33) The accumulation of capital, whether through plunder or Company fraud, (34) was - as will be seen in the following chapter - to be behind the first Indian influences on architecture, and early hints of the bungalow's development, in England. (35)

In the sixty years following the Battle of Plassey, a series of wars against the Indian states brought the entire sub-continent under British military, administrative and diplomatic control. By 1818, the effective conquest of India was complete. It is against this background that the bungalow, to become the rural, and subsequently, suburban 'model dwelling' of the next political rulers of India, was developed. The opportunity was provided by the installation of the two principal instruments of the new 'proto-imperial power', the army and its system of civil and juridical administration.

In the first half of the eighteenth century, the interior of India had been largely closed to Europeans. The exceptions were occasional embassies, some few soldiers taking service with local rulers and the agents of chartered companies. (36) With the rise of the East India Company's power, the number of Europeans in the interior or 'mofussil' settlements now rapidly increased.

The basis of Company rule in Bengal was military strength. The first permanent military camps or cantonments were established outside Patna (Bankipur) and Calcutta (Dinapur, Berhampur and Baraset) in 1772. (37) Here, Indian and European troops were housed in 'hatted lines', tents or barracks; their European officers, in a rapidly evolving version of the bungalow.

Administrative developments ran parallel to military control. In 1765, the East India Company was granted the management of the Bengal revenues, a further opportunity for the accumulation of capital. The task of collecting these, as well as administering

justice in the newly-created districts, previously undertaken by local Indian officials for the Moghul empire, was now handed to the Company. With the establishment of the appropriately-named office of Collector (1772), British administration began. (38) By the end of the century, a network of officials had been created as the British took over responsibility for governing their new possessions. With the introduction of the office of district judge and then that of Commissioner, with authority over a number of districts, the juridical and administrative system was extended to the Company's territory in Madras.

The emergence of the bungalow as a culturally distinctive house form is inseparable from these developments. The 'officer's bungalow' on the cantonment, like the 'Magistrate's', 'Collector's', or 'Commissioner's Bungalow' in the districts, was the work place and residence of the representatives of the new ruling power.

At first, the scope as well as the area of this authority was limited, the number of its officials few; in the mid-eighteenth century, less than 700 Europeans were in Bengal and only a third of them in 'up country' factories: 'tiny knots of Englishmen . . . barely noticeable on the fabric of Bengal society'. (39) As the Company's power and numbers grew, however, so the extent of its control increased. The effect on building developments and the growing inland towns became increasingly more marked. When the responsibility for ruling India was transferred in 1858, from the Company regulated by Parliament, to the British government itself, the control and influence over the environment became even more apparent. Where a few European travellers had adapted themselves to Indian forms of shelter in the seventeenth century, the representatives of an imperial political and cultural power brought an extensive adaptation of Indian forms two centuries later.

It was also during these years (c 1770 - 1830) that the most detailed evidence on the bungalow is produced. It shows, on one hand, its widespread acceptance as the typical, 'up country' dwelling for English officials; on the other, the phenomenon becomes of sufficient interest 'at home' that extensive descriptions need to be made. How this developed form had emerged from its indigenous prototype can now be discussed.

Theories of origin

According to Buchanan, the real banggolo described above was not the true prototype for the 'European' or 'Anglo-Indian' bungalow.

'Another kind of hut called a Chauyari (literally, 'four sides') has been introduced and this is the form which Europeans have adopted in their cottages (sic) when they use a thatched roof. It '(presumably the roof)' consists of four plain sides which, if the building is square, are triangular and meet in one point; but, if the cottage is long, the two ends of the roof only are triangular and the two sides (which are triangular truncated at the apex), form a straight ridge. Europeans have made great improvements in this kind of building, have surrounded it with a gallery to exclude the heat, have introduced windows, have divided it into convenient apartments and have suspended cloth ceilings to free them from the vermin that occupy the thatch. These luxuries seem unknown to the natives of the district (Dinajpur). Their chauyaris are built of the same materials with their Banggolos; but being used chiefly among the rich, have usually wooden posts and many of them have garrets that are inhabited and have openings by way of windows'. (40)

Buchanan's suggestion that the gallery round the house was a European addition can be questioned. Other sources indicate that houses having a 'gallery' were already indigenous to Bengal. According to a later authority, 'native houses to this day are divided into ath-chala, chau-chala and Bengali, or common huts'. (41) The ath-chala implies that the roof had four sides, with four more projections so as to cover a verandah all round the house, which is square. Nilsson refers to this type as the 'double-roofed house' and believes it to be the true prototype of the European bungalow. (42) The basic difference here is that the upper and lower (or verandah) roofs are separate.

1.16

A third alternative prototype, combining the roof structure of the chauyari with the pillared gallery of what Buchanan sees as the 'true banggolo', is described by Grant in 1849. In the ground plan of a 'native's bungalow'

the centre square consists of either one or two apartments, according to the circumstances or wants of the individual, whilst the thatched roof, extending considerably over all sides, is supported at the extreme edges upon bamboo or wooden pillars, thus forming a verandah round the building.

1.17

Grant, by deliberately featuring the pyramidal roof of the 'chauyari' alongside the curvilinear structure of the 'banggolo' appears to be deliberately excluding the latter as the true prototype.

The European resident, improving upon this, encloses the verandah by erecting either a mat or brick wall, and in like way, throwing partitions across the corners, converts the verandah into little rooms for the convenience of himself or visitor friends. The roof being carried beyond these as before, would complete nearly all which exists in the European's bungalow of the present day. (43)

1.18

This last account accords most closely with the earliest detailed description of an Anglo-Indian bungalow dating from 1783 and the earliest known drawing (both referring to Lucknow) of three years later.

1.19

'Bungalows are buildings in India, generally raised on a base of brick, one, two or three feet from the ground, and consist of only one storey; the plan of them is usually a large room in the center for an eating and sitting room, and rooms at each corner for sleeping; the whole is covered with one general thatch, which comes low to each side; the spaces between the angle rooms are viranders or open porticos to sit in during the evenings; the center hall is lighted from the sides with windows and a large door in the center. Sometimes the center viranders at each end are converted into rooms'.(44)

This description, as well as Grant's ground plan, are confirmed by a German traveller writing in 1890, with the exception that the bedrooms are placed at the side of the bungalow and the bathing rooms in the corners. This was the more usual arrangement.

1.20

Not all of these early European bungalows had verandahs. In 1803, a young army officer, Henry Roberdeau, wrote

'The Englishmen live in what are really stationary tents which have run aground on low brick platforms. They are 'Bungalows', a word I know not how to render unless by a Cottage. These are always thatched with a straw on the roof and the walls are sometimes of bricks and often of mats. Some have glass windows besides the Venetians but this is not very common . . . To hide the sloping roof we put up a kind of artificial ceiling made of white cloth . . . There are curtains over the doorway to keep out the wind . . . I have two Bungalows near to each other, in one I sleep and dress and in the other, sit and eat'.(45)

1.21

The fourth hypothesis, from a later, though still reputable source, J.Lockwood Kipling, father of Rudyard and founder of the Bombay School of Art, suggests that

'Our early residents in India, engaged in military, administrative or trading duties, lived a nomadic life for the greater part of the year in tents, and since there was nothing in the indigenous buildings of Bengal suited to their requirements, their first dwelling houses, designed by themselves and built of materials at site, are naturally planned on the model of the Indian service tents to which they were accustomed, i.e. a large and lofty room surrounded by double walls of canvas enclosing space between them, with partitions at two or more corners for bath or store rooms. It is probable, indeed, that in the beginning the tent itself was occasionally covered with the sun-proof thatch or 'bangla'. The name and the thatch were all we took'. (46)

1.22

Some credence to this theory is lent by Roberdeau's description and by the affinity of the structural components and enclosed areas of the tent and bungalow. It would also be supported by present-day Indian army practice whereby the sides of semi-permanent tents are often reinforced by brick walls.

Kipling also suggests that the 'double-roofed' bungalow with a 'clerestorey' was a later, mid-nineteenth century development of the earlier version where 'the roof covers both living rooms and verandah, as an extinguisher covers a candle, and which admits light through the doors only'.

Whilst Kipling's suggestions are credible, the true origins of the bungalow would seem to lie more in the explanations of Buchanan and Grant. The main characteristics of the developed Anglo-Indian bungalow in the late eighteenth century - its free-standing and single-storey structure, the plinth, the pitched, thatched roof and the verandah - are all characteristic features of the indigenous Bengal hut, whatever additions came from the Europeans. Moreover, consideration of the labour and expertise responsible for the construction of these early bungalows would seem to confirm this.

The early travellers in India were traders not settlers. In North America, Australia or South Africa, early emigrants had, in general, built their dwellings with their own hands and according to the cultural models in their heads. In India, however, Europeans were merchants, officers or diplomats rather than settlers. The social relations of production were such that manual labour, then as later, was carried out by the appropriate Indian castes with local materials and technology. If Europeans wanted work undertaken, it

was carried out by 'native labour' under European instructions and supervision. Even the European common soldier had 'native coolies' and servants to undertake manual tasks. Whilst European officials in rural districts might have had their own idea of the sort of dwelling they wanted, as it was not they but the local population who actually built it, the end result was more of a native product. The persistence of Indian 'housing models' over those of the European patron for whom the house was built, was a frequent source of amusement.

1.23

The Anglo-Indian bungalow; 1810: structure, materials and form.

By the last quarter of the eighteenth century, therefore, a new form of dwelling had been produced, based on an indigenous prototype but used only by Europeans. For Williamson, first in India in 1778, there was no doubt about the main characteristics of the bungalow which distinguished it from the substantial, and often architect-designed city houses of Europeans in Calcutta.

Thatched, on one (ground) floor, and not envisaged for long-term or permanent use, it was of cutcha not pukka construction, that is, built with sun-dried bricks and plastered with either mud or mortar: 'such (of these cutcha) houses as are so built for the sake of cheapness, being, almost without exception, intended for thatches, and thus becoming what we term bungalows'. Moreover, 'with respect to bungalows, or any other building coming under the designation "temporary", their foundations are usually very shallow . . . and as their inner walls are well secured by verandahs . . . very shallow foundations are deemed sufficient'.

'Most of the bungalows built by Europeans are run up with sun-dried bricks; usually of a large size, eight of them making a cubic foot; each being a foot long, six inches broad, and three inches thick . . . Bricks are generally made in wooden moulds, which, being laid on some level spot, previously swept . . . are filled with mud; the surface is then levelled, with the hand, or with a strike, when the mould is raised, by means of handles, and washed in a large pan of water, and then placed on a fresh spot . . . An expert labourer will, if duly supplied with mud and water, make from 2000 to 2500 bricks daily . . . one labourer mix(es) the soil, one suppl(ies) the water

and two hand-barrow men keep one brick-maker in constant work; the whole expence may be about sixteen to eighteen pence; the same quantity of work done in England would cost full as many shillings'. (47)

The weaknesses of such cutcha materials, however, were very apparent

'the least crack in the roof, or the smallest hollow near the foundations, will teem with danger. The rain . . . soon gets into the walls, where it does incalculable mischief; many of these houses . . . may annually be seen in ruins after a continued fall of heavy, or of drizzling, but oblique, rain; the latter . . . drifts in under the plaster, damps the mud cement and brings down the heavy roofs with a most sonorous crash'. (48)

an occurrence which contemporary records suggest was frequent. One solution to this, resulting in the best baked bricks Williamson had ever seen in India, had been devised by a fellow engineering officer. After first having the walls built with sun-baked bricks, the interior was then filled with more bricks and fuel and the walls were baked 'in situ'. (49)

Around the bungalow was a verandah (*italicised throughout Williamson's account*), a term and feature of tropical building which had probably been brought to Asia from Portugal in the fifteenth century. (50) For Williamson, this was an essential component in the structure, plan and use of the bungalow. Its base was incorporated into the foundations - a feature adapted from the indigenous banggolo prototype.

'With respect to bungalows . . . their foundations are usually very shallow . . . for the most part, raised a foot or two from the surrounding level; and, as their inner walls, that often run from sixteen to twenty feet in height, are well secured by the verandas, which likewise preserve the precinct for full twelve or fourteen feet from being softened by the rains, very shallow foundations are deemed sufficient. The surrounding parapet which limits, while it raises the veranda, is usually of burnt brick, cemented with good mortar, and plastered over with the same . . . The verandas of bungalows are sustained either by strong wooden posts, or by pillars of masonry'. (51)

Verandas were frequently used for sleeping. They were also

'generally allotted to the accommodation of servants . . . and . . . serve for the home of whatever . . . bearers may be employed. These have each their mat, on which they sleep, forming a pillow of any bundle of cloaths and covering themselves with their quilts . . . When a gentleman has company, the side-board is usually set out in the veranda, where also the several guests' hookahs are prepared; and, in rainy weather, their water cooled'.

Although most bungalows had 'an abundance of out-offices', few people allowed their palanquins or gigs to be kept there as 'they would be subject to various unpleasant purposes whereby their interior especially would be often soiled'. Hence, the gig and palanquin were also kept within the verandah, the former requiring a ramp up which it was drawn.

1.24

'A close veranda is by far preferable to an open one; and, were it not for the immense additional charges, we can hardly doubt that the European inhabitants of Calcutta would in imitation of the generality of bungalow-residents, have their apartments surrounded by a veranda, of full fourteen feet in width; with apertures, of good size, in the exterior wall, corresponding with those of the interior. This arrangement renders the generality of bungalows remarkably pleasant'. (52)

The inside woodwork was generally of mango wood, a cheap and not particularly durable timber; alternatively, the rafters of such cheaply-made bungalows were bamboo, an all-purpose material found everywhere in India. The ceilings 'were rendered inconceivably neat', not by plaster but

'by means of a double sheet . . . of very coarse cotton cloth called guzzy of which tents are usually constructed. These sheets are fitting to the several apartments . . . bound with strong tape around and have . . . various tapes forming an union cross of eight limbs, or rays, all meeting in the centre. As the cornices commonly project near a foot, abundance of space is left for lacing the sheet (called a chandny) to battens, nailed to pegs built in the wall; these battens . . . admit the sheet to be strained very tight, so as to bag very little, if at all, in the centre. Some white-wash their chandnies, and take so much pains in establishing a firm appearance, as to

render them very similar to well-made ceilings. Without this last mode of preparation, music has no effect in a bungalow; indeed . . . the most powerful instrument is heard under great disadvantages, owing to the number of apertures . . . mats, couch and table covers . . . all of which deaden the tone considerably'. (53)

Because of white ants, warping and the noise of footsteps where 'menials . . . are ever moving about in various parts of the house', boarded floors were 'almost unknown in India'. Instead, they were made according to local tradition by coating the brick base with a solution of cow dung and mud.

One of the chief merits of such a bungalow, constructed with local labour, technology and materials, was its cheapness and flexibility.

'In almost every part of India, an excellent bungalow may be built for about five thousand rupees, completely fitted with glass doors, and windows, and with all the necessary out-offices duly tiled, or thatched, according to their purposes; while a house suited to the accommodation of the same family, in Calcutta, could not be finished for less than ten times that sum'. (54)

Williamson has little to say on the internal lay-out or dimensions of the bungalow though, in most cases, this probably followed the simple structural arrangement suggested by Hodges in 1783: one central room or hall, occasionally sub-divided, with additional sleeping or bathing rooms made by enclosing sections of the veranda.

Some insight into the dimensions can be obtained from other sources. Descriptions of two bungalows from the 1830 - 40 period in the Punjab suggest an overall plinth area of over 7,000 square feet (84' by 84'). Verandahs on either side of fifteen feet each, and one at the rear of ten feet reduced the 'core area' to 54 feet wide by 74 feet deep. This was divided into a narrow entrance hall on either side of which was a dressing room and servant's room; at the rear, were a drawing and dining room. The four corner rooms followed the traditional pattern: two for bathing to the front and two for stores at the rear (55) Fanny Parkes describes the dining room of her Cawnpore bungalow in the 1820's as of 40 by 28 feet and the swimming bath, 30 by 21 feet. The 'fine garden' round the house

1.25

contained two wells, coach house, stables, cow house and servants' accommodation. For this they paid 150 rupees a month, or about 150 guineas a year, ' a heavy rent for an up-country house'. (56)

One method of insulating the bungalow from excessive heat was to first thatch the roof and then cover this with tiles, a practice which Heber noticed at Kanpur. (57) The main method of controlling the thermal environment, however, was to modify behaviour rather than the building: when the inside got too hot, the occupants moved onto the verandah. Technology was adopted from the local inhabitants. Chicks, a type of roller blind, were made of split, thin, bamboo canes, from four to six feet long, loosely strung together and bound at the edge with tape. Rolled up and tied with a cord when not in use, these were fixed to the lintels of windows or the door plate and lowered to reduce the glare. In the gaps between the pillars of the verandah, jaumps, adopted from the Bengali peasant hut, were heavier wooden screens, secured at the top of the verandah roof and raised or lowered with the aid of a wooden pole. For other means of environmental control, the Anglo-Indian bungalow depended on labour-intensive technology. Tatties, screens made of the fibrous roots of sweet-smelling grass (khas), were fitted to doors and windows. During hot periods, these were splashed with water by servants to cool the hot breezes blowing through the house. The punkah, hung from the ceiling, was a heavy cloth fixed to a wooden beam and pulled to and from by a rope to stir the air. The punkah was known in Moghul India and had been first adopted in a modified version by Europeans in Bengal in the 1780's (58) Both with tatties and punkah, the comfort of the occupants depended on local labour. Indeed, the total environment of the bungalow and compound as well, of course, as its construction, depended on colonial ability to employ cheap native labour.

1.26

Williamson's detailed description is confirmed by pictorial data. What is probably the earliest drawing of an Anglo-Indian bungalow named as such (1820), clearly shows the raised plinth, mud walls, pyramical thatched room, and verandah. What Williamson does not mention, however, was both the site and location of the bungalow without which neither its form nor function could have been developed.

1.27

The bungalow was invariably situated in a large compound, an area

of marked territory which, in turn, was located at a distance from other buildings or places of settlement. The compound, as the evidence of Streynsham Master suggests, was a concept which represented enclosed space either leased, bought or appropriated by representatives of an incoming, 'invading' society from the indigenous inhabitants of the land. The development of the bungalow as a culturally-distinctive, Anglo-Indian dwelling form depended, first and foremost, on the secure possession of territory in which cultural choices could be expressed in an environment over which there was considerable, if not total, control.

1.28
1.29
1.30

The spacious compound, of two, ten or even twenty acres, was a pre-requisite for the bungalow's development. Being of only one storey, and with an extensive thatch covering the whole, the dwelling depended on the space around for ventilation and light. Moreover, as discussed elsewhere (59) the compound was simply an extension of the bungalow's internal space, an outdoor room, fulfilling a multiplicity of social, political, cultural and psychological needs. Thus, the bungalow was in direct contrast to the courtyard house in the 'native city'. Here, a central courtyard allowed the penetration of light and air; three or four storeys above and the closely clustered, cellular-structured buildings all around, kept the lower rooms dark and cool. Activity in this courtyard house was centripetal: movement was inwards, towards the courtyard. In the bungalow, it was centrifugal, outward, on to the verandah, and further into the compound.

The location of the bungalow-in-its-compound, away from places of native settlement, expressed the political and social relationship between the occupants of both. Spatial distance reflected social distance. The closely-clustered houses of the native town or village, were functional not just in terms of climate or existing levels of technology and transport; they also expressed the basic social and economic relationship of their inhabitants. The occupants of the courtyard house were members of a larger joint family; the inner court provided a place of exercise and relaxation for those female members of the family whose religious customs restricted their free movement outside; the blank, windowless outer walls giving onto the narrow street ensured privacy for the occupants inside. The people of a

1.31

crowded mohulla (neighbourhood) of a city, or the grouped banggolos of the Bengali peasant village, might share kinship, caste or religion; the overall physical pattern of the town or village reflected the social structure and relationship of the people it contained.

The European occupants of the bungalow, however, had neither social nor religious ties with the inhabitants of the Indian town. Their relationship was one of 'ruler and the ruled': the spatial separation of the district officer or army subaltern from the native town expressed a social and political divide. It was also explained on cultural grounds, European beliefs leading them to perceive the 'native city' as a source of illness and disease.

Thus, by the end of the eighteenth century, the idea of the native banggolo had undergone a basic change. On one hand, many items of structure, technology and materials were comparable to the Bengali dwellings. On the other hand, the political and cultural needs of its British inhabitants had radically transformed its setting and site. Social changes were to increasingly modify its form.

The bungalow in use

In the eighteenth and early nineteenth century the bungalow was put to a variety of uses. Though primarily a rural, 'up country' dwelling, in the growing suburbs of Calcutta it often served as annexe or temporary house. In some cases, one, two or more bungalows were built in the grounds of a substantial mansion. Here, at a time when the idea of the hotel was still relatively new in England, and hardly known in India, the bungalow provided accommodation for guests, storage space or acted as a 'summer house'. The first reference to appear in an English dictionary or encyclopaedia (1788) referred to 'an Indian term for a thatched house with walls of mud or matting' and, giving an indication of its function, added 'a cottage or warehouse'. (60) Thus, the India Gazette advertised in 1780 'to be sold or let, a Commodious Bungalo and out houses' in Calcutta; four years later, in the Calcutta Gazette, 'a large and commodious house' was advertised in Chinsurah, twenty miles north of Calcutta, 'the outbuildings (including) a warehouse, . . . six store-rooms, a cook room, and a

1.32

garden with a bungalow near the house'. (61) Bishop Heber, visiting Calcutta in 1824, noted that Lord Amherst's house at Barrackpore 'barely accommodates (his) own family; and his aides-de-camp and visitors sleep in bungalows built at some little distance from it in the park'. (62)

At this date, most Anglo-Indian bungalows were probably in cantonments. Though references are occasionally found to 'collector's' and 'judge's' bungalows, most civilian officials still relied for accommodation on tents. The Collector of a district near Bareilly, 'settling with the Zemindars with their taxes' in the early 1820's, and inspecting irrigation work, had 'an establishment of tents' which was 'extremely large and handsome'. He lived in 'a very spacious tent with glass doors, a stove and a canvas enclosure at one end which in Calcutta would have passed for a small compound'. (63) However, judges on circuit were already provided at this date with a bungalow for a 'circuit house' in each of the minor stations. (64)

1.33

Where there was no circuit house, judges 'make their circuits during the travelling months of the year, generally pitching their tents near towns and holding their courts under trees'. It was a practice which had arisen from the recognition that alien European surroundings could seriously inhibit Indian behaviour.

one of the judges said (that) . . . an Indian of the humbler class is really always under constraint and fear in a house, particularly if furnished in the European manner, and can neither attend to what is told him nor tell his own story as well as in the open air and amidst those objects from which all his own objects are drawn. (65)

A further use of the bungalow was for temporary summer accommodation in the newly-created 'hill stations' developed in the lower Himalaya and Nilgiri Hills since 1815. The relatively late development of the hill station bungalow meant that architectural ideas from 'home' influenced its form. On the conquest of Almorah (1817),

1.34
1.35

'Government very liberally built a number of small bungalows in airy situations around it, for the accommodation, gratis, of any of their civil or military servants who might come here for their health. They are small, with slated roofs, and looking extremely like the sea-bathing cottages on the Welsh coast, having thick walls, small windows low rooms and other peculiarities (most different from the generality of Anglo-Indian houses) which suit a boisterous and cold climate. The bungalows are also built low because of the danger from earthquakes'. (66)

At the Bombay seaside, the bungalow was used as temporary summer home.

'The bungalows on the esplanade at Bombay are all temporary buildings and are removed as soon as the rains begin to fall . . . At the start of the hot season . . . those Europeans who are obliged by business . . . to have their principal residences within the fort, erect bungalows on the adjoining esplanade, which are, many of them, remarkably elegant buildings but quite unfit to resist the violence of the monsoon. On its approach, the inhabitants return to the fort, the bungalows are taken down and preserved for another year'. (67)

Such bungalows were obviously built of different materials to those described by Williamson; this would, however, seem to be the earliest evidence of the bungalow being used both as seaside dwelling and, in current parlance, as 'second home'.

Reference to the bungalow in the mid eighteenth century generally refers to 'up country', rural areas in Bengal. Gradually, however, as British influence spread throughout the country, mention is found in Lucknow (1783), Bombay (1793), and South India (1809); by 1810, according to Williamson, it seems to have been in use wherever the British were settled in India.

Compared with the evolution of dwelling forms in other colonial societies, two factors deserve comment. First, at no time in the history of the Anglo-Indian bungalow was consideration given to questions of defence. Though cantonment bungalows were, after 1857, increasingly tiled rather than thatched as a precaution against incendiarism, the bungalow was never fortified; the security of its occupants was provided by the cantonment, never very far away.

Moreover, unlike dwellings of early emigrants elsewhere, the bungalow was never a farm, accommodating animals, stored crops or tools. Nor was the surrounding compound ever meant for cultivation or pasture. The Anglo-Indian bungalow was solely for living in; alternatively, it combined the functions of residence and work, the work being that of administration or managing native labour. In the later colonial bungalows, this function of political economy was reflected in the 'office', an institution in the plan which remained long after the end of colonial rule. (68) It is the office which, for the Marxists, would symbolise the appropriation of surplus value.

1.36
1.37
1.59

Growth and change, 1800 - 1857

Whilst a comprehensive picture of the bungalow at this time can be constructed, two developments make the analysis more complex: there are changes in the materials and form, and also in the use of the term.

The first can be described as a gradual "Westernisation". Already in the later eighteenth century, architectural ideas were being introduced by the Company's engineering officers to gradually transform the design. Related to this change there occurred a different use of the name.

In the seventeenth century, bangla (with various spellings) was a native term used both by Europeans and Indians to describe an Indian structure. As this was adapted and Europeanised in the eighteenth century, so also was the term: bungelow, bungelo (1711), bangallaa (1747), bungalo (1780), with the modern English spelling of 'bungalow' first recorded in 1784. (69) After 1820, spellings other than this are rare.

By the late eighteenth century, 'bangla' or 'bungalo' was used in three different ways: it referred to the native Bengali hut, to the Anglo-Indian dwelling adapted from this and, finally, it was beginning to be indiscriminately applied to any kind of small European house in India. When the term is first recorded in print in England, (70) the second meaning was most common. 'Bungalow' was recognised as 'an Indian term' and, according to the earliest

dictionary definition in English (1788), described ' a thatched house with walls of mud or matting'. Such definitions, in terms of the bungalow's structural characteristics, continued till the middle of the nineteenth century. Thus, two early encyclopaedia appearances (1832, 1838) confirm that it is 'an Indian term for a house with a thatched roof'. (71)

By the mid nineteenth century, the anglicised form of the term seems to have been fully accepted into the English language. It is no longer described as 'an Indian term' but is given in anglicised form with its etymology acknowledged as being 'from the Indian word 'bangla'. In 1850, for example, the Imperial Dictionary recognises two distinct phenomena. The bungalow was 'in India, a house or villa of a single floor'. There were two types: 'native bungalows are generally built of wood, bamboo, etc. but those erected by Europeans are generally of sun-dried bricks and thatched or tiled'. Here again, however, both are defined according to their structural attributes.

By the early twentieth century, and probably earlier, changes in the form of the bungalow, together with a less specific use of the term had subtly changed its meaning. A 'bungalow' was 'the most usual class of house occupied by Europeans in the interior of India'. Though this was usually 'of one storey, with a pyramidal thatched roof' it is important for future developments to notice that the major criteria of definition are not related to what it is but rather, who it is for - which is, of course, the way in which the term originated: bangla, 'of, or belonging to Bengal'. Significantly, however, as a result of the colonial process, the ownership of the term has been transferred.

Indeed, even in 1824 there already existed the idea that the bungalow was a house type the use of which was limited to a particular ethnic or racial group: the cantonment at Barrackpore had bungalows, according to Heber, 'for the European officers and other white inhabitants'. (72) In the early twentieth century, 'bungalow' was already widely used in South Asia generally to describe the type of house 'most frequently used by Europeans', whether of one or two storeys, but always detached and located outside the city in the suburbs. Yet the earlier meaning still remained 'with reference to the style of the house', the term being 'sometimes employed in contradistinction to the 'usually more pretentious) pukka house;

1.38

1.39

by which latter term is implied a masonry house with a terraced roof'. (73) This is confirmed by Fanny Parkes (1850): 'If a house has a flat roof covered with flag-stones and mortar, it is called a pukka house; if the roof be raised and it be thatched, it is called a bungalow'. (74)

The development of such 'pretentious houses', adopting features from the classical architecture of Europe for the single storey bungalow in India was already in evidence early in the nineteenth century. In the vast mansions and 'garden houses' of East India Company nabobs in Calcutta, Madras and their suburbs (74) there were plenty of precedents. Contemporary illustrations confirm, however, that two distinct forms of single-storey 'bungalow' exist: one based on the English 'classical' tradition, the other, on the development of the indigenous Bengali hut. Both Williamson and Buchanan comment on these influences: Williamson, comparing 'the first European builders in India' with 'the moderns', suggests, in 1810, that 'more attention is being given to the exterior', with Europeans adopting the Indian idea of the flat, beaten clay roof: 'Many gentlemen have adopted the plan, some wholly, some partially, in their bungalows', a practice that was to be widely followed. He regretted that, 'of late years, the European architects have been rather prone to sacrifice comfort to appearance'. (75)

1.40
1.41

Similarly, Buchanan, concluding his discussion on the origins of the term, indicated that 'the name has been somewhat altered by Europeans and applied by them to all their buildings in the cottage style although none of them have the proper shape and many of them are excellent brick structures adorned with the forms of Grecian architecture'. (76) Heber, (1824) confirms this trend. 'Bungalow . . . is the general name in this country for any structure in the cottage style and only of one floor'. However, he goes on to suggest that it is still primarily applied to the 'genuine' Anglo-Indian bungalow,

1.42

Some of these are spacious and comfortable dwellings, generally with high thatched roofs, surrounded with a verandah and containing three or four good apartments with bathrooms and dressing rooms enclosed from the eastern, western or northern verandahs. The south is always left open. (77)

In the first half of the nineteenth century, therefore, two parallel developments took place. On the cantonments and in mofussil, 'up country' stations, the 'original' Anglo-Indian bungalow continues to be built. In many of these, the verandah was supported by brick-built, plastered columns. Many of such dwellings, frequently caricatured, still survive. They 'look nearly all roof without and contain only one storey within', (78) and appear 'like exaggerated beehives perched upon milestones, a judicious combination of mud, whitewash and thatch'. (79)

Alongside this, was the independent growth of the more substantially built, flat-roofed 'classical' bungalow used particularly to house the officials, first of the Company and after 1858, of the Crown: the District Officer, Judge, Civil Surgeon, Superintendent of Police, as well as army officers on the cantonment. Here the form was increasingly influenced by metropolitan pattern-books of 'cottage architecture' familiar to the engineering officers who supervised their building. With the establishment of the Public Works Department (PWD) in 1854, an 'engineering vernacular', known more widely as the "Military Board" style, became the standard form for official Government of India buildings.

1.43

1.44

1.45

1.46

III Colonial House Type, 1857 - 1947

The background

The revolt of 1857 combined with other developments to bring marked change in British views of India. As the economic transition from an agrarian to an industrial base proceeded in Britain, so India was seen in a different light. With the expansion of the cotton industry in Lancashire, the sub-continent became a vast market for

cheap textiles coming from the factories of new industrial towns. As Kemp puts it, mercantile capital had to face the challenge of industrial capital, which saw India as a market and as a source of raw materials and was therefore hostile to the East India Company's monopolistic position. (80) The Company operated with the help of a comprador class of Indian merchants; the continued development of trade opened up further opportunities inside India for the enrichment of a merchant class.

The changes after 1857 were to reflect these developments. In the process they were to have a drastic effect on British residential settlement in India. In the fifty years following the transfer of authority from the Company to the Crown, British numbers rapidly increased. Colonial rule required a strong state: in the army and police, 450,000 troops were commanded by British officers. The growing purchasing power in Britain and the increasing international division of labour brought plantations and the development of cash crops: the tea gardens of Assam, worked by Indian coolies, were run by British managers. By 1913, nine tenths of the total trade in Calcutta passed through European hands: 'non-official' British in planting, commerce and the professions numbered more than 50,000. (81) In the railways, jute mills and larger retailing stores, the managers, like the capital, were from Britain. There were also British engineers, lawyers, newspaper editors, as well as missionaries and teachers.

As the economy was increasingly oriented towards British interests, government services grew. To ensure that India remained a market for British goods and a producer of raw materials, the state provided an infrastructure of roads, bridges, railways, telegraphs, irrigation works, administrative centres and army camps, the construction of which was supervised by the PWD. In the second half of the century, forest, agriculture, engineering, education and medical services were established or organised on different lines. At the peak of the system was the 'steel frame' of the Indian Civil Service. Here, the highest administrative and political offices, in a country of 244 million people (1913), were held by just over one thousand British officials. The 260 administrative districts, each ranging in size from 2000 to 10,000 square miles and with a population from half to four million people, were still controlled, depending on the region or province,

by the Collector and Magistrate or Deputy Commissioner. Excluding British troops and their dependents, there were some 120,000 Europeans in India. (82)

The most visible sign of this presence was the expanding 'European quarter' of the towns. Calcutta, Madras and Bombay had originated as European settlements. Hence, the Europeanised architecture and spatial pattern which had emerged was an urban form to which the residential needs of native newcomers had had to adapt.

Outside these major centres, however, European areas had grown up round the civil stations and cantonments. These, for obvious reasons, had been placed next to, but usually two or three miles removed from, existing Indian towns. Alternatively, where a cantonment had been established in virgin territory, a 'native town' had often grown alongside. In these provincial towns, therefore, there had developed two separate and unequal urban settlements, one 'European', the other, the 'native city'. Here, in the civil station and cantonment, the typical dwelling was the bungalow-in-its-compound, a scattering of them taking up a vast area just outside the indigenous town. It was the 'classical' Anglo-Indian bungalow of civil station and cantonment which became, in these years, the symbol of the new European political and cultural presence in India.

The setting: cantonment and civil station

The bungalow, 'station' and 'native city' are best described by contemporaries

'An Indian station consists of two parts: the cantonments of the Europeans and the native city and bazaar. The west and east are far apart, separated by a waste common, fields or gardens . . . There is no bond of union between the two, in language, faith or nationality. The west rules, collects taxes, gives balls, drives carriages, attends races, goes to church, builds its theatres . . . and drinks its pale ale . . . The east pays, takes in the shape of what it eats grown on taxed land . . . sits in decaying temples, haunts its rotting shrines, washes in failing tanks, and drinks its semi-putrid water. Between the two is a great gulf; to bridge it over is the work reserved for him who shall come to stabilitate our empire in the East . . .

The European station is laid out in large rectangles formed by wide roads. The native city is an aggregate of houses perforated by tortuous paths . . . The Europeans live in detached houses, each surrounded by walls enclosing large gardens, lawns,

out-offices. The natives live packed up in squeezed-up tenements, kept from falling to pieces by mutual pressure. The handful of Europeans occupy four times the space of the city which contains tens of thousands of Hindoos and Mussulmen'. (83)

The cantonment of Kanpur (Cawnpore) was typical of its kind.

1.47

' . . . The cantonments lay along the bank of the river, over a tract extending six miles . . . for, wheresoever in Hindostan Englishmen make their homes, no regard is had to economy of space. Each residence stands in a separate 'compound' . . . of some three or four acres, surrounded by an uneven crumbling mound and ditch, with here and there a ragged hedge of prickly pear. For all over India fences appear to exist rather for the purpose of marking boundaries than for protection against intruders. The house consists of a single storey, built of brick, coated with white plaster; the whole premises, if the owner be a bachelor or subaltern, in a most shabby and tumbledown condition. A flight of half a dozen steps leads up to a verandah which runs round three sides of the building.

The principal door leads . . . into the sitting room, a spacious ill-kept, comfortless apartment; the most conspicuous article being a huge, oblong frame of wood and canvas suspended across the ceiling . . . The furniture . . . is in the last stage of dilapidation. Every article in an Anglo-Indian household bears witness to the fact that Englishmen regard themselves but as sojourners in the locality . . . A large, rickety table . . . eight or ten chairs . . . a couch with broken springs . . . a Japanese cabinet . . . and an easy chair of colossal dimensions, the arms of which are prolonged and flattened, so as to accommodate the occupant with a resting place for his feet. . .

The centre apartment is flanked on either side by a smaller chamber, both of which are employed as bedrooms, if . . . our young friend is keeping house with some . . . chum. The door into the Sahib's bedroom stands open, like every other door in British India; the multitude of servants, and the necessity of coolness, forbidding the very idea of privacy. There stands a bedstead of wood . . . inclosed on all sides with mosquito curtains of white gauze . . . Little of ornament or convenience is seen around save a capacious brass basin on an iron stand, a half a dozen trunks . . . An inner door affords a view into the bathroom, paved with rough bricks; the bath consisting of a space surrounded by a parapet six inches high, in which the bather stands while his servants sluices him with cold water from a succession of jars . . .

Such are the quarters of a British subaltern. The home of a married pair may be somewhat more comfortable. . . the lady must have her drawing room, where she can display her wedding presents . . . The Commissioner, his sanctum where he can wallow in papers.

At Cawnpore, there was also a church, 'meeting houses of diverse Protestant persuasions, a Roman Catholic chapel, a mission for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel . . . a race-course, as there is in every spot in the East where a handful of our countrymen have got together; a theatre . . . a freemason's lodge . . . a racket court . . . library and newsrooms, and billiard rooms . . . the . . . band-stand'.

The quarters of the native troops consisted of long rows of huts built of mud on a framework of bamboos and thatched with straw. Every soldier had his own cabin in which he kept 'an inconceivable quantity of relations . . . There he rules supreme, for no Sahib, be he ever so enthusiastic on the subject of sanitation and drainage, would care to intrude upon the mysteries of the sepoy household'. Each regiment had a bazaar; at Cawnpore, it contained two thirds of the native city's 60,000 inhabitants (84). Some sixty years later, a similar cantonment at Bangalore was described by a young cavalry officer, Winston Churchill.

'All round the cavalry mess lies a suburb of roomy, one-storeyed bungalows standing in their own walled grounds and gardens . . . We three . . . took a palatial bungalow, all pink and white, with heavy tiled roof and deep verandahs sustained by white plaster columns, wreathed in purple bougainvillia. It stood in a compound of perhaps two acres . . . we took over from the late occupant about a hundred and fifty splendid standard roses . . . Our three butlers formed a triumvirate in which no internal dissensions ever appeared . . . and thus freed from mundane cares, devoted ourselves to the serious purpose of life.

This was expressed in one word - Polo'. (85)

As the cantonments bore a remarkable similarity to each other, so also did the civil stations. The comments of visitors over a century, irrespective of date, are striking in their similarity.

'The approach to Kishnagur, which is exceedingly pretty and woody, early indicates proximity to European city or town - a beautiful avenue of Teak trees, shaded a remarkably smooth (and) well-kept road. We fairly entered Kishangur, and I, for the first time in my life, a civil station.

A civil station . . . is so called in contradistinction to a military one; and contains those courts and offices of Government with their functionaries, that are distributed over the land to administer its laws, civil and criminal, and regulate its revenue affairs.

Kishnagur is, indeed, a delightful place, and for salubrity bears the highest reputation. The only fault I can find with it is that, as a station, it is so very stragglng. There is a handsome little church . . . a Government College . . . a park, a truly beautiful English-like place. The centre is a race course, whilst plantations of magnificent Teak trees, cultivated by order of Government . . . everywhere meet the eye . . . I must not omit to notice the little Dak bungalow which is here found - the first of those staging conveniences . . . we have met in this mofussil trip'. (86)

The writer of this account, Colesworthy Grant, includes illustrations both of the 'dak bungalow' as well as that of the Assistant Magistrate. (87)

The dak and inspection bungalow

The stragglng handful of bungalows provided a private cultural environment for both 'official' and 'unofficial' Europeans. Between such stations, the major cities and 'the hills', smaller areas of 'cultural territory' were needed if the traveller was to feel 'at home'. The 'dak' system, by which mail was carried by relays of runners, had been taken over from the Moghuls and from the early nineteenth century, the British had built 'dak bungalows', not only where relays changed but where officials might stop overnight. Offering solitude and familiar surroundings the dak bungalow was preferred to the unfamiliarity of the dharmsala in the Indian town.

1.48

With the expansion of the governments's activities, 'Inspection', 'Forest', 'Canal' and 'Irrigation bungalows' were added. Like the dak bungalows, these were private cultural enclaves, which, though spartan in their furnishing, were permanently staffed by two or three Indian servants. According to The Times correspondent, W.H.Russell, in 1859,

'though varying greatly in actual comfort, all are on the same plan. A quadrangular building of masonry, one storey high with a high-pitched roof of thatch or tiles, projecting to form porticoes and verandahs. The house divided into 'suits' of two, three or four rooms, provided more or less imperfectly with charpoys (cots), deal tables, and deteriorating chairs . . . Off each room, however, is that universal bathroom and the earthern jars of cool water . . . The bungalow generally stands at a distance of twenty to thirty yards from the road, in an enclosure, which contains the kitchen and sleeping places of the khitmatgar (caretaker) and servants . . .

These buildings, though in theory open to all, are in practice and reality, almost exclusively used for Europeans. I have never yet met a native gentleman stopping in one'. (88)

Later dak bungalows followed the basic pattern of 'PWD vernacular'. The central room, with its flat roof, was higher than the verandah and, to ensure ventilation and a cool breeze at ceiling level, windows were high up in the 15 or 20 feet high walls. Already common by 1850, the type remains long after colonial rule.

1.49

The architecture of empire

In Britain, growing interest in India combined with the increasing self-consciousness of the architectural profession to bring this 'engineering vernacular' under fire. The first official architect to the Government of India was appointed in 1858. In 1865, the leading architectural journal spoke out.

'The revival of architectural taste which has sprung up in England within the last twenty years is slowly but gradually spreading to India; and within the last few years . . . public buildings (have) been erected which would do no discredit to any European capital. This improvement has not come before it was wanted. Until lately, we did not shine in designing public or private buildings at home . . . but we certainly surpassed ourselves in India, and succeeded in inventing a style (irreverently known as the Military Board style) which for ugliness beat everything that was ever constructed by man'. (89)

The Principal of Thomason College, Roorkee, in the Punjab, where engineering officers received some little architectural training, was equally conscious of 'the sense of desolation that comes over one at first sight of our Indian cantonments . . . the straight and dusty roads, the rows of glaring white barracks, and the barn-like church'. The reasons for this lack of architectural merit in government buildings were put down to the exigencies of climate and the over-riding need for economy.

It was also felt, however that 'the true principles of architectural construction for buildings in the East, which are to be used by men habituated to an entirely different climate, have not yet been discovered'.

Another reason was that earlier British residents had hardly seen themselves staying for long. After praising the fine buildings of the Hindus and Muslims, one army officer wrote in the early nineteenth century,

'All colonisation being discountenanced, no buildings but such as are intended for immediate comfort or security, are ever thought of, either by Government or individuals; so that no edifices, except the fortifications, which are necessarily of a massive form are at all calculated to resist the ravages of time. . . . When half a century shall have elapsed, after the cessation of our dominion in Hindustan, there will not perhaps be a stone left to point out where dwelt any portion of the 40,000 islanders who so long held in subjection 100 millions of people'. (91)

With the formal creation of Empire, things were to change. For the imperial professionals at home, 'tropical architecture' was about to emerge.

The challenge was taken up by a leading metropolitan architect. In probably the earliest paper on what later became 'tropical architecture' given to the Royal Institute of British Architects in 1868, T. Roger Smith spelt out some of his Indian experiences. (92)

Smith was only concerned with buildings for the use and occupation of Europeans; his comments represent an accurate account and 'rationalisation' for the evolution of the bungalow's form over the previous hundred years.

For Smith, the main determinants were climatic - the intense light, heat, seasonal and torrential rains, and the wind, dust and thunder storms. Hence, the main walls had to be screened from heat and rain, windows and doors should admit every breeze, and walls be as thick as possible: 'a screen called a verandah is essential and it becomes, in fact . . . the leading feature of buildings in the tropics'. This was usually about ten feet wide with the roof running over it in a continuous line. The rooms provided by the verandah served as work places for 'native people', or were used by the occupants for 'lounging, smoking, walking and even dining and sleeping in', Indian life, 'being much al fresco, and privacy little studied compared with comfort'.

The bungalow ought to be oriented to catch the prevailing breeze, with rooms arranged en suite from side to side, with doors and windows opposite each other so that a breeze blows throughout. This

necessity of a through draught and a thoroughfare all round the building (the verandah) had combined to exclude corridors almost entirely from dwelling-houses; 'your life in an Indian bungalow (or house) is public to a degree that would here seem strange'. The general plan of the bungalow should be kept simple, at once both compact and roomy. It was important for his middle class audience to know that 'all servants reside apart' and the few stores in the house were kept in the verandah which 'swelled the bulk of the building extraordinarily'. Over this simple mass a roof was thrown which, if not a terrace, had a flat pitch with the eaves overhanging so as to give most shadow and throw the heavy tropical rain away from the foot of the walls.

As stairs were 'a serious fatigue in a hot climate', buildings of many storeys were not common. The ordinary height of a storey was about eighteen to twenty feet, supplying 'all the air we can get'. The single storey was also safer in the case of earthquakes.

Smith's rationalisation of the single-storey structure was, if nothing else, naive. In a continent not known for earthquakes, and with a centuries-old, multi-storey tradition, the real explanation passed him by: the political economy of colonialism where the economics of land and labour were rarely considered. (93)

The absence of water-borne sewage arrangements combined with local caste traditions to ensure that all sanitation activities were located along the external walls. To each bedroom, a 'bathroom' was attached in which there was 'a large cement platform with a raised ledge' which, as there was no water laid on, was filled by a water-bearer from a skin. The water was either carried inside or poured through a pipe leading in from an outside wall. As the system of water conservancy was not established in India, 'in or adjoining each dressing room is a convenience taking the place of a water closet'. The 'removal of faecal matter was done twice daily, and the persons whose business it is to do this work (termed sweepers), must not, both on account of the offensive nature of their work, and their lowness of caste, come into the building so as to risk their contact with higher caste servants'. A sweeper's staircase was therefore necessary, with access along the verandahs to the external wall of each dressing room. Here, a small doorway through the wall gave access to each convenience.

This necessity for a dressing room to each bedroom, and for a secluded and external access to each dressing room for the water carrier and sweeper, makes no inconsiderable demand on the ingenuity of the architect.

Another peculiarity of 'tropical life', (not, it might be noted, 'colonial life'), was that every European who could afford it rode to his business or pleasure and thus every building required a carriage porch, sheltered from the monsoon. Each house also required stabling and coach houses. The compound was, 'a compromise between a meadow, an orchard and a garden'. Within this nestled a cluster of huts where the servants and their families lived, household work done, and a kitchen for the cooking in the bungalow. 'The number of attendants required is very great. As a rule in tropical countries (read 'colonial') 'native labour is cheap and plentiful; each individual does not do much and the subdivision of labour is carried out to a perplexing extent'. Stabling and servants' dwellings should be located to the windward of the main dwelling, particularly as the smell from burning the dried dung cakes used for fuel was 'particularly offensive in a hot climate'.

L-51

After discussing climatic factors, as well as the 'taken-for-granted', social, cultural and administrative requirements of 'buildings for European occupation' Smith comes to 'the question of aesthetics'.

There still remains the ultimate question, and perhaps the most purely architectural question of all. What aspects, as works of art, shall we, as artists, strive to impress upon the buildings . . . for the art of any building is undoubtedly the one element . . . which concerns us architects peculiarly and most exclusively.

As many 'unprofessional men' were required to comprehend the arrangement of buildings and the organisation of works

it is our special honour . . . to render (those works) not merely servicable as structures but impressive as monuments; that of us is expected, indeed, not merely a work of skill but a work of art.

This then was the expression of the growing consciousness of a professional, architectural role; there was, however, an added political role which the new, empire-conscious architect had to fulfil. The solution to the question of style lay 'in the adoption

of a type essentially European', though blending with it admissable features as are found in the best styles of architecture developed in tropical climates. The difficulty lay, however, in the lack of a distinctive 'modern English style'. Had that existed, 'we ought . . . to use it as the Roman did in his colonies'. In Smith's view,

as our administration exhibits European justice, order, love of law, energy and honour, so our buildings ought to hold up a high standard of European art . . . (Such buildings) ought to be European, both as a rallying point for ourselves, and as raising a distinctive mark of our presence, always to be upheld, by the natives of the country. (94)

Although such views had existed for decades, they had rarely been so clearly articulated. In recognising that architecture provided 'a rallying point', Smith touched on one of the most important symbolic functions of colonial architecture, that of providing the European community with a visible assurance of their own cultural identity. As a 'distinctive mark of our presence', such architecture fulfilled its major function: the affirmation of authority by the dominant cultural and political power.

The dwelling which Smith describes had evolved over more than a hundred years; it was to continue almost unchanged for a similar length of time. In comparison to the built forms of those who were ruled, it had roots in a different cultural tradition. For an economic and political elite, there were few constraints on the use of land, or governing the selection of sites. In making such decisions, it was the exercise of a cultural choice, by a group who had political control, which determined locations in respect to the indigenous town.

The bungalows were nothing if not spacious. For example, in Bengal in the early twentieth century, accommodation for officials was provided in four categories. The third (next to the most senior), for officers drawing £960 to £1,600, the cost was not to exceed £2,800. The accommodation comprised

1-52
1-53

Dining room	18' by 22'	2 Dressing rooms	19' by 22'
Drawing room	23' by 22'	6 Bathrooms	10' by 10'
4 Bedrooms	18' by 18'	1 Store room	12' by 10'
Study	25' by 12'	1 Lamp room	9' by 10'

A verandah, 14 feet wide fronted the bungalow, one 10 feet wide ran along the rear, and the verandahs on the other two sides formed the bathrooms. The cost of native labour varied, but was between 2p to 4p a man per day. (95)

In influencing the form and size, cultural and political considerations were likewise paramount. Command over economic resources enabled travel by carriage or later, car. It also provided for the occupants between ten and thirty servants to undertake the tasks which English middle class life style required. The excess of leisure time, combined with plentiful native labour, encouraged entertaining on a liberal scale. Servants were cheap: malis to tend the garden, a chowkidar to guard the gate, a syce to care for horses, the bheesti to carry water in a skin, dhobis to do the laundry, a darzi to manufacture European clothes, a jamadar to clean the scattered areas of the dwelling, substituting their labour for mechanical systems of sanitation, a cook to shop in a bazaar unfamiliar - or distasteful - to the bungalow's inhabitants, chokras to assist in the preparation of meals, bearers to wait on table when entertaining was a past-time for all, craftsmen to make furniture and reproduce an expanded version of a middle class environment 'at home'.

1.54

The nature of Anglo-Indian society and the activities of its members were instrumental in the evolution of the bungalow and its distinctive location, appearance and form. As imperial rule extended, it spread throughout the land, embodying a single, cultural and political meaning, a type of dwelling which contrasted, everywhere it was found, with the regional types of native house. From Bangalore to Bombay, though frequently differing in style, the plan and structure of the bungalow was more or less the same. For the official and his family who used it, moving at the end of each 'tour', it provided continuity through the progress of a colonial career.

In the first half of the twentieth century, the 'classical bungalow' though by no means the only form of residence for Europeans

in India, was nonetheless the most typical, and most favoured for official and non-official elite. Of equal importance, it was increasingly being adopted by the growing Indian middle class.

IV Indian Inheritance, 1900 - 1980

'Traditionally, Indians ate their meals sitting on the floor. The food was served either on leaves or on metal . . . plates. Among the upper castes, and especially among Brahmins, eating was a religious act. The food had to be cooked while the women were in a ritually pure state, since it was offered first to the domestic deities before being served to members of the family . . . At the end of the meal the dining leaves became impure and were thrown out. The places where the leaves had rested were purified with a solution of cowdung.

Now, in the larger towns and cities, the educated and Westernised groups increasingly prefer to eat at tables. The most obvious feature of the change is the new technology - chairs and table, stainless steel utensils, spoons - but it also has other implications . . . the new mode of eating contributes to an increase in secularisation as the table is not likely to be purified with cowdung solution after meals, and the ritual acts traditionally performed before and after meals tend to be dropped'. (96)

The process which Srinivas describes, namely, the Westernisation of Indian domestic material culture, has so far been little explored. To put it briefly: just when, where, how, and for what reasons did members of a rising middle class abandon traditional behaviour, stop sitting cross-legged on the floor, eating with their fingers, sleeping on roll-away mattresses, living in traditionally designed houses in the ancient cities and villages and move into Western-style 'bungalows', adopting, in the process, the chairs, dining tables, cutlery, tableware, bedroom suites, sanitary fittings and 'sofa sets' with which the houses of contemporary middle and upper middle class Indians are filled? Such a sweeping generalisation obviously needs qualifying: much 'traditional' behaviour persists and the vast majority of so-called 'Westernised' Indians vary their behaviour to suit situation and circumstances. More important, to label 'Western' what is clearly international, or even just 'modern', is both ethnocentric and simplistic. What is here referred to as 'Westernisation' was only one of many cultural influences on Indian architecture and social life

which have included borrowings from foreign rulers in earlier times - Afghans, Turks, Persians and, in some parts, even the Chinese. Moreover, 'Western' or even 'European' is far too crude a term in that it makes no distinction between Portuguese, Dutch, French and British influences which had made themselves felt on Western India from the fifteenth century. Even British influence was differentiated, not least over the two centuries during which it was felt.

Bearing these factors in mind, for the sake of convenience rather than accuracy, Srinivas's term will be used. The discussion in this section, on a theme deserving a doctoral dissertation in itself, is therefore, no more than exploratory.

Westernisation and the built environment

Urbanisation is usually seen as a social or economic process, one that is concerned with changes in social behaviour or the nature or employment. It is also, obviously, a physical and spatial process. New types of behaviour and social organisation - the 'sit-in' or a game of cricket - are acted out in particular buildings and environments. Likewise, buildings and environments - and how they are perceived - have effects on people's behaviour.

In the Indian context, we might ask what effect have the distinctive planning, building and architectural developments of the last century, or even the last decades, had on the perception of social stratification in a particular city? How have government housing projects helped to modify traditional caste structures or generate new class formations? How have 'Westernised' dwelling-types modified, if at all, family forms and behaviour? How has new technology - electricity, sanitary equipment, prepared foods - affected caste practices and beliefs, what effects have new constructional technologies had on a traditional occupational and caste structure? The questions are endless.

Srinivas uses the term 'Westernisation' to refer to 'the changes brought about in Indian society and culture as a result of 150 years of British rule, and the term subsumes changes occurring at different levels - technology, institutions, ideology, values'. (97) Here, the notion of 'Westernisation of domestic architecture' implies three

inter-related changes which have both affected urban house forms in India as well as the larger urban setting in which these forms are located. Though the processes are of a physical (including 'architectural') and spatial nature, they obviously result from larger social, economic, technological and cultural processes.

1. A change in house plan, form and structure. Whilst regional differences are recognised, this typically means a change, especially in Northern India, from a one, two or more-storeyed, courtyard-type dwelling, with rooms giving inwards onto the courtyard, and structurally joined to similar houses on one or more sides, to a free-standing, 'courtyard-less', 'outward-facing', one or two-storeyed 'European-style' bungalow. It also implies a change in the number, size and arrangement of rooms.

2. As such bungalows are, by definition, detached and free-standing, the change in house form also involves a change in location. This, therefore, involves a move away from the traditional, indigenous city to a suburb. In particular, 'Westernisation of domestic architecture' implies, in many cases, a move to those suburban areas, at first exclusively European, generally known as the 'Civil Lines' or 'Civil Station'.

Such a change is not to deny the existence, prior to European settlement in India, of free-standing, detached dwellings, outside the traditional town, occupied by ruling nawabs or wealthy Hindu families.

3. The adoption of Western domestic equipment, especially cutlery, tableware, cooking and serving utensils, furniture and sanitary equipment (either 'Indian' or 'Western style' closets, wash basins, shower equipment and (very rarely) bath tubs. A distinction might be made between those items of equipment which bring no apparent improvement in the performance of domestic tasks (i.e. eating from a table and sitting on a chair is no more 'efficient' than sitting and eating on the floor) even though the possession of such equipment has important social functions, and other equipment such as electric stoves or refrigerators which obviously bring increased efficiency as well as the saving of time and labour. This latter

type of equipment (of relatively recent introduction, i.e. post 1950) is not implied in the notion of 'Westernisation'.

Obviously, there is a chain of relationships by which the adoption of one 'Western' item leads to the adoption of others. Cutlery and tableware have to be stored; hence, a 'sideboard'; its use requires a table and dining chairs which require a place to be used and stored; hence, a 'dining room'. Rooms then take on specialised functions, defined in terms of use and equipment ('sitting room', 'dining room', 'bedroom'). Other social functions are used to define rooms in traditional Indian houses; with sleeping equipment that can be put away in wall cupboards, rooms have multiple, rather than single functions.

Three obvious points might be made. The Westernisation of domestic life in India began 'at the top', so to speak, with the 'nobility'; it advanced most rapidly in urban centres, particularly those with large and influential European populations; thirdly, its progress was affected by regional, religious, political and, as far as domestic architecture was concerned, local architectural factors. A useful distinction may also be made between two types of city: those major metropolises which were effectively European settlements (Calcutta, Madras, Bombay) where the dominant urban pattern was European and indigenous inhabitants were arguably more likely to be exposed to the dominant culture. On the other hand, were those long-established Indian cities (Varanasi, Lahore, Delhi, Bangalore) where European settlement took place outside and away from the indigenous settlement. (98)

Westernisation and the Indian Elite

The mutual architectural influences between European and Indian elites in the early period of European settlement have been well documented. (99) British fashions in household furnishing had been adopted as early as the 1770's: the Nawabs of Lucknow imported 'all sorts of European manufactures', including mirrors, lustres, framed European prints and Worcestershire china. Lord Valentia, visiting Lucknow in 1803, noticed that the palace was equipped with English chairs, tables, a service of plate, knives, forks and spoons, wine-glasses and decanters. (100) Apart from this attachment to Western

furnishings, many Indian princes built new palaces, modelled on the 'Classical' Residences and public buildings of the colonial community.

Middle class houses: changes in style and form

The operations of the East India Company in Calcutta had created a comprador class of Indian merchants. As early as the eighteenth century, these had commissioned houses in a mixture of Hindu, Muslim and British styles, an architecture - to use Sinha's phrase - of 'comprador syncretism'. Holt Mackenzie, commenting on the new class behaviour in Calcutta in 1832 referred to 'the marked tendency among the natives to indulge in European luxuries; they have well-furnished houses and . . . are fond of carriages . . . and drink wines.' (101)

It was Macauley's Minute of 1835, however, which opened the way for the growth of a westernised middle class. This famous decision had launched English education and knowledge into India. The object of the Minute, imparting 'to the Native population knowledge of English literature and science through the medium of the English language' was 'to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern; a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, opinions, in morals and intellect' who would help govern in the interests of the British. (102)

Engaged in government offices or commerce, they would emulate Europeans in the development of India's resources and increase the demand for the consumption of British goods.

To appreciate these stylistic changes, some consideration must be given to traditional urban house-types, with their many regional variations. In northern India in the eighteenth century, wealthier urban families lived in brick houses, of two, three or even five floors, with flat roofs. (103) Two storey houses were also common in parts of Bengal but in the Purneah district, the houses of the rich middle class were a collection of huts called baris or havelis, fenced all round. In Varanasi 'rich Hindus preferred to live in detached houses with open courts surrounded by high walls'. In the South, however, there was a greater frequency of one-storey dwellings with a courtyard plan and a gallery inside the courtyard. (104)

'The bungalow, a single-family residential quarter of mixed European style . . . was not popular with any section of Indian society till the end of our period' (i.e. the early nineteenth century) (105)

The early stylistic influences on these two and three storey house forms occurred with the eclectic adoption of 'classical' elements characteristic of European urban building in the first century of settlement. Thus, Bishop Heber, writing about wealthy Indians in Calcutta in 1823 commented

Their progress in the imitation of our habits is very apparent, though still the difference is great. None of them adopt our dress. But their houses are adorned with verandahs and Corinthian pillars . . . (106)

1.55

About ten years later, a visitor to Shahjahan's old city of Delhi reported

In no other part of our Eastern possessions do the natives show so earnest a desire to imitate European fashions . . . the houses are of various styles of architecture, partaking occasionally of the prevailing fashions of the West. Grecian piazzas, porticos and pediments are not infrequently found fronting the dwellings of Moslems or Hindoos. (107)

Stylistic change was one thing: sociologically, however, change in house form and location was another.

'Middle class' dwellings: the westernisation of form

Even for comparable socio-economic groups, urban houses varied greatly throughout different regions of India. Nonetheless, at the end of the nineteenth century, J.E. Padfield believed that there were some main principles which pervaded all Hindu domestic architecture. As much of his description still holds good for traditional urban areas, his comments on 'an ordinary house of the fairly well-to-do Hindu in the town' are worth quoting at length. (108)

'The chief feature in the building is that it must be in the form of a square, with an opening to the sky in the centre. The roof slopes outward and inward, and the inner sides all converge around a rectangular open space. . . In large houses, this . . . space will form a regular courtyard, whilst in smaller buildings . . . it is only a few inches square . . . The origin of this is not very clear . . some say it is in order that the sun's rays may shine into the house . . . others say . . . for the rain to fall into the house in order to secure happiness . . . there are few windows, if any at all, looking out upon the street . . . often there is nothing presented to the public road but a blank wall with a more or less imposing doorway . . .

. . . on entering the front door (one may) step into the open space or court . . . or there may be a passage from the door with rooms on either side leading into it . . . around (the court) there is a kind of verandah upon which open out the rooms of the dwelling. The four points of the compass are strictly considered in arranging the rooms. The kitchen should always be on the south side and it runs the whole width of the building. This is the most sacred part of the whole house and persons of a lower caste than the household are never allowed to enter it . . . I have been inside many native houses but I have never been allowed to cast even a glance into this sacred room . . .

. . . except in the Presidency cities, and other large towns, houses have, as a rule, no upper storey at all . . .

. . . The rooms opening out on to the inner verandah are the bedrooms and other private rooms, as well as the store-room, and any other necessary rooms and offices. All the arrangement of rooms is regularly fixed in the (two books of the Vastu Shastram - the science of domestic architecture) and great blessings are promised where these rules are complied with . . . one portion of the verandah is apportioned off as a kind of office, or study, in which writing work and the like is done . . .

If we look at the furniture of a house we are at once struck by its extreme simplicity. Taste and wealth are not manifested in grand furniture and costly hangings, or any other of the things that go to make up a luxurious home in Europe . . . The furniture . . . is very little . . . In the houses of the more modern and more advanced, there are occasionally a few chairs, and a table or two; and a chair is usually produced for a European visitor; but as a rule even among the better classes, there is a complete absence of most of the domestic conveniences which even the poorest Europeans consider indispensable. In the kitchen-dining room there are no tables or chairs, no knives, forks or spoons, no plates, or dishes . . . A few metal or earthenware pots and pans and a simple fireplace suffice for the culinary operations, and the large leaf of the lotus or plantain, or a few smaller leaves cleverly stitched together, form the dinner plate . . . One needs to live amongst such people to learn how very few, after all, are the real necessities of life, if we only rid ourselves of notions formed by habit and custom . . .

In the office place . . . there may be a low kind of table serving as a seat by day and a couch by night . . . a rug or two . . . a few cushions . . . a few simple pictures representing scenes from the life of Krishna . . . being paintings on glass . . . Occasionally a print or two may be seen, perhaps a cutting from some illustrated English paper . . .

The bedroom furniture too, would not strike an English lady as having that air of snugness and comfort which is the charm of the European bed-chamber. There may be a native cot . . . a box or cupboard for the . . . more expensive cloths and jewels . . . a shelf, and in the wall, a few niches for the little native lamps . . . a few native pictures on the wall representing scenes from the Ramayana . . . a brass, mug-shaped vessel serving (for washing), a few square inches of looking glass . . . The water from the brass vessel is poured from the left hand into the right . . . and applied to the face . . . The complete bath, in the absence of a river, or tanks or other means of immersion, is taken by pouring water over the person from the same brass vessel . . . for both men and women, it is generally done in the back-yard or some such suitable place as may be convenient . . . In passing along the streets in the early morning, one often sees the ordinary citizen, brass pot in hand, performing his morning ablutions, seated on the edge of his front verandah . . .

There is no 'going to bed' in the sense understood by the European . . . The men . . . seem to lie down anywhere, in the inner verandah or along the narrow verandah seat that usually runs along the front wall next to the street . . . The long, sheet-like cloth is unwound from the body, or some sheet or blanket which is kept for the purpose is used and with this the person is covered, head and all . . . In the . . . better off class or the aged, and generally by the master of the house, a cot is used for sleeping upon (and) . . . shifted about from place to place to suit convenience . . . It is easy to see how little difficulty there is in providing for visitors . . . there is plenty of room for the men to lie down . . . and the females lie down with those of the household . . .

It is . . . the absence of comfort which (to the European) seems most conspicuous in a Hindu home. Of this the idea, or sense, or whatever it may be called, does not seem to exist in the Aryan inner consciousness, and hence there can be no manifest development of it'.

Unfortunately Padfield did not say anything of the homes 'of the modern Europeanised Hindu . . . the hybrid civilisation which we see presenting itself'.

For Muslims, a different interpretation of the courtyard house in the mid-nineteenth century is given.

'There is no necessity for courtyards in Europe because women are not confined to their homes and go out as men do. In contrast it is necessary for houses in India to have courtyards so that women may be able to enjoy fresh air within the perimeter of their own homes . . . There has always been a distinct difference between Hindu and Muslim houses and this exists to this day.

In Hindu houses the courtyards are small and the building is constructed without regard to whether or not air and light will get in. In contrast to this, Muslims like bright, open houses . . . ' (109)

It could also be added that, in general - and especially for the Zamindar - the symbolic significance of the house was greater for the Muslim than the Hindu.

As Padfield and others suggest, it is safe to assume that the abandonment of this traditional dwelling for a bungalow in the suburbs was more prevalent in the major cities and other mainly British settlements. Yet given the ambiguous use of the term 'bungalow' in the nineteenth century, gradually replacing the term 'house' (at least, in the English language), it is not always certain just what building type later nineteenth century commentators are referring to. Nevertheless, 'bungalow' usually implies a free-standing, ex-urban dwelling, usually (in the nineteenth century) of one storey, though increasingly in India (in the twentieth), of two. More particularly, it would be a dwelling conforming more to a colonial 'Indo-European' than traditional Indian model.

If 'bungalow' does suggest 'Westernisation', then Heber's comment on Mirzapoor in 1824 implies an early development. The town 'had greatly increased since the arrival of the English'; 'numerous and elegant bungalows' had arisen in the outskirts, 'partly in European style but obviously inhabited by natives' (110) At Ahmedabad in the 1840's, wealthy merchants were likewise adopting Western habits and building houses 'in the English style'. Other merchants built bungalows outside the city.(111) According to Lord Napier, writing in 1878, 'the moment a native of this country becomes educated and rich, he abandons the arts of his forefathers and imitates the arts of strangers whom in this respect, he might be competent to teach'. Domestic architecture ought to be the expression of social institutions and the necessities of climate, both of which were expressed in the 'old-fashioned Indian dwelling', with its interior courtyards: this was 'the feature which the Indian house-builder should never forsake (yet) it is just the feature which he is giving up'. Napier had just visited a 'native nobleman' in his 'country residence' where he had built a small palace to entertain his European guests.

Every trace of native style had disappeared from this more recent example of native building, and a handsome European villa, of spotless chunam, had risen among the grey pagodas. (112)

Though these developments were relatively rare before 1857, they gradually became more common. To understand the change however, would require a thorough analysis of the many factors behind the creation of the 'middle classes' themselves. Here, a few comments must suffice.

In England, the middle class developed largely as a result of economic and technological change and was mainly engaged in trade and industry. In India, however, they emerged more from changes in the system of public administration and law than in economic development and belonged to the learned professions. This basic difference had far-reaching implications for the process of 'Westernisation'. It meant that in government service or, after 1918, commissioned ranks in the army, acceptance into the higher echelons was conditional upon a lesser or greater degree of 'Westernisation': not merely the acquisition of language, dress, behaviour and 'life-style' but also, a willingness to adapt to Westernised environments. Thus, the rules for 'The Occupation of Public Works Inspection Bungalows' in one province include 'Asiatic officials are eligible to occupy these bungalows if they have adopted European customs' (1927) (113) Much of the controversy regarding the question of opening up club membership to Indians also revolved round these issues. (114)

The growth of government services resulted in increasing numbers of Indians being accepted into government occupations. With the creation of Indian universities after 1857, the Indian professions grew. Between 1857 and 1901, the number of Indian government servants rose from less than 3000 to some 25,000. The Indian Civil Service, long the preserve of Europeans, slowly began to admit Indians and by 1913, some 50 of its 1000 or so members were Indian. Police services expanded, with 7000 Indian members in 1901 and getting on for 20,000 by the end of colonial rule. Whilst science and technology were slow to develop, extensive irrigation, railway and public works developed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and though senior posts were, till 1921, monopolised mainly by Europeans

and Anglo-Indians, many Indians were employed as contractors. After 1918, the process of Indianisation proceeded among the commissioned ranks of the Indian army. (115)

The real growth in the Indian middle classes, therefore, was a twentieth century phenomenon even though, for medical doctors, the Calcutta Medical College had been established in 1835. In the world of business, the rise of a middle class was particularly associated with the expansion of the joint stock company, especially in banking, planting and trading. (116)

This growth in the professions and the number of Indians in government service coincides with a steady increase in urbanisation after 1900 and the faster growth of individual cities. It implies an increasing exposure to European life styles, not only 'on the ground' but through the media of photography, the press and books. To meet the demand for Western consumer goods, European department stores were established in Calcutta.

The effect of these developments on the residential behaviour of the middle class, on the architecture of their houses and the growth of 'Western-style' suburbs after 1900, however, are difficult to trace. Some insights can be gained from case histories of individual cities and autobiographies. Of these, Allahabad was typical, with a quarter of its professional families, Indian and British, and most of the major Indian lawyers living in the cantonment and Civil Lines in 1891. (117) Matilal Nehru, already an eminent lawyer, was soon to follow.

'He moved from the densely populated city of Allahabad to a bungalow, 9 Elgin Road, in the spacious and exclusive 'civil lines', where European and Eurasian families lived in solitary splendour . . . It signified a desire on his part to live in healthier surroundings with greater quiet and privacy . . . It was also a sign of the transformation that was taking place in his life: the rise in the standard of living was accompanied by increasing Westernisation . . . having a lively curiosity and zest for living he made a point of ordering the latest gadgets and improvements. Anand Bhavan (1, Church Road where he subsequently (1900) had moved to) was the first house in Allahabad to have a swimming pool and it was also the first to have electricity and water laid on'. (118)

About the same time (1896), Padfield referred to the homes of the 'modern Europeanised Hindu' which, however, were 'comparatively

few in number and chiefly confined to the large towns and cities'. Departures from traditional lifestyles were only beginning 'in the Presidency cities and other seats of light and learning'. (119) The most detailed description of the process, however, comes from a member of India's post-independence business elite. Prakash Tandon (120) describes how the social, architectural and administrative environment of British rule in Lahore influenced his father's style of life.

On retirement from government service, he built himself a house in 'Model Town', a suburb south of the civil lines six miles out of Lahore. Model Town was

'almost entirely populated by retired government officials . . . somebody had conceived the idea in 1925 of acquiring a big tract of wasteland . . . and dividing it into plots. The plan of the town was completely geometrical. It had a series of concentric circular roads, crossed by four main roads at right angles, and smaller roads in between . . . The roads had no name but the blocks were alphabetically numbered so that our address was 12G while the house opposite was 12F . . .

One after the other, old engineers and army doctors, retired civilians and sessions judges arrived and started laying their foundations. The results of their efforts were all curiously alike, because they were all patterned on the government bungalows which had been their homes, and the dak bungalows which had been the scenes of so much of their activity. Each house was divided into two parts by a huge vestibule in the middle. On one side, were dining and drawing rooms and an office room; on the other, the bedrooms, with dressing rooms and bathrooms.

The lay-out of the bungalows was similarly based on PWD tradition, now being applied in the new imperial capital at Delhi. (121) The 1935 map of Lahore shows four very distinct types of spatial pattern in the built-up area of the city, which it is tempting to associate with different kinds of values, social relations and behaviour. The old walled city with its intricate, meandering network of streets and tightly-packed houses, suggests a traditional society and culture; the 'civil lines' area to the south with its spacious bungalows, wide metalled roads and sparse development intimates the 'ruralised', middle class values and leisured life style of the European colonial culture; the rectangular grid system of the military cantonment implies the formal social organisation of the army; the more relaxed, yet still

geometrical lay-out of Model Town, suggests the social life of the retired officials whom Tandon describes.

Bangalore was another centre of cultural change in the early twentieth century. The Indians who moved into Western-style, suburbs from 1920 were those in senior government positions, were 'foreign-returned', Western-educated engineers or army officers or - like the military contractor - in roles mediating between the local and the colonial society. The change was in the first decades of this century; into their bungalows were imported German chandeliers, Czech crystal doorknobs and Western sanitary fittings. Their new-style habitat provided the setting for such Westernised habits as 'drinks', 'afternoon tea' and 'cricket'. Cultural attitudes to colour also changed: 'people didn't think so much about interior decoration (sic) then as they do now. Not everything 'matched' or conformed to a 'colour scheme'. (123) As Western influence grew strong, the dwelling had changed from a house in which one put things' to an object of social display.

Begum Shaista Ikramullah describes a similar process in Lilloah, a suburb of Calcutta. (124) In 1915, the family had been living in a traditional Muslim town house. Four years later, the Begum's father, the second Indian Muslim doctor to take an FRCS qualification in London and one of the first Indians to do so, entered the East India Railway as District Medical Officer and took a government bungalow in the 'civil lines' area.

'We had a very nice house and a really lovely garden. . . This was the stage when Indians went in for extreme Westernisation in every way, particularly those who joined the Service, which so far had been reserved for the English. They felt it was their incumbent duty to prove to Englishmen that they could emulate him to perfection . . . Our house, therefore, was furnished to look exactly like an English house. In the drawing room there were heavy sofas . . . lace curtains, gleaming brass and silver . . . and knicknacks displayed in cabinets. The dining room had a fairly massive sideboard . . . displaying a love of heavy silver. The hall and study were furnished in the typical English style of the times . . . We had afternoon tea with hot buttered toast and even at other meals we ate what was called 'English' food which I now realise was a mixture of English, French, Portuguese and Indian culinary efforts'.

This was also the period of the building of New Delhi, based on the environmental assumptions and values of British colonial power. The Delhi 'Civil Lines' area, with less than thirty bungalows in 1871, expanded rapidly, and after 1920 had been developed as a colonially modified, 'Indo-European' style suburb, with some 150 bungalows, many soon to be occupied by Indian families as their inhabitants moved to New Delhi. Here, each bungalow was located in a compound of one to five acres, creating - in a city sprawled over thirty square miles - densities of less than ten people to the acre. In Old Delhi, two or three miles to the north, were half a million people living within a walled town of two and a half square miles, at densities eighty times as great. (125)

*1.57**1.58*

Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter has been to present some descriptive historical data on a topic where there has previously been little research. To suggest in a few pages 'conclusions' would be to grossly oversimplify the complexity of the issues involved. These are of two kinds: the first, relating to policy and practice; the second, of a more theoretical or academic kind.

Within the scope of this study, any discussion of the policy implications of the above is not possible. Some of these have been discussed elsewhere (126) and others are taken up in Chapter Five. Most obviously, such issues concern the implications of 'the bungalow' - as symbolic of colonial housing and urban development - for urban planning, the question of developing appropriate standards, or the radical modification of inequalities which colonial developments have left behind. The bungalow and the segregated environment in which it existed was, however, not just a physical and spatial form but was also an attitude of mind, institutionalised in Public Works Department practices and lasting long after colonial rule. Following the creation of Pakistan, for example, it was continued in the layout of new settlements and in Islamabad, as at Chandigarh some years before, the bungalow formed the basis of 'Western-style' developments, manifesting in style and scale, the ranking and status of its occupants. Though the direction of urban planning may have changed, controversies over the future of colonial environments remain. (127)

*1.59**1.60**1.61*

The second set of issues are of a more theoretical kind, yet still of practical concern. What is the relationship between social and environmental change? What insights does the history of the bungalow in India provide? To take up some of the issues of the previous section, a physical move from the old to the new part of the city, even to a European-style bungalow, might well represent a change of attitudes, values and behaviour. It need not necessarily imply, however, a change in family structure or organisation, and may even provide opportunities for traditional modes of property-ownership. As Shah suggests, the notion of the multi-membered 'joint family' in India as it relates to household membership and residential behaviour is a stereotype which does not withstand close analysis (128). Although urban households of eight or more may exist, the four to five person unit is much more common.

It would be difficult to believe, however, that 'bungalow-type' colonial urban development prior to 1947, as well as government **1-62** housing programmes since, with tens of thousands of flats and houses laid out in strict 'PWD' style, and often with limited accommodation, have not influenced the size, structure and relationships of Indian families. This seems likely to be a major component of 'Westernisation' processes affecting the contemporary Indian family. (129)

As for the introduction of 'Western' furniture and equipment, there is no doubt, as Srinivas suggests, that this has not only resulted from economic and cultural change but has also helped to bring such change about. Both the planning of modern Indian housing as well as the introduction of equipment is bound up with changes in beliefs and actual behaviour, particularly relating to cooking, eating, the serving of meals, relaxation or defecation. Kira, for example, has discussed the relationship between religious and social beliefs, body postures and sanitation practices (130); traditional notions of pollution in India explain why high caste Hindu males, for example, for reasons of purity and hygiene, objected to such practices as urinating in a standing position. (131) Similar beliefs governed the way in which bathing was undertaken. Yet while bath tubs are rare in Indian houses, Western-style closets are less so. As any orthodox Brahmin will confirm, the arrangement of rooms in modern Indian government housing, particularly regarding the location of kitchen and

bathroom (i.e. where access for low caste sweepers to clean WCs and bathrooms is possible only through the kitchen or past the main dining room) creates conflict in regard to orthodox Hindu beliefs.

Much more systematic research is needed into the issues implied above. Recent historical studies have shown the importance of changes in ownership and the development of a land market in the growth of residential areas in Madras (132), in the development of retail trading of consumer goods in late nineteenth century Calcutta (133) and of changes in taste and values brought by the introduction of 'Western' criteria of design. (134) Further research is needed into the introduction of urban legislation - bye-laws, building regulations - and their relation to British models, into changes in the organisation of building, the rise of the architectural profession and the development of journals and new standards of design. The place of modern transport and the role of market forces in the development of the bungalow's suburban setting also need investigating. These are some of the factors which have helped produce the urban environment of contemporary India. The relevance and meaning of these environments for the understanding of social change needs to be explored.

Chapter One Footnotes

1. H.Yule and A.C.Burnell, Hobson-Jobson. A Glossary of Colloquial Anglo-Indian Words and Phrases, John Murray, London, 1903, p.128.
2. K.N.Chaudhuri, The Trading World of Asia and the East India Company 1660 - 1760, Cambridge University Press, 1978, pp. 7-10.
3. P.Spear, A History of India Vol.2, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1965, p.66.
4. W.W.Hunter, A History of British India 2 Vols. London, 1899 - 1900.
5. P.Woodruff, The Men Who Ruled India, Vol.1: The Founders, Johnathon Cape, London, 1965, p.53.
6. J.Fryer, A New Account of East India and Persia, 1672-81, Hakluyt Society, London, 1909, p.119.
7. Ibid., pp. 120-22.
8. Woodruff, op.cit., p.54.
9. Captain A.Hamilton, A New Account of the East Indies, Vol.II, p.12, quoted in P.Spear, The Nabobs, Oxford University Press, 1963, p.3.
10. Spear, 1963, op.cit., p.5.
11. C.Lockyer, An Account of Trade in India, 1711, p.4 quoted in Spear, 1963, op.cit., p.4.
12. W.Foster, The English Factors in India, 1655-60, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1921, pp. 290-1.
13. Yule and Burnell, op.cit., p.128.
14. R.C.Temple, ed., The Diaries of Streynsham Master, 1675-80, John Murray, London, 1911, Vol.2, pp. 209-10.
15. J.Deloch, ed., Voyage en Inde du Comte de Modave, Paris, 1971 quoted in R.Llewellyn-Jones, 'The city of Lucknow before 1856' in K.Ballhatchet & J.Harrison, The City in South Asia, Curzon Press, London, 1980, pp.88-128, p.97.
16. Yule and Burnell, loc.cit.
17. Captain T.Williamson, The East India Vade Mecum, Black, Parry, 1810. 2 Vols, Vol.1, p.490.
18. R.Heber, Narrative of a Journey, etc, John Murray, London, 1828. 2.Vols, 1, 281.
19. Yule and Burnell, loc. cit.
20. F.Buchanan, The History, Antiquities, Topography and Statistics of East India, 3 Vols. W.H.Allen, London, 1838, 2, pp.922-4.

21. Williamson, op.cit., Vol.1, pp. 483-518.
22. ibid., I, p.483-96.
23. H. and S.Hill, Chinnery and China Coast Painting, Lewis, Leigh on Sea, 1970, p.8.
24. S.Nilsson, European Architecture in India, 1750-1850, Faber, London, 1969, p.186.
25. R.Desmond, 'Photography in India during the nineteenth century', in India Office Library, Report for the Year, 1974, HMSO, London, 1976, pp. 5-36, pp. 8,30.
26. Desmond, op.cit. p.8.
27. A.H.Dani, Muslim Architecture in Bengal, Asiatic Society of Pakistan, Dacca, 1961, p.12.
28. Ibid., p.13.
29. Ibid., pp. 180-1.
30. C.Grant, Rural Life in Bengal, Thacker & Spink, Calcutta, 1859.
31. B.S.Cohn, India, The Social Anthropology of a Civilization, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1971, p.
32. Chaudhuri, op.cit., p.111-14.
33. Quoted in A.G.Frank, Dependent Accumulation and Underdevelopment, Macmillan, London, 1978, p.88.
34. T.Kemp, Historical Patterns of Industrialisation, Longmans, London, 1978, p.139.
35. See Chapter 2.
36. Spear, 1963, op.cit., p.80.
37. S.C.Ghosh, The Social Condition of the British Community in Bengal, 1757-1800, Leiden, E.J.Brill, 1970, p.108.
38. H.H.Dodwell, Cambridge History of India, Vol.5,CUP,1929, pp.630-45.
39. Ghosh, op.cit., p.110.
40. Buchanan, loc.cit.
41. Yule and Burnell, loc.cit.
42. Nilsson, loc.cit.
43. C.Grant, Anglo-Indian Domestic Life, Thacker and Spink, Calcutta, 1849, p.6.

44. W.Hodges, Travels in India During the Years 1780-83, London 1793, p.146.
45. Quoted in Nilsson, op.cit., p.187.
46. J.L.Kipling, 'The Origin of the Bungalow', Country Life in America, vol.19, 8 February, 1911, pp. 308-10.
47. Williamson, op.cit., 1. 514-16.
48. Ibid., 2, p.18.
49. Ibid., 2, p.15.
50. R.Lewcock, Early Nineteenth Century Architecture in S.Africa: a Study of the Interaction of Two Cultures, 1795-1837, BaIkema, Cape Town, 1963. See also Appendix.
51. Williamson, op.cit., 2, pp.34-8.
52. Ibid., 10-11.
53. Ibid., 51-2.
54. Ibid., 11.
55. J.Vansittart, From Minnie, with Love. The Letters of a Victorian Lady, 1849-61, Peter Davies, London 1974, p.118.
56. F.Parkes, Wanderings of a Pilgrim in Search of the Picturesque, Pelham Richardson, London, 1850, p.137.
57. Heber, op.cit., 1, p.206.
58. Ghosh, op.cit., p. see also Spear, 1963, op.cit., pp.96-8.
59. A.D.King, 'The colonial bungalow compound complex: a study in the cultural use of space', Colonial Urban Development: Culture, Social Power and Environment, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1976.
60. Anon., The Indian Vocabulary, John Stockdale, London, 1788. Under 'bungalow'.
61. Yule and Burnell, loc.cit.
62. Heber, op.cit., 1, p.33.
63. Ibid., p.247.
64. Ibid., p.124.
65. Ibid., p.187.
66. Ibid., p.272.
67. H.Brown, The Sahibs. The life & ways of the British in India, etc. Hodge, London, 1948, p.75.

68. See page 40. Govt. of West Pakistan. Punjab Public Works Department, Buildings and Roads Branch. Designs of 'A' Class Bungalows and Houses for Satellite Towns, 2nd edit., Superintendent, Govt Printing, West Pakistan, Lahore, 1956.
69. Yule and Burnell, loc.cit.
70. In A.Murphy, The Upholsterer, or What News? A Farce in Two Acts, 1758. See chapter 3.
71. The London Encyclopaedia, 1832; Partington's British Cyclopaedia, 1838.
72. Heber, op.cit., 1, p.34.
73. Yule and Burnell, loc.cit.
74. M.Archer, 'Aspects of classicism in India; Georgian buildings in Calcutta', Country Life, 1966, 132; ibid., 'Georgian splendour in South India', Country Life, 1964, 130, 728-31.
75. Williamson, op.cit., p.104.
76. Buchanan, loc.cit.,
77. Heber, op.cit. 1, p.34.
78. S.L.Blanchard, Yesterday and Today in India, W.H.Allen, London, 1867, p.33.
79. G.F.Atkinson, Curry and Rice, Day & Son, London, 1859.
80. B.Fuller, The Empire of India, Pitman, London, 1913, pp.197-205, 269-76, 297-8.
81. Ibid.
82. Ibid.
83. W.H.Russell, My Diary in India in the Year 1859-60, Routledge, Warne and Routledge, London, 1860, 2 vols, 1, pp.140-1.
84. G.Trevelyan, Cawnpore, Macmillan, London, 1894, pp.2-11, 40.
85. W.Churchill, My Early Life, Collins, 1937, pp.
86. C.Grant, Rural Life in Bengal, Thacker and Spink, Calcutta, 1859, p. 59.
87. Ibid.
88. Russell, op.cit., pp.141-3.
89. The Builder, June 24, 1865, p.441.
90. Ibid.

91. J.Blakiston, Twelve Years' Military Adventure in Threequarters of the Globe, Henry Colburn, London, 2 Vols, 1929, 2, pp.107-8.
92. T.R.Smith, 'On buildings for European occupation in tropical climates specially in India', Proceedings of the RIBA, 1868-1869, 1st series, 18, pp. 197-208.
93. King,op.cit.
94. Smith, loc. cit.
95. Colonial Office. Correspondence respecting the design of bungalows for Government Officials in W.Africa. Colonial Office. 1909. See Appendix. See also J.Pott, Old Bungalows in Bangalore privately printed, London, 1977.
96. M.N.Srinivas, Social Change in Modern India, Cambridge University Press, London, 1976, p.53.
97. ibid., p.47.
98. J.E.Bush , 'The morphology of Indian cities' in R.Turner, ed., India's Urban Future. University of California Press, Berkeley, 1962, pp.57-70.
99. M. & W.G.Archer, Indian Painting for the British, 1770-1880, Oxford University Press, 1955.
100. Ibid., pp.56-7, 74-8, 88.
101. B.B.Misra, The Indian Middle Classes: Their Growth in Modern Times, Oxford University Press, London, 1961, p. 154.
102. M.Edwardes, A History of India, Mentor, London, 1967, p.241, Spear, 1965, op.cit., pp. 126-7.
103. V.P.S.Raghuvanshi, Indian Society in the Eighteenth Century, Associated Publishing House, New Delhi, 1969, p.232.
104. Ibid., pp. 232-6.
105. Ibid., p.236.
106. Quoted in Misra, op.cit., p.153.
107. Anon. 'Delhi in 1835' in The Tourists' Guide from Delhi to Kurrachee, Lahore, 1865, p.5.
108. J.E.Padfield, The Hindu at Home, Simpkin, Marshall, London, 1896, pp.16-24.
109. Abdul Halim Sharar, Lucknow: The Last Phase of an Oriental Culture, Paul Elek, London, 1974, pp. 186-7.
110. R.Heber, op.cit., 1, p. 178.

111. K.L.Gillion, Ahmedabad: A Study in Indian Urban History, University of California, Berkeley, 1968, pp.56-7.
112. The Builder, August 27, 1870, pp.680-2.
113. Rules regarding the occupation of PWD Inspection bungalows, Burma PWD, 1908, amended, 1927.
114. 'Indicus', 'Indian reforms and the Station Club', Contemporary Review, 116, pp.321-6.
115. Misra, op.cit., especially chapter 7. See also B.Fuller,(1913),The Empire of India, Pitman, London; W.Gutteridge, 'The Indianisation of the Indian Army'; 1918-1945, Race, 4, 1963, pp.39-48.
116. Misra, op.cit., chapters 7,9.
117. C.A.Bayley, The Local Roots of Indian Politics. Allahabad, 1880-1920, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1975, pp.53-6.
118. B.R.Nanda, The Nehrus. Motilal and Jawaharlal. Allen and Unwin, London, 1965, pp.30-1.
119. Padfield, op.cit., p.1.
120. P.Tandon, Punjabi Century, 1857-1947. Chatto and Windus, London, 1961, pp.236-9.
121. A.D.King, Colonial Urban Development.Culture,Social Power and Environment, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1976, Chapter 10.
122. Survey of India. Lahore and Environs, Guide Map (3" = 1 mile).1935.
123. J.Pott, Old Bungalows in Bangalore, South India, published by author, 56, Addison Avenue, London W.11, 1977, pp.50-71.
124. Begum Shaista Ikramullah, From Purdah to Parliament, The Cresset Press, London, 1963, p.17. This also includes interesting reference to the traditional Muslim house and its special usage (pp.3,5).
125. King, 1976, op.cit. Chapter 10.
126. Ibid. Chapter 11.
127. See forthcoming issues of Lotus International (Italy) on India.
128. A.M.Shah,The Household Dimension of the Family in India, University of California Press, London, 1974.
129. Ibid.
130. A.Kira, The Bathroom, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1976.

131. Raghuvanshi, op.cit., p.201.
132. S.M.Neild, 'Colonial urbanism: the development of Madras City in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries', Modern Asian Studies, 13, 2, 1979, pp. 217-46.
133. C.Furedy, 'The development of modern elite retailing in Calcutta, 1890 - 1920', Indian Economic and Social History Review, 16,4, 1979.
134. M.Tarapor, 'Art education in Imperial India: The Indian Schools of Art', Seventh European Conference on South Asian Studies. SOAS, London, 1981.

CHAPTER TWO

THE BUNGALOW IN ENGLAND 1750 - 1890

Introduction

I International Context

The international economy and its effects

The word and image

II National Development: Economy and Society

The development of leisure resorts

Masses and classes: segregation at the resorts

III Local Setting

Bungalow development: Phase one

Bungalow development: Phase two

The contemporary response

Architects and innovators

Conclusion

CHAPTER TWO

THE BUNGALOW IN ENGLAND 1750 - 1890

Introduction

The first bungalow to be built and named as such in England - and almost certainly in the Western hemisphere - appeared on the North Kent coast, some two hours train journey from London, in 1869. In the next four years, six more were built close by. (1) What were they? What function did they serve? Why this particular time, location and place? Who built them and for whom? Not least, how did they acquire their distinctive Anglo-Indian name?

In answering these questions, this chapter first considers the 'invention' of the bungalow - a purpose-built leisure or holiday dwelling - as a case study in the specialisation of building form. It suggests that the accumulation of surplus capital which industrialisation brought in its wake led, on one hand, to an increasingly differentiated urban environment and, on the other, to the creation of specialised building types. The new leisure environment of the mid-Victorian seaside resort resulted from surplus capital, railway developments and an increase in leisure and material consumption, all of which had been brought about by the Industrial Revolution. The bungalow was a further, and logical extension of these developments. Yet basic to this Revolution was the growth of an international economy and this was also to provide the context for the diffusion of the bungalow image and name.

The second theme has been touched on in chapter one. How are the values, beliefs and activities of a society - as well as its social structure - reflected in its buildings and physical environment? The bungalow as introduced into Britain was a product of prevailing ideas about property, but also about health, behaviour and the divisions of a society, increasingly divided, both socially and spatially, according to class.

I International Context

The international economy and its effects

By the middle of the eighteenth century, the trade between Europe and Asia with which the previous chapter began was rapidly expanding into a system of capitalist production working on a global scale. Though the Industrial Revolution was to totally transform the economy and society of Britain, leading to immensely increased productivity and wealth, behind it lay the colonial and 'underdeveloped' markets overseas. As Hobsbawn remarks, exports provided the leading sector of demand in the genesis of Britain's industrialisation, along with the growing home market. Infant industries were helped, sometimes created by accelerating overseas trade. In Europe, this rested on the rise of an everyday market for overseas products (like sugar) and overseas, on the creation of systems for producing such goods (such as the slave-operated plantations) and the conquest of colonies. 'Our industrial economy grew out of our commerce, and especially commerce with the under-developed world . . . the exchange of overseas primary products was to be the foundation of our international economy'. (2) After 1750, this was to grow rapidly and have both direct and indirect effects on urban and architectural developments in Britain (3), not least on the emerging seaside resorts.

Just as the profits of the West India sugar plantations had provided their owners with country seats such as Fonthill or Harewood(4), so, somewhat later, the wealth of the East India trade had a similar impact on the landscape. In between Plassey (1757) and Waterloo (1815), it has been suggested that the total wealth - plunder according to some - flowing to Britain from India amounted to £1000 million. (5) Some of this financed the country (and parliamentary) seats of the Anglo-Indian 'nabobs' returning with fortunes from the East. Between 1760 and 1785, fifty of the more prominent of these were established (6), one of the more exotic being at Sezincote in Gloucestershire. Here, making use of wealth accumulated during service with the East India Company, Sir Charles Cockerell, assisted by his architect brother, Samuel, built an elaborate farm and country house in 'Oriental' or 'Indian' style (7) . Apart from providing the inspiration for the Prince Regent's Pavilion at Brighton, the facade of the house, built in 1803, and the nearby cottage, in adopting the distinctive curvilinear form of the thatched roof 'banggala', were to anticipate the arrival of other

bungalow images from the East.

The foundations of Britain's industrial economy were laid in the first half of the nineteenth century. By the end of the 1840's, however, the second phase of capitalist industrialisation, based on coal, iron, steel and the railways had begun. By then, the stringencies of the early years had led to a situation where an annual surplus of £60 million was crying out for investment. (8) In 1850, the 'great boom' started, leading Hobsbawm to label the next twenty five years 'the Age of Capital'. (9) The two developments which were to increasingly absorb and ultimately create more wealth in this era were extensive investment in railways and the massive geographical expansion of the economy, as a result of the railway, steamship and telegraph, with the subsequent huge growth in markets for industrial products. The major theme of these years, then, is the extension of the capitalist economy to the entire world. (10).

If railways supplied one major field for investment, another was provided by urban developments linked to them, especially the new seaside resorts. The third quarter of the nineteenth century saw a remarkable expansion of these. 'By the mid 1860s, a middle class holiday boom was already transforming parts of the British coastline with seafront promenades, piers and other establishments, enabling landed proprietors to draw unsuspected profits from hitherto uneconomic stretches of cliffs and beaches'. (11) It is in the context of this railway and resort development, and the emergence of an international system not only of economy but also of linguistic and cultural exchange, that the introduction of the bungalow into Europe takes place. Yet before it arrived 'in the flesh' so to speak, the word and image had to be known.

The word and image

English merchants and travellers in India were quick to adopt aspects of its language and culture and by the early seventeenth century many terms had entered their vocabulary. Some - like bazaar, godown or serai (market, warehouse and accommodation for travellers) - described the places where they worked; others - like hookah, cheroots, mangos, curry and punch - were items of local culture which they adopted. At first, such terms only belonged to the small speech community of the European in India, though possibly shared with Company officials back home.

Until the mid eighteenth century 'bunglo' was such a term; it had restricted circulation and this, in speech more than writing. Unlike chintz,

jute or calico, words for goods actually carried to the West, written in bills of lading and attached, as it were, to the materials when they arrived, the term 'bunglo', like the object it described, stayed for long in India. When written, it was in manuscript rather than print: in correspondence, diaries, navigation charts or documents, all with restricted circulation.(12) Before the middle of the eighteenth century then, the term and concept were virtually unknown outside the restricted culture of Anglo-India.

About that time, however, India came to the front of the English political scene. In 1756, the Nawab of Bengal, Suraj-ud-Daula, attacked and captured the British factory at Fort William, now re-built as an 'octagon' fort with escarpments. Some occupants fled: others were imprisoned in what became known as the infamous 'Black Hole'. The East India Company's military commander, Robert Clive, moved up from Madras, rapidly gathered his troops and re-took Calcutta. In the ensuing battle at Plassey, the Nawab's troops (allied with the French) were routed. The Nawab was displaced and Clive's nominee, Mir Jaffa, whose 'firman' or 'permission to trade' was immediately obtained, was put in his place. The British were the masters of Bengal.

With the India lobby in London avidly interested in the wealth which now seemed likely to flow, the event found expression on the London stage. Murphy's farce, The Upholsterer, or What News? celebrated the victory in India. In the play, full of references to current events, 'Quidnunc' makes what might well be the first public reference to the 'bunglo' in England.

I bring you joy - the Nabob's demolished . . . Suraja Dowla is no more . . . our men diverted themselves with killing bullocks and camels till they dislodged the enemy from the octagon, the counterscarp and the bunglo - the new nabob, Jaffir Ally Cawn has acceded to a treaty and the English company have got all their rights in the phirman. (13)

As British power was established, the traffic in ideas, as well as goods, increased. Knowledge of India as well as the Anglo-Indian community filtered back to England. In Calcutta, printing presses were set up and newspapers published (The India Gazette, Calcutta Gazette, Bombay Courier), copies of which soon began to reach the metropolis. Here, curious readers might have seen 'bungalos' advertised as part of large Calcutta estates. (14) The 'Nabobs' - also the subject of a play of the same name by Foote (1768) - became important cultural brokers between India and the West.

It was another political event, however, which re-focussed attention on Anglo-Indian life, the impeachment of Warren Hastings, ex-Governor General

of Bengal, for alleged misgovernment. For the large public interested in the proceedings, the need for background information was met by publications such as John Stockdale's Indian Vocabulary: to which is prefixed the Forms of Impeachment (1788). Here, people were told about Hastings' vast Calcutta estate including 'a convenient bungalow containing two rooms and a verandah all round'. (15)

Yet knowledge of Indian culture, and particularly, its topography, peoples and architecture, was still virtually unknown in late eighteenth century England. If familiarity with what it looked like began to improve at this time, it was through the activities of a handful of artists, especially the brothers William and Thomas Daniell, and William Hodges who, as official draughtsman, had accompanied Captain Cook to the South Seas. Under the patronage of Warren Hastings, Hodges had gone to India in 1788 where he produced a series of sketches and paintings before returning home six years later.

Hodges published his Select Views in India in 1786 and Travels in India, 1780 - 3 in 1793. As he wrote in his Preface, it was 'a matter of surprise that, of a country so nearly allied to us, so little should be known'. (16) Particularly interested in architecture, his descriptions of India's cities and European buildings were, in 1793, the most detailed and perceptive up to that time. Hodges travelled from Calcutta, up the Ganges to Benares, Allahabad and Lucknow. Here, in 1781, he stayed in the 'large bungalow' of a senior Company officer. His exact description of the plan, structure and materials were not to be equalled for another sixty years. (See chapter 1, p. 55).

The end of the eighteenth century was to witness an increasing rationalisation of agriculture as landlords enclosed common land, either to follow modern farming methods or create, where previously tenants had farmed, 'Arcadian' prospects on their estates.

As part of the process, architects produced books of designs for 'picturesque' cottages, the object of which was to enhance the view of the estate and in the process, as Williams points out, convert its function from one of production to consumption.(17) In one of these collections, Sketches for Country Houses, Villas and Rural Dwellings (1800) by John Plaw, appeared **2.2** a cottage design 'with a viranda, in the manner of an Indian Bungalow'. Though still described as a cottage, here was a close approximation of the pyramidal, thatched roof form. The innovation here, however, was not the bungalow itself but the 'viranda', a term and feature which, from this time (possibly the

first record of its use in Britain), become gradually more common. As Plaw, Hodges and the Daniells all seemed to have exhibited at the Royal Academy in the nineties, they could well have been in contact. (18)

As more travellers undertook the long, yet now less hazardous journey to India, travelling in the interior, staying in up-country stations and returning to publish their travel accounts back home, the idea of the bungalow became increasingly familiar. (19) Such travellogues were supplemented by the memoirs of Company officials, both civil and military; of these, the most detailed accounts of European bungalows appeared in the books of Williamson and Buchanan between 1810 and 1820 (see pages and these accounts often included glossaries of unfamiliar Indian terms. Thus, Maria Graham's popular Journal of a Residence in India(1813) described the 'bungalo' as 'a garden house or cottage' and included a distant sketch of a temporary version 'built of bamboos, covered with cotton cloth and decorated with leaves, flowers and coconut' encountered in Ceylon. A more authentic illustration, of 'the Captain's Bungalow, Cawnpore' appeared in Mrs. Sherwood's Stories from the Church Catechism(1817), an account of life with the non-commissioned ranks in British India.

The term seems to have been adopted as English rather than Anglo Indian around the 1830s. About ten years prior to this, for example, an 'old India hand' seems to have built a farm between Newmarket and Cambridge. No doubt with nostalgic memories of days in South India, he named 'Bangalore Barn' about 1825. Unfamiliar to local ears, by 1838, 'Bangalore' had been changed to what was then a more familiar 'Bungalow Farm', one, if not the earliest use of the word as a place name in England. (20)

As the mails improved and more of the middle class took service in India, the word and concept became increasingly known. And as women now accompanied their husbands up country they felt obliged to describe domestic life for their sisters back home. Thus, in 1847 Mrs. Graham writes that bungalows were 'for the most part built of unbaked bricks and covered with thatch, having in the centre a hall . . . the whole being encompassed by an open verandah'.(21) Letters helped to fill information gaps. 'I hope you will send the sketches of the country, the natives, of yourself, your Bungalow', Mrs. Lewin wrote to her soldier son in 1826.(22) Similar sympathies inspired Colesworthy Grant to send home 'Sketches of Anglo-Indian Domestic Life' to his sisters, later to be published in 1859,(see pages 55-6)with their detailed drawings. For a few people with connections and interests in India there were occasional paintings and, in 1825, the lithographs of Charles D'Oyley, who, as Opium Agent had spent a number of years in Panta.(23)

Anglo-Indian life was now a topical subject

for humour, as expressed for example in George Atkinson's Curry and Rice (on forty plates) or The Ingredients of Social Life at 'Our' Station. (1850)

Immediately behind (the huts for native troops) are the domiciles for officers, commonly called a bungalow, in its own territory . . . These bungalows you observe, look like exaggerated beehives, perched upon milestones - a judicious combination of mud, whitewash and thatch . . .

Similarly, in the fifteen years after 1889, E.H.Aitken's Behind the Bungalow - more scenes from Anglo-Indian domestic life, with strong overtones of racial superiority - was to run into eight editions.

By the mid nineteenth century, therefore, 'bungalow' was simply one of a large number of Indian words and ideas familiar to the educated English public. Thackeray, for example, with his own Indian background, liberally sprinkled his novels (particularly The Newcomes, 1854) with words like backsheesh, cashmere, juggernaut, Nizam, purda, bungalow. (24) In Our Street (1848), Captain Bragg, retired Commander of the Ram Chunder East Indiaman, comes home to settle in the 'splendid new white-stuccoed, Doric-porticoed genteel Pocklington quarter of the borough of Lathanplaster'. Here, he built 'Bungalow Lodge' though as he lived on 'the first floor', this was somewhat of a misnomer.

In the fictional Captain Bragg, Thackeray was parodying the many Anglo-Indians by then returning to England. Captain Bamford, however, was real. Returning from India in 1859 to the sylvan suburb of Norwood in South London he built himself a lodge-like house, calling it 'The Bungalow'. In later years it gave its name to Bungalow Road, close to the Crystal Palace Football Stadium. (25)

It was the massive uprising against British rule in 1857, however, which was to bring India once more to the centre of events in England. Apart from his weekly reports in The Times, W.H.Russell's My Diary in India in the Year 1858-9, with its detailed descriptions of dawk bungalows, hill station bungalows and bungalow life on the plain, circulated widely during these years. By the time E.Sullivan's Bungalow and Tent (Travels in Ceylon) appeared in 1859, or when G.O.Trevelyan wrote 'The Dawk Bungalow: or, is his appointment pukka', in Fraser's Magazine (1866), there was little need to describe or define the phenomenon. Since the 1850s, photography had brought images to the descriptions; by then, the word was fully naturalised, incorporated into English speech in **2-1** England and illustrated in the Imperial Dictionary of 1851, where 'native bungalows are generally of wood, bamboo, etc. but those erected by Europeans are generally built of sun-dried bricks, and thatched and tiled'.

More important than a mere acquaintance with the term, however, were the images now attached to the bungalow style of life. In the 1860s and 70s, life in the country or hill station bungalow was seen as a positive experience, far from the madding crowd and waited on hand and foot. Like other facets of Anglo Indian (and Indian) life, it seemed to represent something which had been lost in England, increasingly industrialised and urban, and offering an opportunity to escape from social changes which some people were beginning to disapprove. (26) Without the discomforts of actually going to India then, here, in the single-storey simple Indian bungalow, was an institution which, with profit, could be modified and adopted back home.

II National Development : Economy & Society

The development of leisure resorts

As introduced into England, the bungalow was a new type of dwelling, designed for a particular function. It was the prototype of a purpose-built 'leisure' or holiday house built, not at the request of a particular client, but speculatively, for a growing middle class market with surplus wealth to spend. As the buyer of the first one wrote to the architect, 'if there were many bungalows, there would be many buyers'. The ultimate development of the bungalow as a holiday house for the mass or, in the present century, as 'second home', provides a good example of the tendency to specialisation - in this case, of building types - which industrial capitalism has brought about. (27)

When viewed in the long history of urban and architectural development in Britain, the purpose-built bungalow was part of the emergence of a new form of urban settlement, the recreational or leisure town which, in England, was typically the seaside resort. To explain the 'invention' of the bungalow, therefore, we must look briefly at the development of the resort.

Although the Romans reputedly patronised leisure resorts on the Adriatic (28), the development of the modern phenomenon from the mid eighteenth century in Britain is very much a product of capitalist industrialisation and the consequent growth of large urban populations. The major outcome of industrialisation was to create material wealth. It represented a rise in per capita production which, in comparison with the agricultural economy it first complemented and eventually displaced, resulted in the accumulation of surplus capital.

The surplus was not just of material wealth: it was also, for a sizeable minority, a surplus of time. The application of new forms of energy and the

mechanisation of industry meant that more goods were produced with less time and effort. While the development of factory production in the early nineteenth century meant, for the new urban working class, longer work hours and, in comparison to their agricultural forebears, a loss of traditional rural holidays, for the growing minority of employers and rentiers it meant a substantial increase of leisure. As industrialisation and the size of the surplus increased, as markets expanded and workers gained more control over their conditions of labour from the 1860s, increased prosperity and leisure became available to a larger proportion of the population, at first, the middle class and then, towards the end of the century, a fair proportion of the skilled working class.

The most obvious environmental expression of these developments - surplus capital and surplus time - was in the new purpose-built leisure environments of the nineteenth century, the seaside resorts.(29) These had developed from the earlier aristocratic and upper class practice of visiting inland spas and had grown especially from the mid-eighteenth century (30). By the first decades of the nineteenth, they were the main location for leisure for the aristocracy and upper middle class. With the rapid expansion of bourgeois society and developments in railways between the 1840s and 1860s, the seaside resorts were to provide an important source for the investment and circulation of surplus capital (31)

The most recent studies suggest that, in the majority of cases, much of the investment came from London, (32) though just how much of this ultimately derived from overseas is not clear. However, until research is undertaken, it seems reasonable to assume that indirectly at least profits from overseas trading helped in the establishment of the resorts. What is generally known is that many people, returning temporarily or permanently from the colonies, chose to invest their savings in property on the south coast. (33)

Industrialisation was also to have immense effects on society and lead to new forms of stratification. The vast increase in the size of the surplus and its uneven distribution created greater inequalities; new industrial and scientific techniques generated a host of new occupations, each with its particular status; and a vast growth in material goods (especially in housing and material consumption) allowed this stratification to be expressed in different ways. Thus, in comparison with the relatively simple divisions of the 'ranks' and 'orders' of pre-industrial Europe, the new class structure of the industrial society was based on wealth, its differentiated rungs frequently expressed in the dwellings produced for members of the various classes.

In a parallel way, industrialisation resulted in an increasing differentiation and specialisation of the spatial or geographic environment. At the most obvious level, this was manifest in the growth of towns and an increasing differentiation, not simply between urban and rural, but between places on the basis of size, economic function (market, industrial, commercial, mining,) and industrial process (weaving, spinning, smelting, pottery). Within the towns, further differentiation occurred. In the classic phrase of geographers, the place of work was separated from the place of residence. Not only did the factory take work away from the dwelling but the location of each was gradually separated in the town. Similarly, spare time and leisure were accommodated in the specialised environment of the resort.

Such a spatial differentiation was accompanied by, and expressed in, a parallel specialisation of building types. As technological processes became increasingly diversified, new, purpose-built or adapted building types emerged: the textile mill, engine shed, dye works, and foundry. In the new industrial towns, the stratification of society was expressed in various ways: the location of various classes in different sections of the town; the allotted space for, and size of each house; and the form, name and quality of the dwelling itself: the labourer's cottage, working class tenement, gentleman's villa, and mansion flats, and the location where they were found: suburban residence or country seat. On one hand, therefore, the seaside bungalow was evidence of the increasing tendency towards functional specialisation in building form: on the other, it was simply another way in which social stratification was expressed in the built environment.

In the nineteenth century, the seaside resorts seem to have developed in three phases, each influenced, among other factors, by the operations of the capital market and the available means of transport, especially its carrying capacity and speed. The earliest (e.g. Brighton or Worthing) were accessible only by horse-drawn coach, with its small carrying capacity and infrequency of trips. Dependent on the patronage of royalty and upper class, they were located close to the metropolis. The second phase, from about 1815 to the 1840s, relied on steam-powered, sea-borne transport (the hoy and steam packet) with its faster speed and much increased passenger capacity. By then, patronage was drawn from a much wider social clientele, though still largely from London, and the resorts, such as Margate and Ramsgate, were a greater distance away. From the mid 1840s, however, the development of the railway brought a form of transport which, in terms of speed, frequency, the number of passengers carried and at relatively little cost, was unrivalled. It led, from the middle of the century, to the development of resorts within easy reach of the large populations

in the towns.

During the first phase, some nine 'seaside watering places' were established on the Channel coast, four in Sussex and five in Kent.(34) In 1841, of the thirty six 'principal sea-bathing places' in England, two thirds of them lay south east of a line drawn from the Wash to the Bristol Channel: a quarter were in the two coastal counties closest to London, Sussex and Kent. Ten years later, when the census takers decided for the first time to distinguish between 'seaside towns' and 'inland watering places', five of the largest resorts were in these two counties (Margate, Ramsgate, Dover, Brighton and Worthing), (35) that is, closest to their patrons and the finances which had largely developed them.

The growth of these resorts (as also the inland spas) was as phenomenal as that of the commercial and industrial towns. In the fifty years after 1801, the population of eleven 'resort towns' and four 'inland watering places' increased by over 250%, a higher rate than that of some fifty manufacturing towns (224%) and the metropolis itself (146%) - evidence enough that institutionalised leisure was a product both of industrial growth and the capital which this, and expanding markets overseas, had generated. (36) By 1851, when the population of the leading resort (Brighton), overtook that of Bath, as the most eminent of the inland spas, the seaside had become society's principal location for leisure.

Fundamental to these developments was the same form of energy which had sparked off the industrial revolution itself - steam power, applied to transport both at sea and on land. Though the first railway to Kent was established in 1830, the opening of the London, Chatham and Dover line to Ramsgate and Margate in 1863 was to double the number of daily visitors between 1861 and 1881 and Margate's resident population grew from some 10,000 to over 18,000. (37) In the thirty years before 1870, the journey time between London and Margate was cut from three to two hours.

Masses and classes : segregation at the resorts

The development of Westgate and Birchington, the location of the first English bungalows, was an outcome of the 'great Victorian boom' which occurred between 1850 and 1873. (38)

From the 1850s, an increasing level of investment occurred in building construction and urbanisation, rising to a peak in the mid 1870s. Between 1869 and 73, when the first bungalows were built, the London building cycle was at a peak, even though the national one was in decline. (39) At nearby

Ramsgate, the London-based British Land Company were largely responsible for the building boom at this time (40)

At Westgate, the capital was apparently supplied from Coutts' Bank of London. (41) As in other realms in the market economy, both the resort and the type of residential buildings it contained were to carefully exploit, and reinforce, existing divisions in society.

The earliest seaside 'watering places' had developed primarily as places for the rich. Yet as their size and number increased, the divisions of the larger society were reflected in the newer resorts round the coast. (42) Where Brighton and Weymouth had been patronised by royalty and the elite, the resorts of Kent became associated with the new middle class. By 1841, London supplied most of Margate's visitors, the vast majority people of 'independent means', merchants, manufacturers and members of the professions, but few titled aristocracy. (43) In the middle of the century, the common practice was for the entire family to come down from London for some weeks, dependent on income, during the two or three month season. After a week, the head of the family would return to his business activities.

By 1870, however, Margate and Ramsgate had become increasingly favoured by the lower end of this middle class market. They were, in the words of a visiting London architect, 'somewhat plebian watering places'. (44) Wealthier people were already moving out to nearby Cliftonville, or, from the mid 1870s, to the rapidly rising town of Westgate.

In the 1860s, the site of Westgate had contained little but a farmhouse and coastguard station. After the opening of the railway in 1870, however, it grew rapidly and by 1881, was a 'populous town with a semi-circular promenade, terraces, squares and shops, a fashionable hotel and a railway station'. (45) The transformation had been effected by a local capitalist, apparently in combination with Coutts bank. A London architect was employed to lay out the town and strict covenants governed the type of property built. All the roads were private and only detached houses were to be built.

By the late 1870s, Westgate-on-Sea had become (with Cromer) one of the most fashionable and exclusive metropolitan resorts, the first town in the country to test out electric lighting in its streets. The town was

'next door to Margate . . . yet had nothing in common with it but the finest stretch of open sea on the coast of England . . . One may walk its whole length . . . without being reminded, even by an advertisement or a signboard, of such things as we wish to forget when we leave cities and come to the sea . . . There is no regulation line of flat, white lodging houses to overshadow the sea itself . . . There is no obtrusive hotel with a stucco face and a style of architecture too well known as Anglo-Marine. Indeed, there is no stucco at Westgate at all . . .

Westgate, 'where there was nothing conventional, not even a pier' was reserved for the well-to-do, It was 'a seaside corner, practically close to London, with none of the seaside discomforts and vexations'. It was not a place

'such as the energetic excursionist would choose for his peculiar purpose . . . Westgate does not want him and will do nothing to attract him . . . for its own convenience it uses the express train which . . . without stop or change, turns its seventy miles from London in distance into about an hour and a half in time; but the excursion train never comes at all. A great number of the houses belong to residents who either live there all the year round or make it their autumn quarters. So far as society is concerned . . . Westgate is somewhat rigidly exclusive in its tastes and strongly aristocratic in its feelings and ambitions- a sort of Mayfair by the sea!. (47)

The test of these aspirations rested with the people it was able to attract. In this it was apparently successful rivalling 'other upstart watering places in Normandy' in attracting 'persons of refinement and artistic sympathies', numbering a nationally eminent physician, the editor of Nineteenth Century, the MP for Boston and an eminent painter, Sir W.Q.Orchardson. (48) Both in the 1870s and later, it was a place where metropolitan wealth paid metropolitan architects to develop a resort for the benefit of a metropolitan clientele. Westgate's appeal remained for some twenty years; in 1893 it still prided itself 'on its exclusiveness . . . laudably careful in appearances; in its public manner, not a little prudish'. During twenty years 'it was prominent among the most aristocratic resorts in the South of England' and both local and London interests benefitted from the property boom which it sparked off. (49)

Three miles down the coast was the village of Birchington, an adjunct to these developments. Close to the sea, 'with quiet nooks for bathing', the ancient village was rapidly incorporated into the metropolitan 'leisure zone' with the opening of the railway station in 1864; building operations were begun, the church re-decorated and the local tavern re-furbished. (50) In these two places, the first bungalows were to be built.

III Local Setting

Bungalow developments : Phase One

It will be clear from the following account that the first English bungalows were designed for a particular purpose; they incorporated many new features and

were especially adapted to the social and behavioural needs of their potential clientele. Less than two hours rail journey from London and five minutes carriage ride from the train, they functioned as what people a century later would call a 'second home'. Though constructed by a local contractor, the developer, architect, agent and future occupants were all from London. The innovations (which) they incorporated were not just technical (building materials and techniques) but also social. Stylistically, they hinted at architectural developments to come. Though each of these characteristics had no doubt appeared in other buildings, here they were combined into one. By giving the whole a new name, the architect had invented a specialised recreational dwelling.

The first two bungalows were part of a small development of four houses on the seafront at Westgate, formerly 'the nucleus of the town'. Having built these between 1869-70, the architect - no doubt looking for a better site for his idea - moved up the coast to Birchington. Here, between 1870 and 73, the first bungalow settlement was established. (52)

If the economic basis was supplied by London's surplus capital, the site and design of the bungalows were determined by the beliefs and social behaviour of its upper middle class. These were ideas about health, about aesthetics and the type of social setting which, in the last third of the nineteenth century, were being increasingly preferred. In comparison with those of earlier times, these ideas had changed considerably.

The built environment of the early resorts had resulted from a combination of factors - economic, social, ideological and health. Of the latter, beliefs in the beneficial effects of sea water, both for drinking and for bathing, had become increasingly widespread since Russell's famous Dissertation on the Use of Sea Water had been published in 1752. (53) Every resort had its resident physician and 'dipping ladies' to help visitors to bathe. (54)

The logical consequence of these ideas was that building developments took place close to the sea and, as these had to be protected from the storms, sea walls were constructed and the residential terraces were built along the 'sea front'. Previously, coastal settlements such as fishing villages and ports had been built somewhat inland, their simple houses huddled together for protection, their backs generally turned towards the sea. (55) For the population of these small villages, the sea was there for fishing, a source of livelihood which was otherwise to be feared.

For the patrons of the purpose-built resort, however, the sea had a new-found aesthetic and emotional appeal, as well as curative effects. As part of changed attitudes to Nature, central to Romantic ideas of the time, the sea, like the mountains, had become a phenomenon to be admired. 'Grand, vast and

terrifying', it was a perfect example of the 'sublime'. (56) It was there to look at as well as a place to bathe. These ideological factors were reflected in the early nineteenth century resorts, with building development running parallel to the coast and 'marine villas' sited to ensure 'sea views', strung along the sea front. A road, soon developed for use as a 'promenade', separated the building line from the beach and sea. For people wishing to bathe, prevailing norms of privacy required that bathing machines (first seen at Scarborough in the 1730s) were hired, used to disrobe and change, and were then drawn by horses into the sea where the occupants could be easily immersed. For those too irresolute or old, salt water bathing establishments were built (as at Brighton or Margate in the 1760s) (57) where the waters could be enjoyed more calmly.

Yet apart from hoping to benefit their health and indulge their romantic ideas people also visited resorts for recreational and social reasons, to relax, meet and gossip, and these activities were both accommodated in, and reflected by, its buildings and urban form.

The early and mid nineteenth century resort was essentially a social and public place, characteristics most obviously expressed in the institutions which it contained: the assembly rooms, pump room, theatre, bathing establishments, promenades, parades, card rooms, public gardens and library - the latter, a place as much for exchanging gossip as books. These institutions, many of which had been transplanted from the inland spas, provided for collective forms of leisure, encouraging social encounters and the opportunity for personal display. Bathing, often at regulated hours, was very much a social routine. This 'social characteristic' of the resort was also reflected in the type of residential accommodation provided. The earliest patrons of places like Brighton had simply hired lodgings in local cottages (58) but soon, other purpose-built provision had been made. Typically, this was the boarding house and hotel, with public arrangements for eating. (In Kent, the first reference to a 'hotel' is in 1759; to a 'boarding house', in 1774). (59) Gardens, where they existed, were shared between visiting guests. As urban form, the early and mid Victorian resort was compact, keeping its inhabitants together. The prevailing type of housing, the terrace, and its generally carefully planned lay-out as street, square, crescent or place, encouraged a concentration rather than dispersal of inhabitants. Accommodation was primarily for middle and upper middle class visitors and tended to be similar to that in the towns from which they had come. Only slight concessions - most often on terraced housing or 'marine villas' facing the sea - were made to the specifically health, recreational and ideological functions of the seaside. Balconies, for example

were occasionally built on windows, and verandahs (an early nineteenth century innovation) permitted occupants to smell, listen to or gaze at the sea (as well as passers-by), in addition to providing variety. 'No decoration has so successfully varied the dull sameness of modern structures in the metropolis as the verandah' wrote architect J.B.Papworth in 1818. (60) If the informality of their function was expressed in architectural design, it was in a more decorative use of cast-iron, on railings, stairs or balconies. By and large, however, the terraces and villas of mid-nineteenth century Brighton or Scarborough could equally well have been found inland, at the spas, or in the more fashionable parts of London. In brief, although the 'seaside watering place' was a purpose-built leisure resort, and specialised building types such as assembly rooms and piers had been provided for public recreational use, private residential provision was still generally similar to that prevailing in inland towns.

By the later 1860s, however, although similar aesthetic ideas prevailed, medical and social views had changed. Where late eighteenth century opinion had stressed the curative qualities of salt water, that of the mid and later nineteenth century increasingly emphasized the importance of 'bracing sea air'. (61) And with changes in both the nature of work and the permanent, year-round environment of people coming to resorts, their social function and character had also changed.

In Health Resorts of Britain and How to Profit by Them (1860), Dr. Spencer Thompson, like other contemporary physicians, had recognised that people visited resorts for 'relaxation, freedom from business cares and exercise'. His principal concern, however, was to stress the beneficial effects of the sea air. A change of air was 'especially important for the man who has been shut up, day after day, in the unventilated office or workshop'. Going to the sea or hills was where 'the ozone is most abundant'. Ozone ('the oxygen gas of the atmosphere in a peculiar condition') was greater at the seashore and in mountains and less pure in cities. (62) Such emphasis on the atmosphere rather than the water recurs throughout mid and late nineteenth century literature on the seaside; to a large extent, it reflected the understandable obsession with pulmonary complaints and particularly, tuberculosis, which made ravages among city-dwellers irrespective of social class. (63)

Air, vitiated by the different processes of respiration, combustion and putrefaction, or which is suffered to stagnate, becomes prejudicial to the human frame; hence, large cities, public assemblies, hospitals, burial grounds, etc., are injurious to the health and often productive of contagious diseases. (64)

The quality of the air was 'greatly influenced by local causes'. Because of these beliefs, sea air was seen to have particularly healthful properties:

Sea air is well known to be beneficial and invigorating (because of) its constant agitation by the winds and tides and also, the absence of many deteriorating causes to which land is subject.

Different types of air were suitable for different ailments: for 'relexation and debility', 'dry and bracing' air was needed; for the tendency to 'fever and inflammatory action', a 'soft and humid climate was to be preferred'. (65)

As social places, the later nineteenth century resorts were different in two distinct ways. As suggested above, they had become increasingly differentiated according to social class. And, as part of this process, a type of small, upper middle class 'seaside watering place' had emerged where collective, public forms of amusement were deliberately kept out. Even in 1841, Granville had complained that the 'upper and wealthier classes of society' had been 'driven away from every point on the coast by the facilities offered to the "everybody" and the "anybody" of congregating in shoals at the same watering place, creating bustle noise, confusion and vulgarity'. This 'congregating in shoals' had been helped by the 'interminable terraces, parades, paragon and parabolae of houses of every sort and size' which speculators had run up. (66) It was a sentiment increasingly expressed as the resorts grew in size and number, to be repeated again in the early 1880s.

Who is not sick . . . of the interminable terraces and places, crescents and squares, of most of our seaside resorts? . . . Do we not know the painful and reiterated experience of those long rows of bricks, whose very similitude to each other depresses one the very moment the . . . excitement of leaving home and the subsequent journey are over? (67)

What the patrons of the later Victorian resort wanted was social exclusiveness and individuality, expressed both spatially and architecturally. These were the reasons why Westgate (and subsequently, the bungalows) had such an appeal. The town stood 'behind the green edge of the white cliffs' and

apart from the one row of no longer visible shops, it consists of handsome houses, mostly detached and of infinite variety in style. Each house seems to say "I am a house and a home and not merely four walls to lodge in". To this regularity of irregularity the special character of Westgate is largely due. (68)

2.5

In these newer resorts, therefore, natural qualities were stressed: climate, scenery, antiquities and shore. Such resorts were appreciated for their social exclusiveness, their absence of noise and commerce, and for the opportunity they offered for private, not public forms of recreation. Here, away from the social bustle of the town, in detached houses bordering the sea, visitors indulged in family-centred activities. The early nineteenth century resort had been an essentially adult place but, with the 'discovery' of children and their distinctive needs in mid-Victorian Britain, a new type of environment (and accommodation) was required. The large middle and upper middle class family seeking holidays by the sea preferred to 'do it themselves', walking on the sands, collecting shells and seaweed, relaxing in the company of friends 'far from the madding crowd'. (69)

Birchington was typical of these developments. Its attraction was in the absence not the presence of public amusements. Even ten years after its development as a resort

'the jaded professional man in search of ease may pass his well-earned holiday in the most invigorating tranquillity, for the perfect repose of the place is unruffled by the noisy seaside attractions. There are no German bands . . . no distressing niggers on the shore, and no revolting donkey-drivers in the roads. Shorn of these excitements, the cheap excursionists shun the spot . . . Birchington on Sea, without a jetty, or an "Assembly Rooms", or a "Tivoli", or a "Ranelagh", offers absolutely nothing - not even a solitary tea-garden - to lure Cockaigne from Margate. (It was simply) an uncontaminated play-ground for large families and a secluded sanitorium for invalids'. (70)

Patrons of the earlier resorts had sought a change in both their physical and social environments. At Brighton or Scarborough, they had found not only different air but also different people. By the later 1860s, patrons of this newer type of resort were less interested in meeting different people than in meeting no people at all. The aspiration, typical of a later urban age, of wanting to get away from others in a crowded city, was becoming increasingly common. Earlier, it had been confined to a wealthy few. Now, increasing prosperity and the railways made it attractive to the bourgeois population in the town.

The writer who was to describe the new bungalows at Birchington as 'rural-looking and isolated' was therefore, assigning them positive, not negative qualities. The city had always been the centre of culture and civilisation, but now, for the totally urbanised inhabitant, 'rural looking' was an attribute which obviously had an appeal. And social and physical isolation, to be increasingly sought in the 'isolated country cottages' in the decades to come, was a sign, on one hand, of the taken-for-granted human contact in the city; on the other, of the development of means of communication (telegraph, telephone, motor car and press) by which, when need be, the state of isolation could be rapidly exchanged for the reassuring company of the town.

In this context, it was fitting that the detached and socially separate form of the bungalow, imposed from 'outside' on the outskirts of an existing community should carry a suitably exogenous name which, unlike the cottage of the cottager, expressed no social relationship to the village.

The design and siting of the bungalows embodied these new medical and social criteria. Medical views on the benefits of sea air, as well as separation from 'public assemblies', coincided with preferences for isolation from one's fellow men. This meant that the bungalows, fully detached, and each in an acre of ground, should be as close as possible to the sea and as far as possible from older places of settlement. Sited well apart from the village, they were perched on the edge of a fifty foot cliff and had no other houses ^{2.6} around. The site 'had nothing but sea between it and the North Pole'. It was ^{2.7} 'as bracing a spot as our island can supply'. (71) Health considerations meant that the bungalows had 'many novel sanitary appliances' and were praised for 'the airiness of their verandahs'. (72) Bathing facilities were equally important, though in comparison to earlier times, the mode of bathing was now different.

In the early 'seaside watering places', bathing had been a restricted, almost medical practice, with particular bathing times and various arrangements, such as the bathing machine and the segregation of sexes, to safeguard public morals. By the 1860s, however, swimming, rather than mere immersion, was being recommended as a health-giving and pleasurable activity for both women and men. In 1875, the Channel was swum for the first time between Dover and Calais and this had done much to enhance the popularity of the sport. (73) Though men had often swum naked in the fifties, twenty years later convention required that costumes had to be worn. (74)

These activities and conventions had been assumed in the siting of the bungalows. Located at the edge of the cliffs, each had a private tunnel which led, from an entrance in the garden via a 'private dressing room' at the foot of the cliffs, right to the edge of the sea, thus ensuring total privacy. 2-8
2-9

The occupants of the bungalows were not, of course, completely isolated. There were, after all, a group of five in the initial development (1870-3). Still, in 1879 they were said to be 'cut off by deserts of mud and mire from all chance of Christian intercourse'. 'Perfect privacy' was assured as there was no public way along the cliff.(75)

The main functions of the bungalow were those of recreation and health. As the location had been chosen because of the absence of public amusements, private leisure facilities had to be available on site. Hence, gardens were amply laid out, with the front, sea-facing lawn laid out for the new game of croquet, introduced in the late fifties and increasingly fashionable in the next decades. At the other end, the conservatory and south garden afforded 'a pleasant retreat'. The dimensions of the plots were some 70 by 300 feet.

The location gave endless opportunity for inhaling bracing sea air, gazing at passing boats and appreciating the restless waves. A contemporary had noted that 'people at the seaside are, for the most part, intent on doing nothing, and the object is to do this in as great a variety of ways as possible .. The only pursuit of men and women is looking at one another, and at the sea'. (76)

These ideas no doubt accounted for the low belvedere tower in each bungalow where, in the privacy of the single bedroom-study, one could steal away and read, or enjoy, in private, more distant views of the sea. Strung along the cliff edge and with no communicating links between them the bungalow lay-out deliberately rejected any notion of 'community'. 2-10
2-11
2-12
2-13

Inside, the bungalows were spacious, 'cool, commodious cottages by the sea'. (77) The dining room (23' x 15') and saloon (15' x 18') both looked seawards; the saloon had been arranged 'to admit a billiard table capable of removal into the bay window and forming therein a buffet when required'.

The bungalows were designed for the typical Victorian middle class family, with five or six children, and servants. Apart from the bedroom in the tower, all accommodation was on one floor. In the larger version there were nine bedrooms (each approximately 11' by 12'), two of which were for servants. The rooms were planned 'to require the least amount of household work' with a serving hatch from kitchen to dining room 'to economise the labour of service'. Service arrangements included a butler's pantry, store room, larder, scullery, tradesman's entrance, kitchen yard, wash-house, stables and coach house. As the bungalows 2-14
2-15

were separated from the main town, sewerage could only be provided by cesspit. This was perhaps the least satisfactory aspect as the two earth closets, located at the end of the corridor, meant that 'the smell . . . was always complained about as most objectionable'. (78) The total plinth area was some 4,400 square feet.

An extensive basement was sunk into the chalk below. This had a large dairy, wine and beer cellars, and a separate garden entrance. A deep shaft was also sunk in the chalk into which larder shelves were suspended, by balance weights. Here, butter was kept in air 'so cold that no fly will remain in it'. (79) The bungalows also contained partial central heating with the saloon, conservatory and garden pits warmed by hot pipes.

The emphasis on sea air, sea views and bathing which determined the cliff edge site nevertheless brought technical problems. If the major object was to provide a healthy house, it was essential to keep out the damp. In the mid and later nineteenth century, this was a constant middle class worry, posing problems which, as yet, were little understood.

'In hundreds of instances . . . the interiors of rooms, even in houses occupied by persons of means and intelligence, are as moist as some caves. The paper peels off the walls, the plaster cracks and falls to pieces, the covers of books become mouldy and have a fusty smell . . . These, and other evils, are as nothing in comparison with the ill effects produced on our health.

In the interior of the Birchington Bungalows, however, 'none of these unpleasant phenomena are present'. The architect (reputedly the inventor of the 'damp proof course'), had introduced various devices to combat 'descending, ascending and drifting wet', including self-locking tiles on the roof and intricately **2-6** built, damp-proof walls. In these, the outer and inner faces of the wall were separated by slates which overlapped both horizontally and vertically. Outer walls were of locally quarried flint, and the string courses, as well as quoins and reveals, were of special bricks. Severe tests had proved that 'the most penetrating rains and salt sea spray' would not penetrate the walls. (80) The roof was of the simplest construction, with large (7" by 1½") common rafters replacing the usual roof truss. Ceiled beneath, this was then covered with asphalted felt, and topped with the architect's patented tiles.

Inside, the floors were covered with Indian matting. The furniture, specially designed by the architect, was prefabricated and built on a modular system. Chairs, used singly or bolted together, could be made up into settees, sideboards, dressing tables and bedsteads. (81)

The bungalows were a speculative venture, the freehold price (including furniture and fittings) for the smaller 7-roomed version was £1,000; for the 11-roomed bungalow, £1,800. At a time when clerks received between £100 and £200 a year, and seventy-five per cent of the working class between £25 and £100, it seems that they were probably meant for an upper middle class of professionals, businessmen or rentiers with at least £500 or more per year.(82)

The importance of beliefs about health in promoting the idea of the bungalow can be seen in their first owner, an eminent physician and antiquary who, apart from other claims to fame, paid £10,000 to bring Cleopatra's Needle to London. Sir Erasmus Wilson bought the first bungalow at Westgate in 1869 and later, two others at Birchington to let to his clients. Professor of Dermatology at the Royal College of Surgeons, Wilson was the greatest authority on skin diseases of the century. According to his biographer, it is to his teachings, that 'we owe in great measure the use of the bath, so conspicuous a feature of our national life'. (83) His book, Healthy Skin, reaching eight editions between 1845 and 1876, was dedicated to the great drain brain of the nineteenth century, Edwin Chadwick. In it, the author's recommendations for sea-bathing were based on both physical and psychological grounds. The sea apparently had

'a stimulating and penetrating power . . . it opens the pores and reinvigorates the whole nervous system . . . its great healing power in case of diseases is most agreeable in preserving health. Moreover the noble, grand and indescribable prospect of the sea . . . has an effect capable of bracing up the nervous system and producing a beneficial exhalation of the whole frame . . . the physical effects of sea-bathing must be greatly increased by this impression on the mind and that a hypochondriac or nervous person may be half cured by residing on the sea coast and enjoying a view of the grand scenes of nature which there present themselves, such as the rising and setting of the sun over the blue expanse of the water, and the awful majesty of the waves during a storm'. (84)

Wilson was particularly pleased with his bungalow, flying a red flag above it whenever he was in residence. (85) He wrote to the architect

I find everybody charmed with my Bungalow and I believe if there were many Bungalows, there would be many buyers. The house is a novelty, very convenient and fitted for a single family and easy as to price . . . They are novel, quaint, pretty and perfect as to sanitary qualities. The best sanitary home for a family is a Bungalow. (86)

Another was bought by a wealthy and eccentric woman from London who lived there with a menagerie of animals; another by a London merchant. (87) According to the architect, the others had been sold to 'gentlemen of position'. (88) All, however, were generally unoccupied for much of the year, being let furnished (through the agent and The Times) at between seven and fifteen guineas a week, depending on the month. In the season, Birchington could accommodate, at the most, forty or fifty families at a time 'many of them belonging to the world of fashion with a pretty large sprinkling of carriage people among them'. (89)

Bungalow developments : Phase Two

As new, purpose built 'sanitary' and recreational dwellings, the first five bungalows had obviously met with success. After trying the same building methods on a 'bungalow' of two storeys (looking more like a conventional house), the architect turned to pre-fabrication. By this time, about 1877, the initial site had been completed and the new model was constructed further inland. 2-16
2-17
2-18

Pre-fabricated timber building was already a sophisticated industry; in the early nineteenth century, timber cottages had been made and exported round the world and barracks, hospitals and stores had been sent for use in the Crimean War. (90) This, however, was apparently the first example of a 'pre-fab' bungalow, a phenomenon which was to assume immense social significance in the years to come. In this new style, though foundations and extensive basement were as before, the walls were of weather boarding outside and matchboarding within. Between them, wheaten straw was packed for insulation. For the roof, the same simple structure was used as before.

Built on a three quarter acre site, the bungalow was on an equally spacious scale with nine bedrooms, large drawing room (30' by 20'), dining room (27' by 16'), with overhead lighting, study, conservatory and verandah running along the front. Attached, were extensive offices including kitchen, scullery, pantry, laundry, two bedrooms and yards. In a basically L-shaped plan, the main corridor, sixty feet long, joined to a lesser one giving a total length of 100 feet. 'This afforded ample space for exercise under cover if the weather was un-favourable for walking outside'. Though simply constructed, a special feature was made of the fireplace, with 'red brickwork in the chimney breast picked out with gold leaf'. Here, the architect lived for some time, designing his system-built furniture 'to export to any country not a mere shell 2-19
2-20

of a house but a complete bungalow residence, furnished with appropriate chair furniture. (91) Using the same pre-fabricated methods, the Bungalow Hotel was built nearby. 2-21
2-22

By 1880, the bungalow idea had become fully established. Benefitting from the pioneering efforts of ten years before, between 1881-2, four more bungalows were erected along the cliff top. These, without the special materials of the originals, nonetheless followed the same general plan, with bedrooms on both sides of the corridor and dining and drawing rooms overlooking the sea. Larger than the originals, these incorporated an additional billiard room at the end and, to give extra room in the tower, the staircase was built at the side. (92) 2-23
2-24

Contemporary response

Comments provoked by the bungalows suggest that they satisfied not only prevailing health and social requirements but also, emerging aesthetic tastes. These were increasingly moving towards the simple, the 'countrified' and away from ostentatious display. From the mid 1880's they were to emerge, in the 'Arts and Crafts' movement, as a definite style.

They combined 'real comfort . . with pleasing rusticity'. They were not only 'cosy, isolated and rural-looking . . but novel and quaint'. The Indian associations were both recognised and acclaimed: the architect 'must be awarded the credit of the introduction of these modified Indian country-houses in England'. In one particularly, ' he has given a capital reproduction of a cool, spacious, Indian-like hill-dwelling'. (93)

Preference for the individual, the unique, for simplicity and the desire to be distinguished from what was increasingly perceived as a standardised 'resort architecture' can also be recognised. The development was commended for

rescuing this class of building from the commonplace character invariably given them by speculating builders who . . make the most of every foot of frontage and carry up their houses to the same regulation heights and to the same dreadful regulation patterns in town and country.

The architect's intention had been 'to create novelty by attention to extreme simplicity and adaptibility'. The bungalows were 'tasteful as well as useful . . without the addition of anything that could be considered in the way of ornament'. These qualities had resulted in 'the greatest comfort with the least amount of

household work' giving 'simplicity and freedom from care in use' to produce 'a perfect summer abode'. (94)

These aesthetic ideas, a reaction against the formalism and clutter of the times, characterised other developments at Westgate, particularly Beach House, a hotel decorated according to avant garde London taste. Nowhere, according to a contemporary, was there a hotel

'so comfortable . . . and so artistic . . . thoroughly and exquisitely homely. No hideous wall-papers hit the eye with their glaring hues, but the decorative patterns showing the hand of Walter Crane, Christopher Dresser or Lewis Day cover the rooms and corridors with their sober cheerfulness. Gillows' most artistic and comfortable furniture makes you feel that this is a place to stop in' .(95)

These aesthetic fashions added to Westgate's reputation, attracting patrons from theatre and the arts and giving Birchington and its bungalows a certain Bohemian image and appeal.

'All is pretty at Westgate and prettiness is a quality more to my liking than the Beautiful or the Sublime. When I marry . . . she will not be one of your classic tragedy queens . . . but a laughing little gipsy . . . and we will go to live in one of those brown, red-roofed bungalows beyond the smooth lawns and enamelled flower beds of this hotel'. (96)

With thinly-veiled irony, 'An Old Bohemian', described, in a London magazine, Birchington's 'rural simplicity' and 'enchanted primitive ways'. (97) The bungalows were sufficiently novel to be pictured on contemporary souvenirs.

The idea of simplicity, to become a major characteristic of bungalows in future, and have a powerful influence on architecture, was not just an aesthetic fad. When Birchington was developed, the 'servant problem' was already being felt as new work opportunities were opening up for women. (98) The single-storey plan with the absence of a real upstairs; the simple furnishing, serving hatch between kitchen and dining room with sideboard underneath (an early example of this device), overall planning and the emphasis on 'the least amount of household work' were portents which would explain the bungalow's future success. 2-25

Architects and innovators

The man who responded to these social, medical and aesthetic needs and translated them into the bungalow was a metropolitan architect, John Taylor, working with

or perhaps employed by - another more well-known member of the profession, John Seddon.

The development at Birchington arose from some astute land speculation. In the late 1860s, Seddon, like others profiting from railway expansion, had been involved with various professional activities in Kent. Pursuing his antiquarian interests (99) and combining business with pleasure, he had bought a piece of seafront land on which the bungalows were later to be built. Possibly because of his involvement in the building of an orphanage near Broadstairs, the initial responsibility for developing the Birchington land was handed over to his colleague. Though Seddon retained ownership of the estate, Taylor, who thought up the idea, was responsible for designing the first seven bungalows, though the four later 'Tower Bungalows' were designed and built by Seddon, between 1881-2. (100) Also in Seddon's office between 1874 and 9 was an impressionable young man in his late teens, Charles F.A. Voysey (101) on whom the bungalow idea was not to be lost. 2.26

Seddon's connections with London's artistic circles and his more 'arty' tastes resulted in a departure from his colleague's original adherence to simplicity. A grid of roads was laid out on the small estate. To the two earlier and modestly-named 'Cliff Road' and 'Beach Avenue' he added suitable literary and artistic names (Shakespeare, Spenser, Constable, Gainsborough, Wilkie, Leslie, Nasmyth), or those of natural scientists, (Darwin, Lyell, Berkeley and Herschel) appealing to future patrons from the metropolis. (102) A young sculptor, George Frampton, later to make his reputation with statues of Peter Pan and Nurse Edith Cavell in London and Queen Victoria in Calcutta, and to become a leading designer of the 'Arts and Crafts' movement, was brought from London in 1882 to decorate the outside of the coach house and domestic offices of the 'Tower Bungalows'. (103) In the chalk cliff under one of these, a large studio was carved out with a window overlooking the sea, sufficiently appealing to the Victorian painter, Solomon J. Solomon, who subsequently lived there. Other London artists were to visit - J. Stevens, Raffles Davison and Alfred Gilbert, the sculptor. In the last few months of his life, shortened by addiction to chloral, Dante Gabriel Rossetti, an old friend of Seddon was brought to this exclusive and 'artistic' haven of Birchington. At Seddon's suggestion he was installed in Taylor's large, prefabricated bungalow. According to his brother, it was 'a good-looking wooden erection, without being a beautiful one'. Its interior was conveniently laid out for an invalid with 'a long corridor and rooms on either side. At the further end was a drawing room, running the width of the house'. 2.27

It stood conveniently near to the railway station, yet not so close 'as to interfere with habits of retirement'. (104) When Rossetti arrived in February 1882, he wrote to his sister

There is a large garden belonging to the house, which is in all respects commodious. The journey by train is very easy; two hours to Westgate and a quarter of an hour by chaise to come here. (105)

Despite the sea air, and the suitably healthy bungalow, Rossetti lasted only a few weeks. He died on April 10th 1882, to be buried in the church yard and leaving only his name to the avenue where he had spent his last days. **2-28**

Like many innovations, Taylor's bungalows were not completely original by a synthesis of the old and new. The patented building materials and methods, and the prefabricated units were his, but the plan of the most successful of Taylor's three basic bungalow types was borrowed from a popular book of designs. (106) The name came from another cultural context increasingly familiar and attractive to a potential clientele in the previous years. Taylor's contribution was to combine these elements into a whole and, more importantly, do so at an appropriate time and place. **2-29**
2-30
2-31

Just what he meant by using the term 'bungalow' is not immediately clear. On one occasion he applied it to 'one and two storey buildings under one span of roof of the most primitive and simple construction'. On another, it was used for a house type built at a special place. (107) It was left to others to increasingly associate the term with what, in fact, Taylor had created: single-storey, purpose-built and 'simple' holiday houses by the sea. In the circumstances of the time, the innovation is easy to comprehend. Yet one enigma remains. From where did John Taylor get the idea of applying the Anglo-Indian term 'bungalow' to his innovation?

For someone who had probably not been to India, there are three plausible explanations. In the year before beginning at Birchington, Taylor could well have been at the Royal Institute of British Architects, of which he was a member, listening to what was probably the Institute's first lecture on tropical building. Here, T.R. Smith had discussed the design of bungalows in India (see above, p. 76) Alternatively, as an architect interested in 'portable buildings', he might have come across the 1868 catalogue of Derbyshire ironmonger, James Handyside, where, apparently for the first time, a design appeared of a huge cast-iron bungalow for export to Bombay. Or finally, as Taylor was astute enough to borrow the plan for one of his bungalows from a mid-century book of **2-32**

designs, perhaps John Plaw's Sketches for Cottages (1800) with its brief reference to the Indian bungalow, had also been on his shelf. It seems, after all, something more than a coincidence that the producer of Plaw's book was an architectural publisher also known as John Taylor. Was this the architect's father? (108)

Any of these - or some other source - might have sparked off the idea in Taylor's head. Yet it was symbolic of the meaning and purpose of these earliest bungalows in England that the first was to house an eminent physician and the last, the deathbed of a Bohemian painter and poet.

2.33
2.34

Conclusion

The 'invention' of the seaside bungalow provides a good example of the way in which the forces behind industrial capitalism, always on the look out for investment and profit, generate new environments and building types. 'Needs' are constantly invented, especially in the spheres of recreation and leisure. What began in the 'Age of Capital' with the invention or proliferation of the winter garden, pier, and bungalow, or the glittering theatres and restaurants of the metropolis (109), continues today in the casinos, leisure parks and holiday apartments of the leisure industry. The drive is towards consumption, and specialisation - as well as exploitation of class differences - helps to achieve this end. Contemporary with the bungalows were new modes of fashion: clothes for the country and others for the seaside. (110) The money invested in the spacious bungalows at Birchington also helps to explain other contemporary housing in London, the Peabody Buildings or the condition of the homeless described in Mearns' Bitter Cry of Outcast London published just as Seddon's bungalows were complete. (1884)

The artistic associations and patronage of Birchington were equally a product of the times. The era of the railway and foreign investment also provided the economic base for the flourishing of Victorian art. (111) It was a time when painters made fortunes selling to a growing bourgeois clientele. In the 'great Victorian boom', the number of architects more than doubled, from less than 3,000 to almost 7,000 in the thirty years after 1851. (112) When the bungalow where he died was being built, Rossetti, having started as a critic of bourgeois society, was happily living off its profits to the extent of some £3,700 a year, equivalent, at mid 1970s prices, to over £75,000. (113)

Seddon's activities as developer apparently faded in the mid 1880s, possibly because the Birchington Bay Freehold Land and Estate Company had

entered the field in 1882. With a capital of £150,000 in 30,000 five pound shares, the three directors (an ex-Indian Army Colonel from London, a City solicitor and an ex-Mayor of Cambridge) had by then begun developing the resort. Everywhere, according to their prospectus, the development of freehold land offered the best investment, the Liverpool Land Company's 20% being a case in point. At Westgate, land was selling between £2,500 and £4,500 an acre and at Birchington, the bungalow settlement had no doubt helped to 'greatly increase the value of land in recent years'. (114) But no more were built and the developments were of more traditional kind. After Birchington, little is heard of the seaside bungalow until the end of the decade when investment in building, slack during the 1880s, again started to rise. By then, however, the bungalow had also moved inland.

Architecturally, Taylor's bungalows were to be of immense significance. Within a decade, his idea had been taken up on opposite sides of the globe, in Australia and on the North American east coast. Though they had received little professional attention when they were built, thirty years later, when the bungalow came into its own, architectural interests seems to have caught up with Taylor's ideas. Only then, in 1905, were his designs and plans published in full. (115)

Today, so accustomed are people to the plain, horizontal forms of modern building that the significance of these bungalows, both architectural and social, has been ignored. Yet in their simple, essentially functional design - determined by their use, their materials and construction - the rejection of ornament and historic styles, the bungalows, like the Crystal Palace, were a foretaste of things to come. Their simplicity was very much a product of the material excesses of the times. In the early decades of the next century, these aspects were to be more fully explored.

Chapter Two Footnotes

1. See page 118 and note 52.
2. E.J.Hobsbawm, Industry and Empire, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1969, p.50-4, 54.
3. J.Gubler, 'Architecture and colonialism: a historical safari', Lotus International, 26, 1980, pp.5-19.
4. E.Williams, Capitalism and Slavery, University of N.Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1944, pp.87-94.
5. Quoted in A.G.Frank, Dependent Accumulation and Underdevelopment, Macmillan, London, 1978, p.88.
6. J.M.Holzman, The Nabobs in England, A study of the returned Anglo-Indian, 1760-85, New York, Columbia U.P., 1926, Appendix 3.
7. M.Archer, 'The Daniells in India and their influence on British architecture', RIBA Journal, 67, 11, 1960, pp.439-44; also P.Connor, Oriental Architecture in the West, Thames & Hudson, London, 1979, pp.120-4. M.Archer, 'India revealed' Sketches by the Daniells, Appollo, November, 1962, pp.689-92.
8. Hobsbawm, op.cit., p.112.
9. E.J.Hobsbawm, The Age of Capital, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1975.
10. Ibid, p.xiii.
11. Ibid., p.204.
12. For earlier terms, see G.Subba Rao, Indian Words in English. A study in Indo-British cultural life and linguistic relations. Clarendon Press, Oxford 1969; on early use of 'bungalow', see H.Yule and A.C.Burnell, Hobson-Jobson. A glossary of colloquial Anglo-Indian words and phrases, John Murray, London, 1903.
13. A.Murphy, The Upholsterer, A Farce in Two Acts, London, 1758; P.Spear, A History of India, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1965, pp.82-3.
14. Yule and Burnell, op.cit. See also chapter one.
15. S.Nilsson, European Architecture in India, 1750-1850, Faber and Faber, London, 1968, p.123.
16. W.Hodges, Travels in India during the years 1780..83, printed for the author, 1783, preface.
17. R.Williams, The Country & the City, Chatto and Windus, London, 1973, p.294.
18. Connor, 114. For veranda, see Appendix I.
19. e.g. W.Tennant, Indian Recreations, Edinburgh, 1803; F.Buchanan, Travels in Eastern India, etc., London, 1810; T.Williamson, The East India Vade Mecum,

- 2 vols. London, 1810; W.Ward, View of the History, Literature and Religion of the Hindus, London, 1817; W.G.Wallace, Fifteen years in India, London, 1819; R.Heber, Narrative of a journey through the upper provinces of India, 1827; J.Blakiston, Twelve years military adventures in Hindustan, London, 1829.
20. Draft First Edition. Ordnance Survey, 1825 (Cambridge Public Library); English Place Names Society, The Place Names of Cambridgeshire and Ely, Cambridge University Press, vol. xix, 1943, p.116.
 21. Yule and Burnell, loc.cit.
 22. T.H.Lewin, The Lewin Letters, 1756-1884, London, 1909, i, p.214.
 23. M.Archer, Sir Charles D'Oyley and his drawings of India, Appollo, November 1962, pp.173-81.
 24. Subba Rao, op.cit., p.86.
 25. Information from Chief Librarian, Croydon (from Rate Books, South Norwood) and J.C.Anderson, The Great North Wood, privately printed, 1898.
 26. F.Hutchins, The Illusion of Permanence, British Imperialism in India, Princeton University Press, 1967.
 27. For a more detailed discussion of this theme see the author's essay on 'The social, production of the vacation house' in A.D.King, ed., Buildings and Society. Essays on the social development of the built environment, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1980, 193-227, especially 196-201, included here at Appendix 2.
 28. L.Turner & G.Ash, The Golden Hordes, Constable, 1975.
 29. Hobsbawm, 1975, 29.
 30. J.A.R.Pimlott, The Englishman's Holiday, Faber & Faber, London, 1976; J.A.Patmore, 'The spa towns of Britain' in R.P.Beckinsale, ed., Urbanisation and its problems, Blackwell, Oxford, 1970, pp.47-69.
 31. Hobsbawm, 1975, pp.203-4, 206.
 32. J.Walton, forthcoming study on the development of the British seaside resort. Personal communication, December, 1981.
 33. Though this conclusion is based on personal knowledge and hearsay, it is borne out by random sampling in census records.
 34. J.Whyman, Kentish Resorts Before 1900, University of Kent, Mimeo, 1970, to which I am indebted for much of the historical data in this section.
 35. Ibid., drawing on A.B.Granville, The Spas of England and Principal Sea-bathing Places, 3 vols, 1841.
 36. Ibid. See also J.A.R.Pimlott, The Englishman's Holiday, Harvester Press, Hassocks, Sussex, 1976, pp.96-8. According to Macauley 'towns in which wealth, created and accumulated elsewhere, is expended for the purposes of health and recreation'. Ibid., p.97.

37. Whyman, p.3. Between 1763 and 1880, some 117 guides (over one a year) were published relating to Thanet and Margate.
38. R.A.Church, The Great Victorian boom 1850-73, Macmillan, 1975,p.75.
39. E.W.Cooney, 'Capital exports and investment in Britain and the USA, 1856-1914', Economica, NS, 16, 1949,pp.347-56
40. I am very grateful to Dr.R.S.Holmes of St. Lawrence College, Ramsgate for the information in this paragraph. B.Thomas, Migration and Economic Growth, Cambridge University Press, 1973, p.175.
41. H.Hambidge, Westgate-on-Sea, 1909-69. Typescript, 1975. Loaned by author, 39, Linksfield Road, Westgate-on-Sea.
42. Pimlott,p.122; J.Walvin,Beside the Sea, Allen Lane, 1977, pp.37,125.
43. Whyman,p.30.
44. Building News, Sept 2, 1870,p.164. The architect was J.P.Seddon.
45. A.Mayhew, Birchington and its Bungalows, Canterbury, 1881,p.6.
46. The Granville Illustrated News, October 25,1879, p.14; A.Mayhew, The Chronicles of Westgate-on-Sea, Canterbury 1882; The Builder, 1882,p.190.
47. Granville Illustrated News (GIN), ibid-
48. Ibid., p.15.
49. W.T.Perkins, Popular Coast Guide, McCorquodale, London, 1903,p.259. A.Montefiore, The Isle of Thanet, Sutton and Co, London, 1893, p.29.
50. Whyman, p.21.
51. Building News, 1879,p.343.
52. Evidence that these were the first bungalows to be built (and named as such) in England comes from three independent sources: 'to Mr. John Taylor' (the architect) ' must be awarded the credit of the introduction of these modified Indian country houses into England', Mayhew,op.cit., p.18; 'by a bungalow, Mr. Briggs does not mean a house for a special locality like those near Margate to which the title was first applied in England', The Architect, 1891,p.215; 'The first English bungalow was built at Westgate on Sea by Mr. John Taylor, the architect, and this, duplicated, forms the nucleus of the present town', Building News, July 7, 1905,p.3; also 'Taylor was the first architect who built and popularised bungalows in England and these were distinguished from ordinary houses by being generally of one storey only and covered with a roof of one span from back to front', ibid., June 29,1906,p.904. At Westgate, the first was built between August and October, 1869 and a second in 1870 on a plot facing the Esplanade, east of Sussex Square. Both are now demolished although one of the other four houses constructed by Taylor ('Sea Tower') remains. In the same year, two bungalows, on a square plan, were built at Westcliff, Birchington; one of these (east of Coleman's Stairs), was still existing and occupied in 1981. About 1872-3, three more were built close by (by

what was subsequently Spencer Road) on the final, rectangular plan (one of these, 'Fair Outlook', was still occupied in 1981). A 'two-storey' bungalow (now 'Skyross') followed in 1873. The pre-fabricated bungalow, built about 1877 in Beach (later Rossetti) Avenue, was auctioned in 1952 and subsequently demolished. These seven original bungalows were from the designs of architect, John Taylor. In 1881-2, four 'Tower Bungalows' were designed and built by J.P.Seddon and a further one, by the builder, W.E.Martin. The four Tower Bungalows remained in 1981. See Building News, September 2, 1870, pp.164,200; September 16, pp.200,214,217; Aug 15, 1873, p.166; Feb 6, 1874, ; Feb 13, p.172; in 1895 and 1905-6, a series of 27 articles 'About Bungalows' was published in Building News giving full and comprehensive details about the building aspects of the development, especially articles XII to XXVII. See April 19, 1895, pp.540-2; July 7, 1905, pp.3-5; Aug 4, 1905, pp.144-5; Sept 1, pp.282-4; Sept 15, pp.353-4; Oct 6, pp.464-5; Oct 20, ; Jan 5, 1906, p.3; Jan 12, p.60. The articles were written by someone intimately connected with the construction, possibly the builder, W.E.Martin or even Seddon.

Other information from Ordnance Survey Maps for the area for 1877 (survey, 1872), 1898; Isle of Thanet Directory and Guide, 1883-4, Hutchings and Crowsley, London; Mayhew, op.cit.

I am also grateful to various residents of the bungalows and others for their assistance, particularly Mr. A.G.Stevenson, Wg.Cdr. R.E.Presland, Messrs Benefield and Cornford, Estate Agents, the late F.J.Cornford, J.P., Mr J.Shaffer, the County Archivist of Kent C.C., Maidstone and Mr.H.Hambidge.

53. Pimlott, p.52.
54. Walvin, p.23; S.Howell, The Seaside, Studio Vista, London, 1974, p.185
55. Howell, p.45.
56. Pimlott, p.108; Howell, p.44.
57. Howell, p.26.
58. Walvin, p.19.
59. Whyman, p.3.
60. J.B.Papworth, Rural Residences, etc, J.Taylor, London 1818, preface. See also Appendix.
61. Pimlott, p.106; Walvin, pp.66-7.
62. S.Thompson, Health Resorts and How to Profit from them, Warner, London, 1860, p.31.
63. Walvin, pp.66-7.
64. Dictionary of Daily Wants, Houlston and Sons, London, 1859-60, p.14.
65. Ibid., p.15.
66. Quoted in J.V.N.Sloane, The development of the urban and social structure of Bournemouth, 1840-1940. Ph.D thesis. University of Surrey, 1978, p.80.
67. Ibid., p.380.
68. GIN, p.14.

69. Howell, p.100.
70. Mayhew, p.7.
71. Building News, Sept 2, 1870, p.200.
72. Mayhew, p.18.
73. Walvin, p.86.
74. Howell, p.20; Walvin, p.86; Thompson, op.cit., p.34.
75. Mayhew, advertisement at end; GIN, p.12.
76. Walvin, p.72.
77. Mayhew, p.18.
78. Building News, 1905, p.21.
79. Mayhew, p.23.
80. Ibid., p.19.
81. Building News, 1879, p.343.
82. G.Best, Mid-Victorian Britain, 1851-75, Panther, London, 1973, p.110
See also Hobsbawm, 1969 on wages & J.Burnett, A Social History of Housing,
David & Charles, London, 1978, p.196.
83. Dictionary of National Biography.
84. Healthy Skin, J.Churchill, London, 1876.
85. GIN, p.14.
86. Mayhew, p.16.
87. Building News, 1879, p.343; 'An Old Bohemian', A health resort on the
Kentish coast in and out of season, Tinsley's Magazine, vol 28, Tinsley
Brothers, London, March 1881, pp.258-68.
88. The Times, 7 August, 1875, 13a;
89. An Old Bohemian, ibid.
90. G.Herbert, Pioneers of Prefabrication, Johns Hopkins University Press,
London, 1978.
91. Building News, 1905, p.284.
92. Building News, 1879, p.343.
93. Mayhew, p.21.
94. Building News, 1870, p.200.

95. GIN, p. 15.
96. Ibid., p.14.
97. An Old Bohemian, p.268.
98. Burnett, p.192.
99. Evidence suggests that the early notices in the Building News were contributed by Seddon. See also J.P.Seddon, Ancient Domestic Architecture in the Isle of Thanet. John B.Day, London, 1872.
100. Mayhew, p.17; see also map of developments at Birchington in the collection of drawings of J.P.Seddon, Victorian and Albert Museum, and M.Darby, 'The first bungalows', Country Life, August 3, 1978, pp.306-9.
101. D.Gebhard, Charles F.A.Voysey Architect, Hennessey & Ingalls, Los Angeles, 1975, p.9.
102. See Ordnance Survey maps covering the period.
103. The Studio, vol. 6, 1896.
104. W.M.Rossetti, Dante Gabriel Rossetti. His family Letters, Ellis and Elvey, London, 1895. 2 vols, i, p.390.
105. W.M.Rossetti, Some Reminiscences, Brown Langham, London, 1906, p.1945. See also H.R.Angeli, Dante Gabriel Rossetti. His friends and Enemies, Hamish Hamilton, London, 1949.
106. See Building News, 1895, p.541; also John Weale, Designs and examples of Cottages, Villas and Country Houses, J.Weale, London, 1857.
107. The Architect, 1891, p.215.
108. H.M.Colvin,
The John Taylor, jun., son of John Taylor, Architect, died c 1867, listed here seems unlikely to have been the Birchington architect; Taylor wrote a paper on 'Contruaction of labourers' cottages and sanitary appliances', given at the Society of Arts, 1862 (Building News, December 19, 1862, p.475; also 'Sundry Sanitary appliances' Transactions of the RIBA, 1862-3, 1st Series, vol 13, pp. 77-98 where the Birchington building techniques are discussed. He also took out patents relating to Improvements in the Contruaction of Portable Buildings (no. 1438) 21 April, 1873 and (no 1792) 6 May, 1879. He died between 1879 and 1895; Building News, 22 March, 1895, p. 399 refers to 'the late Mr. John Taylor'.
109. A.D.King, Introduction to ibid., Buildings and society. Essays on the social development of the built environment, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1980, p.24.
110. Howells, p.
- 111, Hobsbawm, 1969, 119; 1975, chapter 15.

112. B.Kaye, The Development of the Architectural Profession in Britain, Allen & Unwin, London, 1960, p. 173.
113. J.Nicoll, Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Studio Vista, London, 1975, p. 144.
114. Birchington Bay Freehold Land & Estate Company. 1882. Prospectus, Cambridge University Library.
115. See note 52 above.

CHAPTER THREE

THE BUNGALOW IN ENGLAND 1880 - 1914

Introduction

The changing function of rural land

The bungalow in the country

The bungalow and the Bohemian

The bungalow in the suburbs

The bungalow Prefab on the beach

The bungalow as symbol for the simplification of life

Back to the land

The bungalow re-exported

Conclusion

CHAPTER THREE

THE BUNGALOW IN ENGLAND 1880 - 1914

'(This) design for a bungalow . . . in its own grounds - that is to say, with a garden of at least 20 feet on each side - would be very pleasing. On this account, it will be a useful example for those who intend building in the country or suburbs'.

Illustrated Carpenter and Builder, 27, 706, February 13, 1891.

Introduction

In the thirty years before 1914, the seaside resorts rapidly grew in size, becoming the principal places of leisure for the growing middle class in the towns. With some exceptions, however, the bungalow was relatively slow to 'take off', making its impact at the seaside mainly from the later 1890s.

More important as a pointer to future change was the appearance of the bungalow in the country. It heralded a major, if not radical, shift in the use of rural land. As the urban proportion of the population grew from about a half to almost four fifths in the sixty years after 1851, the countryside was to gradually assume a new role. It was one only slowly adopted in the years before the first World War and then, only by an urban middle and upper middle class. But from the twenties, and especially after the Second World War, this new function came to equal, if not surpass, the traditional agricultural use of rural land. It was the role of the country as a place for mass leisure, a recreational resource for people living and working in towns.

This provides the first theme: the changing use of land as it became subject to the emerging world economy. Tracing the introduction of the country and suburban bungalow provides some insights into these developments.

The second theme concerns the symbolic meaning of architecture. Between 1880 and 1914, the bungalow came to be invested with symbolic meanings: as it was, by definition, physically separate and away from the town, it symbolised not just the 'flight from the city' but also, at a time when many social conventions were in flux, an ideal of Bohemianism and the 'simplification of life'. Its unassuming, single storey form also had political overtones although not till the bungalow arrived in North America were all these ideological meanings fully explored.

Two other themes are touched on: the development of prefabrication in housing and its results, and the beginning of the mass market second home.

The changing use of rural land

Until the second half of the nineteenth century, agriculture had been the predominant, if not the sole, economic activity of rural England. The great estates were the basis of rural society with the landed aristocracy living in country mansions yet with extensive interests, and property, located in the towns. When - as in the eighteenth century - fortunes were made by city merchants, economic and social substance was often given to the fact by the purchase of a country house and estate. Landed interests dominated British political and social life. In the early and mid Victorian age, as Mark Girouard has shown, industrial profits were converted into rural property: of some five hundred country houses built between 1835 and 1890, most were financed from industrially-generated wealth. (1)

In the country, the main business was agriculture. Outside the market towns and villages which linked agriculture to the nation's economy at large, the variety of buildings expressed this function: farms, rented from the larger estates, housed the families working on the land, their various outbuildings containing livestock, implements, machinery and the produce from the land. In the village or on the estate, cottages housed workers who lived mainly by selling their labour and a small proportion of free-holders had buildings of their own. For the mass of the rural population, the villages and fields provided space for recreation, for country games, fairs, festivals and clandestine poaching, in an annual calendar where 'spare time' was governed by the demands of work, the weather, 'Nature's day' and the rhythm of the seasons. The village green and inn were the primary, in many cases, only specialised places for leisure. For the landed gentry, the land itself provided opportunity for traditional field sports of hunting and shooting. In the larger country houses, ample recreational space was provided in the gardens, conservatories, billiard room, libraries or study.

By the 1880s, however, fundamental economic and social changes were beginning to affect the countryside, preparing the way for its function of 'urban playground' which it fulfils for many today. A hint of this

had already occurred in the early nineteenth century with the fashion, among city merchants and others, for the 'rural retreat'. Yet many of the 'ornamental cottages' designed between 1790 and 1840 as part of the cult of the picturesque, were as much to look at as to live in. (2) They were relatively few in number and even where used as 'a retreat from the hurry of town life', (3) the restrictions of horse-drawn transport limited them to being 'a few miles out of town'. (4) Many, in fact, were outer suburban villas. (5)

In the second half of the nineteenth century, 'changes in the countryside were certainly the most widespread of all changes in the geography of England'. (6) They were a result of the economic and technological and consequent demographic factors referred to earlier. With a huge expansion of railways around the world, steamships, telegraphic communication and such innovations as refrigeration in ships, agriculture everywhere gradually became subject to the emerging industrial world economy. (7)

Certain areas such as the North American prairies became massive exporters of grain. The demands of the industrial economy multiplied the market for agricultural products, both domestically, through the growth of cities, and internationally. And as more and more land was brought into cultivation and agriculture fully commercialised, peasant economies began to disappear and everywhere there was a major 'flight from the land'.

This process became especially pronounced in the third quarter of the nineteenth century as railways opened up hitherto inaccessible regions to export production. This period also saw the beginning of attempts to develop certain overseas areas, either formal colonies such as Australia and Bengal or informal ones like Brazil, as specialist producers of exports for the 'developed' world - wool, indigo, jute, coffee and tea. It saw the expansion of plantations and, as we shall see below, the bungalow was also important here. (8)

The international trade in agricultural produce was now in being, generally leading to extreme specialisation or even monoculture in the exporting regions as well as having drastic effects on farming in Britain. It was the real beginning of an international division of labour which, with technological changes in farming, over the coming decades was to greatly reduce the numbers working in agriculture and simultaneously increase the numbers living and working in towns.

In the fifty years after 1860, agricultural workers in Britain were to fall from some 19% to 9% of the workforce, (9) hastened by the agricultural depression of the eighties. The specialisation which had begun in the society and city was now extended to a global scale: some countries became producers of agricultural and primary products, remaining largely rural, while others became industrial and urban. Britain was historically the first example of the industrial, urban society and, as part of the development, much of what was once rural, agricultural land was turned over to urban, residential use, from production to consumption. In Marxist terminology, it changed from use value to exchange value.

Between the 1870s and 1900, the newcomers to the country were a wealthy and largely metropolitan bourgeoisie, whose ranks had been swelled by the growth of industry and commerce, the department stores and the beginnings of the mass market. (10) Expanding railways and, after 1900, the motor car, brought country areas increasingly within reach of the towns. In the third quarter of the nineteenth century, route mileage for railways in England increased by 130% (from just over 5000 to almost 12,000 miles). Helped by improved horse-carriages and hard-surfaced roads, this meant deeper and more frequent penetration into rural areas. By 1912, over 16,000 miles of rail existed. (11) The motor car, introduced effectively in England after 1895, grew rapidly in popularity - for those able to afford them and between 1900 and 1912, the numbers on British roads increased from some 800 to 80,000. (12)

For centuries, the countryside had been the preserve of the aristocracy, for income, residence and mainly, for recreation. As the scale of urban leisure had grown, however, the developing seaside resorts had, for the upper and middle class, provided a variety of places to stay, each with its own social image and prestige. In 1881, it was still apparently true that

the typical aristocrat is apt to despise seaside delights. He prefers to spend the autumn either at his own 'place in the country', or at the place of some friend, or somewhere abroad.

The growing seaside resorts, on the other hand, had to be designed for

the middle classes and though inferior people have also to be considered in these places, it is not to any appreciable extent. (13)

This situation was to change markedly in the next thirty years. Taking the aristocracy as their model, the urban upper and middle class were to start searching for a 'country pad'. With the example, money and transport to do it, and an expanding architectural profession to produce the designs, they were persuaded by an increasingly fashionable ideology. This was not simply a complaint about 'bad air' and the physical conditions of towns; it was a protest about the 'strains and stresses' of industrial life and the constraints of a formalised social routine. (14) 'To have a country cottage, or better still, a bungalow', was to permit temporary escape from the city. For the growing middle class, it was the beginning of an idea now better known as a 'second home'. It catered for temporary use, initially, for some weeks in the summer but, from the later 1880s, for the emerging temporal unit of the 'week-end'. (15) Situated in Berkshire, Surrey, Sussex or Kent, the houses were within thirty or forty commuting miles of London. Sited in bucolic surroundings, the countryside was an aesthetic rather than economic resource. Designed to accommodate not just a family but also servants and guests, they were purpose-built environments for the passing of leisure time. It was in this role that the bungalow was introduced into the country and it is in the interdependent relationship of the bungalow to its surroundings that the function of country as recreational resource is most clearly understood and seen.

The bungalow in the country

An early example was the group of bungalows constructed in the depths of the Surrey countryside, near East Grinstead, in 1887. Some thirty miles from London, the estate (its name, 'Bellagio', conjuring up romantic associations of the lake-side haven on Italy's Lake Como), was reached not without significance - either from London or Brighton by the railway which ran between them. The nearest station was Dormans (opened in 1884) and the estate was reached via a ten minute carriage ride through the thickly wooded area of what today is Dormans Park. By 1891, there were some forty 'bungalow residences', large and small, 'dotted about the copse-clad slopes'. (16)

The surrounding country shows fertile meadows on every side . . . belted here and there with dark patches of woodland. If you want peace and quiet, Bellagio is decidedly the place to get it, for here in your bungalow, hidden away amongst wooden slopes, you can be lost to the outer world as completely as you wish.

When completed, there would be 'no more delightful rural retreat for tired Londoners than Bellagio'. (17)

The bungalows had been designed and built by architect R.A. Briggs. In Bungalows and Country Houses (1891), the first book of architectural designs on the bungalow to be published in England, and an important landmark for the ideology which developed around it, Briggs spelt out the contrasting images of town and country, demonstrating in the process the needs which his bungalows were designed to fulfil. The bungalow appealed 3.1

'to people of moderate means in a City like ours where grime and smoke, bustle and hurry make us long for the country and its freshness, where at a small expense we may pass a quiet week-end 'far from the madding crowd' to strengthen us for the next week's toil. A House in the country with its attendant expense would be beyond our means but a Bungalow can be built and maintained at a comparatively trifling cost.

In this context, it was irrelevant that many of Briggs' 'bungalows' were not always distinguishable from other small country houses of the period, being neither of one storey nor having a verandah. The word represented an idea as much as a form. For Briggs, the word could be loosely used. There was first the image:

'What is a bungalow? . . . our imagination transports us to India . . . to low, squat, rambling one-storied houses with wide verandahs, latticed windows, flat roofs and with every conceivable arrangement to keep out the scorching rays of the sun . . . Or else we think of some rude settlement in our colonies, where the houses or huts built of logs of wood, hewn from the tree and with shingle roofs gives us an impression, as it were, of 'roughing it'.

This was not the kind of bungalow suitable for England, nor what Briggs meant when he used the term.

A Cottage is a little house in the country but a bungalow is a little country house, a homely cosy place arranged so as to ensure complete comfort, with a feeling of rusticity and ease. Cheapness and economy are important facts, but they should not be obtained at the cost of substantiality and utility. (18)

The leisure function was embodied in both the building and the estate. The houses, with billiard rooms, lounge, six to eight bedrooms and spacious gardens, made ample provision for guests. Despite the search for seclusion, there was, well hidden in the bosky estate, other provision for recreation. There was 'no reason to be dull, for fishing is to be had (in two trout lakes), tennis, cricket and football at the recreation ground and social intercourse at the club-house.' (19) This provided 'a capital kitchen, from which the steward provides breakfast, lunches, dinners according to order by telephone from the respective bungalows'. (20) At the entrance of the estate, where later bungalows and houses were built by other forward-looking London architects, C.F.A. Voysey and Wimperis and Arber, (21) was a lodge where 'custodians' kept out intruders.

In the ten years following the establishment of Bellagio (1887-97) the Building News ran competitions for the design of a 'seaside', 'countryside' and 'hillside bungalow' and later, for a 'bungalow club'. For the 'country-side bungalow' (1893), the function was made explicit.

'Bungalows, or free and easy dwellings in the country, erected on sites out of the way of the ordinary run of holiday-seekers, or on some river-bank or unfrequented shore, are nowadays becoming more the fashion with people whose business compels them to spend the greater part of their time in London or our larger towns. To have a country cottage, or better still, a bungalow, with space and surroundings within doors somewhat in character with the comforts of home, and none of the horrors peculiar to lodgings, affords an attraction which warrants the necessarily frequent railway journeys to and from the shop or office during the summer months, while the family are enjoying the freedom of a country-side stay in some rural retreat'. (22)

The idea of the bungalow as 'a little country house' was particularly associated with 'Bungalow Briggs' as he became known to architectural friends. His book had 'remarkable success', reaching four editions by 1899. 'These little dwellings have become very popular in England as they appeal not only to the economical side of our nature but also to our artistic feelings' wrote Briggs in 1895. 'What we mean by a bungalow is an artistic little dwelling, cheaply but soundly built . . . popped down in some pretty little spot with just sufficient accommodation for our particular needs'. It should be 'a homely, cosy little place, with verandahs, oriels and bay windows, with the plan so arranged to ensure complete comfort with a feeling of rusticity and ease'.

Where local authorities allowed, walls would be of wood, covered with tiles, weather board or roughcast. Inside features were to be 'of the simplest description' with white painted woodwork throughout. Functionally, the bungalow was a 'second home': it enabled 'paterfamilias to enjoy his brief holidays in comfort and at a moderate expense, the year's interest on the capital cost being less than a month's house hire at a seaside resort'. (24)

The exploitation of the countryside for leisure is well demonstrated in Briggs' designs as well as numerous competitions in Building News. The raison d'etre of the bungalow was in those aspects of its location, siting and design which allowed the fullest use of the senses - visual, aural, olfactory - as well as the emotions. They also provided for the particular social functions which the bungalow was designed to fulfil. In 'the bachelor's summer residence', a surrounding verandah provided 'magnificent views'. Cut and clipped yews 'with a rustic summer house under a spreading tree for a book' framed the bungalow in a 'quaint and picturesque setting'. (25) For the Building News 'countryside bungalow', the viewing facilities on the verandah, extending round three sides, were supplemented by a belvedere tower. Inside, maximum time-passing activities were accommodated. Family members and guests (in six bedrooms) might relax, 'for shrimps and tea', in the large (20' by 18') hall/sitting room. A writing room and library could be used for quiet rest. The smoking room should not be too isolated 'for comfort of the kind so needful in a bungalow after a pull on the water or a game of tennis'. (26) The 'hillside bungalow' intended 'for a gentleman' was to be on a site 'a few miles from London' and was to act as 'a summer residence'. (27) There were to be two best bedrooms and two extra ones for female servants, generous living and drawing rooms, a large billiard room and provision in the basement for golf irons and bicycles. In the riverside bungalow (with seven bedrooms) of 1898, a boathouse was incorporated under the billiard room. As 'the rough and ready freedom of Bungalow life' suggested 'an avoidance of delicate detail', special furniture was required. This should be 'distinctly plain and simple, straightforward in construction and more like joiner's work than cabinet-maker's'. (28)

Even in these early days, 'getting away from it all' could also mean taking it all with you. A few years later, the 'bungalow by the sea' was aimed more at the motor user who 'in the rush of modern fashion,

seeks a haven for a few hours at least, from the turmoils of town life'. Though the bungalow suggested an experience of 'roughing it'

'we all know that such a client expects to be surrounded with the amenities of home and . . . the common items of luxury, even down to the minute details to which the well-to-do are accustomed . . . The client himself may pose as a Spartan and his women-folk may talk exquisite nonsense about roughing it but experience proves how ephemeral all this 'poca a poca' really becomes'.

Or, in relation to 'a riverside bungalow', 'the very people who can afford a bungalow on the river are least likely to forego their customary enjoyment of comfortable provisions'.

Nonetheless, what was wanted in a bungalow design was 'the gaiety of a sort of Bohemian freedom, away from the over-bearing etiquette of town residence'. And though privacy was generally desirable 'during tub-time in the house', mixed bathing 'may not be de trop out of doors'. (29)

3.6

The bungalow and the Bohemian

Whatever its form, the significant characteristic of the bungalow was its 'apartness' and consequent social isolation. In Briggs' phrase, it was 'a little house in the country' or at any rate, physically away from everyone else. In what a later generation was to label 'the Naughty Nineties', the bungalow's 'free and easy', Bohemian image is easy enough to grasp. In Gal's Gossip (1899), Arthur Binstead, 'the most authoritative guide to the Bohemia of the 1880s and 90s' produced 'the truest tidings of London's demi-monde ever written'. (30) In this, the heroine (a chorus girl or actress from a West End theatre), recounts her exploits, month by month, each from a different address: The Flat, St John's Wood; Hotel Metropole, Brighton; The Gables, Bottomparley; The Lady Author's Club; Off Cowes, Isle of Wight; the Grand Hotel, Paris. In May, she meets a friend, Mabel Morrison, who 'couldn't really stand Westgate . . . too many invalids there and . . . everyone keeps asking you what you are "down here for"; in July, our heroine moves from the flat in St John's Wood to 'The Sprouts, Bellagio' and 'up to the present, I have not found country life nearly so dull as I thought it would be'.

'I must tell you that Charlie* and I have taken the delightful semi-detached bungalow between Horley and Crawley that I told you about in my last; indeed, we have been living in it for the past fortnight. I think it exquisitely rural. We are over a mile from a house of any sort, and nearly two from a tavern. Charlie has hit upon such a pretty name for it, "Dryzell". Is it not charmingly sylvan? As far as I can judge, our next door neighbours are particularly quiet people, but it may be that they are only keeping so (as the walls are very, very thin) in order to overhear what we say'. (31)

*Not, of course her husband. Charlie had an eyeglass and was a friend of 'Jocelyn-Johnson who parted his hair and name in the middle'.

The events of Gal's Gossip, with its references to Gaiety chorus girls, ornate garters, bedroom windows with no blinds, girls in the nude and the Gatwick steeplechases, might not all have occurred at Bellagio but a distinct reputation was established which lingers on to the present.

The 'Bungalow Utopia' 'quickly acquired a Bohemian reputation'. (32)

A subsequent inhabitant recalled the 'gay skating parties on the lake with fairy lights hanging in the trees'. (33) In the mid 1970s, there were still 'persistent local traditions about the goings on at Bellagio, from the (former) Prince of Wales downwards'; (34) 'the place acquired a very "fast" reputation and local residents shunned it'. (35)

This meaning which the bungalow acquires as arty, Bohemian, a symbol of the unconventional, is seen at its best in George Gissing's novel, The Whirlpool (1897). Gissing had a keen sense for what was going on around him and the novel, a brilliant commentary on the social world of the nineties, with its references to amateur photography, cycling and 'the simple life', captures many of the overtones surrounding the bungalow at this time.

The 'whirlpool' is London, with its stifling social life of gossip, keeping up appearances, problems with houses and servants, and entertaining. Much of the story revolves round a series of tensions: the dissatisfactions of a small-scale rentier class of owning property, with its attendant responsibilities, and yet a wanting 'to be free'; between the social climbing of London and an idealised 'simple life' in 'the country' or leaving it all for a 'rugged' one in the colonies; between the wishes of a woman drawn at one time to the life of the Bohemian artist and at another, to that of a lady with social conventions to respect.

The villain of the story, Cyrus Redgrave, is a mysterious, somewhat

shady bachelor, a 'man of the world' and, a 'polished capitalist'. He has 'a little place' at Riva, on Lake Garda in Italy (an interesting parallel with Briggs 'Bellagio'), another in the Pyrannees and a taste for other men's wives. In London, conventionally dressed, but abroad in Bregenz, he wears 'flannels, a white necktie loosely knotted and a straw hat'. At forty, 'the passions were sportive, half fantastical as though . . . they had grown to ripe worldliness'. He was, in his own words, 'a natural Bohemian, liking nothing so well as to disregard ceremony'.

When not abroad, Redgrave lived at his sister's house at Wimbledon. The large garden was in fact 'a sort of little park' and here, among the trees, he had 'built himself what he calls a bungalow' carefully hidden by shrubbery. 'One is free there', Redgrave says, 'a member of the family whenever one likes; domesticated; all that's respectable; and only a few steps away, the bachelor snugery, with all that's' As his housekeeper noted, 'the rooms had French windows - a convenient arrangement. The front door may be locked and bolted but people come and go for all that'.

The central incident of the story takes place in the bungalow. One evening, the young wife, nervous at the thought of compromising her social position, visits. 'The thought of stealing into his bachelor house . . . startled and offended her self-respect'. Stepping from her carriage, she finds 'a house of unusual construction, with pillars and a verandah'. Her senses are dazzled and confused. She enters, crosses a floor of smooth tiles, under electric light 'ruby-coloured by glass shades' and enters a room illumined, 'until the servant turned on a soft radiance like that in the hall', only by a fire. 'She sensed the atmosphere of luxurious refinement, its colour, perfume and warmth at once allured and alarmed her . . . She wished to indulge her senses . . . but she also wished to turn and escape'.

Redgrave is away, but the visit and what the woman's husband later believes to have taken place, cause him to race over to the Wimbledon bungalow, with dire consequences for both Redgrave and himself. (36)

The moral symbolism with which Gissing invests the bungalow, using it as part of a larger moral topography of metropolitan districts and dwellings (Alma wanted 'an interesting house to live in. Nobody's ancestors ever lived in a semi-detached villa. What I should like is one of those picturesque places in Surrey, quite in the country yet within easy reach of the town') - was to be echoed some years later by Gissing's

friend and mentor, H.G.Wells. Like Briggs' designs for a bachelor's bungalow, Gissing also provides insights into a society dominated by masculinity as well as wealth.

The bungalow in the suburbs

As an artistic, small country house for summer or temporary use, or even for permanent occupation, the bungalow became steadily more popular for a wealthy upper middle class from the early 1890s. (37) At a time ^{3.6} when average incomes were less than £80 a year, there were perhaps 2% or 3% of the population for whom a country house or second home at one or two thousand pounds was within reach. (38) Briggs' houses were in this bracket although he also included two designs at £250 and £400.

That many of these bungalows were of two storeys rather than one confirms the notion that, for this class, the bungalow was defined as much in terms of its use and image as any more prosaic criteria. There was, however, increasing professional opinion that the term should keep its traditional meaning. According to The Builder (1891)

'No doubt any one is free to call his house a bungalow if it pleases him but the word . . . was, we believe, originally applied by Europeans living in India to the typical wide-spaced, and low-verandahed house all on one floor . . . and we think it might as well be kept to its original meaning. A house may, however, conform to the bungalow type architecturally without being literally of one storey.' (39)

Indeed, even in 1878, the Building News had felt it necessary to inform its less cosmopolitan readers that the term was used in India 'for a country house of one floor only'. That some were being built in England despite the idea being still relatively unknown is suggested by the following.

In this country, the term is similarly applied to single dwellings on one floor. (And then apparently drawing on the Indian prototype with its distinctive type of roof). The general characteristics of them being a square plan with the entrance at the side or in the centre, a high-pitched pyramidal roof, with sometimes the chimney made the central feature. (40)

Ten years later, this 'structural meaning' had obviously been fully accepted among the English public at large. According to Murray's New

English Dictionary (1888) it was 'a one-storied house (or temporary building, e.g. a summer house) lightly built, and usually with a thatched roof'.

Among architects, the notion was more flexible. According to one of the more eminent, Professor Robert Kerr, the bungalow's single storey should be 'of especial spaciousness and simplicity' and have a verandah. The plan should be 'very liberally treated, with superabundance of light and air and the rules of aspect fully observed'. Though these requirements largely confined the bungalow to 'the open country and sea', (41) it was about to move into the suburbs. In provincial cities, the wealth generated by the growth of the mass market enabled increasing numbers of people in commerce or the professions to move to more spacious surroundings, a move made possible by tramways, now reaching out of built-up areas and for some, the ownership of a car. However, developments were already taking place in the pre-fabricated bungalow which foreshadowed the disrepute which was to overtake it some thirty years on. In the most extensive discussion of the English bungalow printed in the nineteenth century, the Building News attempted to clarify just what the concept meant.

'Some people have the idea that the bungalow is of necessity a very temporary kind of structure - something like a dismantled railway carriage deprived of its wheels and fitted up as a residence . . . such an idea is at variance with the fact for all the bungalows herein described are extensive permanent houses built with bricks and mortar, covered with slate and tiles, except in a few cases where they are built specially with wood-framed walls, match boarded and roof-felted, to permit of rapid removal and re-erection elsewhere at a minimum cost. An extensive verandah is associated with a bungalow in the popular acceptance of that term, but this is not a special feature of the bungalow as naturalised in the British Isles'. (42)

As the house-type was clearly gaining in popularity, the Building News pointed out its advantages. With domestic service becoming scarcer and more expensive it saved the labour of servants and occupants, particularly in climbing stairs; invalids in wheel chairs had access to all the rooms; neither children nor adults could fall on stairs; removal of furniture up and down stairs was avoided; loss of life by fire was lessened as occupants could climb out of the windows; there was security from the spread of fire as the walls of the rooms were carried up to the roof; gas, water and bell wires could be laid and removed more easily; soil and water pipes could not leak and damage ceilings and walls.

Another contemporary advocate (no doubt anticipating the 'old people's bungalow' of the future) drew attention to the problem in two-storey houses of carrying coffins downstairs.

There were no disadvantages for the occupier, though costs were higher and the plot larger than for a house of similar accommodation. For three living rooms, six bedrooms and the usual offices, a roof of 2,300 superficial feet was needed in comparison to one of 900 feet for a three storey house of similar accommodation. Plot sizes would be 1,600 feet compared with 560 superficial feet. Moreover, the bungalow, owing to its limited height, required more room all around than a higher house as no two rooms could overlook the same frontage and there were no upstairs rooms on a high level to command hedges, boundary walls or shrubberies that might, if too close to the house, 'completely block the view'.

Evidently, the bungalow was already being used as a 'retirement dwelling'.

The neighbourhood should be good, that is, the surrounding property should be of good class and likely to be maintained. If the locality is retired, it will always be well to be within reach of pleasant company. People who have spent their lives in a busy, noisy city naturally seek at first the quiet of the country or the seaside.

For such a purpose, clear air and pleasant surroundings were essential. The air near large towns was 'vitiating by respiration, combustion, sewage effluvia and deleterious gases from chemical works and gasworks'. The plans which accompanied this extended discussion all included accommodation for servants. (43)

In the decade spanning the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the bungalow, sometimes large, rambling and spacious began to appear in the equally spacious suburbs. (44) The term itself was much in vogue, with a 'Bungalow Dog Kennel' at the Royal Agricultural Society Meeting at Leicester (1895) and a Royal Bungalow Restaurant at the 1901 International Exhibition in Glasgow. (45)

3-7
3-8
3-9
3-10
3-11

Bungalow Prefabs on the Beach, 1880 - 1914

In the late 1880s, the permanent seaside bungalow was still very much a middle or even upper middle class phenomenon, located at the 'better

3-12

resorts' such as Frinton. In the first of the Building News competitions for a bungalow or Seaside Villa, provision had to be made for large drawing (24' by 18') and dining (20' by 17') rooms, a small library, four best bedrooms and two more for servants. When E.C. Brewer compiled the second edition of his Dictionary of Phrase and Fable in 1895, he noted the 'English bungalows at Birchington and on the Norfolk coast at Cromer'. Like Westgate, Cromer was much favoured by the wealthy, the literary and the artistic; its visitors included the Empress Elizabeth of Austria, Oscar Wilde, J.M. Barrie, Ellen Terry and Lords Tennyson and Curzon. (46) Personified by a contemporary writer (1897) as 'the art-loving, red-haired intense descendant of Pre-Raphaelitism', it hosted 'Girton and Newnham girls' and 'learned gentlemen and professors writing poetry for high class magazines'. (47) Here, two somewhat unorthodox bungalows with a hint of the fashionable Japanese taste had been built in the nineties. (48) It was thought that Cromer 'would never be vulgarised'; the new houses would grow old and 'the bungalows will be toned down to the landscape'. (49)

Before the early 1880s, the seaside bungalow seemed slow to catch on. From then, however, advances in transport and growing sophistication in the construction of portable buildings were to bring rapid changes. The thirty years before the first World War saw a boom in the major resorts. Places like Southend, close to centres of population, doubled in size. The permanent population of seventeen major resorts rose from just over half a million to more than 900,000 between 1870 and 1900. (50) Between 1901 and the first World War, Blackpool's population grew from 47,000 to 61,000; Bournemouth's, from a similar figure to almost 80,000. (51) The drift to the south east (including its resorts) had already begun. In the two decades before the war, south east England registered the highest proportional gain in urbanisation in the whole country; (52) much of this gain was in the seaside resorts (like Bournemouth, Brighton and Hove) where permanent as opposed to holiday residence was becoming increasingly common: 1903-4 saw a housing boom in England, especially at the seaside. (53)

Yet in these growing resorts, accommodation for summer holidays - was still - with exceptions such as Blackpool, Skegness or Cleethorpes - primarily for a middle class clientele. (54) In the 1850s, people visiting Brighton had usually rented houses or, for the less well off, lodgings. 'To live in public in a hotel' was considered 'disgraceful'. (55)

From the 1880s, however, as the resorts attracted increasing capital investment - in housing, municipal works and entertainment facilities - the large holiday hotel was introduced. (56) And though a block of flats had been constructed at Bexhill early in the century, a leading architect believed that 'flats at the seaside are not a success (and) are not wanted.' (57)

The opportunity of having one's own bungalow, or at least, renting someone else's, came about from two kinds of change: a minor revolution in the manufacture of portable buildings and subtle changes in recreational behaviour on the beach.

The use of cast iron in building, begun in the 1780s, developed especially in the first half of the nineteenth century. As Gilbert Herbert has shown, these were the pioneering years for pre-fabrication. With the invention of corrugated iron in the late 1820s, a new material was found which was to revolutionise building techniques. From the 1830s, corrugated iron and timber buildings were being shipped all over the globe, stimulated by emigration and the gold rushes to California and Australia in the middle of the century. In 1854, over 30,000 corrugated iron and timber houses, valued at over a quarter of a million pounds were sent to Victoria, Australia. By the last third of the century, the prefabricated corrugated iron building - for temporary houses, sheds, barns and factories - had become 'commonplace and unspectacular'. (58) Though its aesthetic qualities were not always appreciated, corrugated iron cladding was accepted as suitable for walls and recognised in the Local Government Board's Model By-laws in 1888. By then, the industry was producing some 200,000 tons a year, some three quarters of which were exported. (59) The domestic market, however, was now about to increase, stimulated by export production.

The portable cottages and gamekeepers' lodges manufactured during these years were primarily for the aristocratic estate. From the later 1880s, however, many factors had combined to create a wider demand for leisure buildings. (60)

It was to meet this market that firms like Boulton and Paul of Norwich began producing iron buildings for country and seaside use.

The advent of the pre-fabricated, 'temporary' bungalow from the later 1880s was to bring a major change in the morphology of the seaside, and one associated with changes in public behaviour on the beach. In the

3-13
3-14

space of a hundred years, building was creeping closer to the water's edge, colonising the shore. As we have seen, the earliest seaside visitors had been lodged in existing cottages. The next stage of settlement was marked by purpose-built accommodation; typically, this was the substantial terrace, located at a distance from the shore, with an intervening thoroughfare separating buildings from the beach. The 'marine residences' of this time, even the bungalows at Westgate, were similarly on firm ground, with access roads often separating them from the shore.

The small, pre-fabricated and lightweight bungalow, however, placed as close as possible to the high water mark on the beach, marked a third stage in the colonisation of the coast. From then on, further advances could only be made by the erection of pile dwellings in the sea or, in the later twentieth century, by the appropriation of shallow waters with flotillas of small boats.

An early, and possibly the first example of this process was on the Sussex coast, west of Brighton, between the ancient port of Shoreham and of Lancing, some one and a half hours train journey from London. The site was a strip of beach sandwiched between the sea and the backwater of the Adur estuary. In the late 1880s, this had been occupied only by a coastguard station, a cholera hospital and recently erected chemical plant. Between 1890 and 96 however, some dozen bungalows were built. By 1902, **3-15** there was a continuous line of over two hundred, each occupying adjoining square plots, with 66 foot frontages and all within twenty yards of the high water mark. (61) Within another ten years, the line extended for a mile and a half down the coast. Bungalow Town, with its own railway **3-16** station marked on cyclists' maps (62) had been established. **3-17**

The settlement had apparently begun when a local resident noticed three or four old railway carriages towed to the beach and used as net stores by local fishermen. From then on, his role had been that of entrepreneur. Plots were marked out and let, the tenant paying a ground rent to the lord of the manor in whose control lay the beach. Rent and taxes for the plots, at 25 shillings per year, were collected by the manager who also arranged the purchase and removal of railway carriages from the Brighton Railway. Costing £10 each without wheels, these were taken on horse-drawn trolleys to the beach for a further £2 or £3 and erected on a foundation of sleepers. The inside was stripped, though the doors and windows remained intact.

Various designs were possible, depending on the number of carriages used. A single carriage could be fronted with a verandah; another formed a T-plan, with two carriages and another, an H-plan with three. A popular solution, both here and at nearby Lancing, used two carriages placed in parallel with a space between. This was then roofed in with a low pitched gable and, once sub-divided, served as entrance hall, living and dining area, with bedrooms and kitchen in the 'wings'. With a verandah on the front and a WC to the rear such 'carriage bungalows' sold for up to £200 in the early 1900s. (63)

3-18

3-19

3-20

Other Shoreham bungalows were more conventional, many designed and built in the first years of the century by Dorchester's Borough Engineer, P.T.Harrison. (64) In 1909 he published Bungalow Residences, bringing the bungalow idea to a broader, more popular public than that addressed by Briggs. For Harrison, the word bungalow could refer, on one hand, 'to a commodious and well-appointed residence in the tropics' or, on the other (no doubt with Shoreham in mind), to 'a superannuated railway carriage adjoining a plot of beach or waste ground'. Though Harrison's designs were small, simple and, at about £300 to build, available to a more modest middle class clientele, the idea was very similar to Briggs' more up-market patrons. The bungalows were 'intended for residence in this country either for summer months only or as a permanent residence'. The aim was

3-21

3-22

'to convey a sense of unrestraint and easy comfort . . . some bungalow dwellers situate their bungalows so as to afford as much change as possible from the conditions of living in towns by seeking the simple life . . . situation and environment are, of course, instrumental in making bungalow homes so attractive. They usually possess a liberal amount of garden or ground around them, being built in districts where land is comparatively cheap.

The isolation and privacy which Briggs had provided for was equally important to Harrison's less affluent clientele. Turning his back on Shoreham, he now described the ideal:

No one would entertain for a moment the idea of erecting rows or even pairs of bungalows because by so doing their principal charm as well as their distinctive character would be destroyed.

Rather, they were to be erected

for the most part at the seaside or in the country in positions chosen for the quality of the air, or for recreative facilities or other attractions . . . (it was) an added pleasure if the site commands views of white cliffs and restless sea, of verdure-clad hills or winding river.

Harrison's bungalows contained a central room, a living room, four small bedrooms (including one for a servant) and - significantly - a bicycle store. Set on sleepers, they - like most of the others by now - were timber-framed, with external weather-board walls and inside surfaces in matchboard. The roof was of corrugated iron. (65) Painted white, and with details picked out in green, with names like 'The Nugget' or 'Mon Repos' they were bought by local landladies who hired them out at two guineas a week. (66)

The explanation of this and other 'Bungalow Towns' in the next decades was due not just to the availability of pre-fabricated buildings, developments in transport and a general rise in living standards. There had also been changes in attitudes and behaviour surrounding the practice of bathing on the beach. In the mid Victorian period, the moral climate of many seaside resorts had become increasingly strict, formalising behaviour and introducing new social codes. Bathing suits, for example, had become compulsory and the segregation of sexes before bathing had been generally enforced. (67) By the turn of the century, however, more liberal views prevailed. Influenced perhaps by French practice, mixed bathing began to be allowed (apparently, first at Bexhill in 1901); (68) men, if not yet women, appeared in shorter, more 'rationale' swimming garb, including bathing trunks; the old, 150 year old habit of changing in bathing machines and being hauled, in total privacy, across beach to water, was being abandoned in favour of using static bathing tents providing privacy only when actually undressing. It was now acceptable not only to be seen in bathing dress on the beach but even, among certain classes and in particular resorts, to change there.

Moreover, the emphasis on health at the seaside was already shifting from the quality of the air to the quantity of sun. (69) Where earlier, nut-brown skin or reddened neck were marks of ill-bred country labour, now, the sun-tanned cheek was becoming a sign of health and leisure. According to writer Clement Scott, wealthy visitors to Cromer in 1897 were going there 'to brown their skins'. (70)

These changes, slight and not everywhere applicable, helped to permit the idea of the beach bungalow at the turn of the century. It was part of a growing belief in the merits of the outdoor life - an 'open air craze that had brought outdoor sleeping sheds', camping and given rise to the invention of the first caravan, purpose-built for holiday tanning in 1885. (71) 3.24

Contemporary postcards of Shoreham suggest that visitors were of relatively modest origins, coming generally from London and, as many doubtless could not swim, only paddling and relaxing on the sand. It was a later writer who spoke of 'one of the most attractive features of life is the delightful "dip" in the morning. You rise betimes, and walk straight from the bungalow and woo the waters'. (72) Bathing was a past-time which could be indulged in 'virtually free of the tiresome restrictions prevailing in the orthodox seaside resorts'. (73)

It was obviously the more liberated then, or those with no social reputation to lose, who patronised these early bungalows at Shoreham, Herne Bay or Clacton-on-Sea where, in the first years of the century, a manufacturer of portable buildings had set up some of his own. Here, 'every convenience' was provided in furnished and unfurnished bungalows, containing from two to ten bedrooms, and reception rooms, for between one and ten guineas a week. They were also available for sale. (74) Other bungalow settlements, if not towns, were established at Heacham (Norfolk), Selsea (Sussex), at Moretown in the Wirral (Cheshire) where simple bungalows could be bought for as little as £20. Even before the first World War, both these places were to run into trouble for allegedly contravening public health bye-laws, passed under the Public Health Act of 1907. (75) Some places, like the Hightown Bungalows on the dunes north of Liverpool were little more than modest outdoor sleeping huts: (76) the important fact was that the land was more or less free.

What the invention of the pre-fabricated bungalow had done was to bring a type of land into use which had not been used for building before. In some cases, the invention of bungalows on piles for African swamps had been found equally suitable for the sands near Bognor. (77) Before planning laws brought controls, the beach below high water mark, and even sand dunes above, were often treated as common land or were available for temporary use, depending on their owner (78), usually with only a token rent to the Lord of the Manor. At Shoreham, trouble occurred when he sold the beach (by then full of bungalows) for £30,000 and the new owner 3.25

demanded £250 to stay there from each of the owners. By the end of the nineteenth century the 'local bourgeoisie' were to steadily gain the upper hand in the control of beaches. (79)

Despite these problems, the bungalow habit had obviously caught on. With the erection of the Royal Bungalow on Snettisham Shore, near Sandringham in 1908, it received a seal of approval. Built in a self-conscious 'hand-crafted' style of yellow stone, with white woodwork and a green slate roof, the inside walls were decorated with shells and varied-hued pebbles from the beach. Inside, the Queen had a small room for herself (with a low hearth fire of rough bricks surmounted by a beam of rough oak) and another for the servants. (80) 3-26

At Hayling Island, opposite the Isle of Wight, where the girls were 'neat, trim and taught and would not have a ribbon or buckle out of place', the writer Clement Scott 'stretched out lazily on the soft grass of our Bungalow Yacht' (apparently a house-boat, moored to the bank).

'Bonnie . . . popped out of her cabin in the most weird of fantastic garments at all hours of the day and night and raced about the grass deck, her hair flying at the bidding of the winds of Heaven, whereas in London, it is coiffed, caressed, waved, banded, as neat as a new pin, the envy of every fashionable audience of smart women in our well-dressed metropolis. (81)

That Bonnie, after two or three pages, turns out to be a dog only marginally detracts from the impression.

The seaside towns had always offered the occasion for abandoning social constraints; they were 'peculiar cities where tens of thousands rushed into a social vacuum'. The bungalow town was an extension of the development. It contained the socially adventurous, the avant-garde, the more liberated members of the community. And as Bellagio was immortalised in fiction, so also was Bungalow Town.

H.G.Wells' In the Days of the Comet, a fascinating blend of socialism, science fiction and romance, was published in 1906. The hero, a young clerk of modest background, is in love with Nettie, the daughter of the head gardener on a large Midlands estate. Having walked all one hot afternoon to see his beloved, he is dismayed to discover that she has been taken out (and off) by the university-educated son of a wealthy industrialist. Taking his revolver, the hero follows the couple to 'Shaphambury' on 'the coast of Essex' where he asks an old inhabitant

about the Bungalow Village. 'Ah, Artists and such. Nice goings on! Mixed Bathing. Something scandalous'; the village was situated 'six lonely miles from the town'.

'Two people were bathing in the sea . . . They waded breast-deep in the water . . . a woman, with her hair coiled about her head, and in pursuit of her, a man, graceful figures of black and silver . . . Each wore a tightly fitting bathing dress that hid nothing of the shining, dripping beauty of their youthful forms.

I came over the little ridge and discovered the bungalow village . . . nestling in a crescent lap of dunes . . .

This place . . . was a fruit of the reaction of artistic-minded and carelessly living people against the costly and uncomfortable social stiffness of the more formal seaside resorts of that time. It was . . . the custom of the steam-railway companies to sell their carriages after they had become obsolete . . . and some genius had hit upon the feasibility of turning these into habitable little cabins for the summer holiday. The thing had become a fashion with a certain Bohemian-spirited class; they added cabin to cabin, and these little improvised homes, gaily painted and with broad verandahs and supplementary lean-to's added to their accommodation, made the brightest contrast conceivable to the dull rigidities of the decorous resorts. Of course, there were many such discomforts in such camping that had to be faced cheerfully and so this broad sandy beach was sacred to high spirits and the young. Art muslin and banjos, Chinese lanterns and frying, are leading 'notes' . . . But . . . I saw the thing as no gathering of light hearts and gay idleness but grimly . . . To the poor man, to the grimy workers, beauty and cleanliness were absolutely denied; out of a life of greasy dirt, of muddied desires, they watched their happier fellows with a bitter envy and foul, tormenting suspicions. (82)

The bungalow as symbol for the simplification of life

This image of the bungalow town as 'a queer village of careless sensuality' (83) and of the bungalow as a symbol of the artistic, Bohemian and, in other contexts, with vaguely political overtones, was at its height at the turn of the century. For two brief years between 1899 and 1901 a slim magazine made a fleeting appearance on the fringes of the London scene. Edited by Max Judge, The Bungalow was devoted neither to building nor architecture but to things 'artistic, literary, topographical and Bohemian'. (84)

Bohemianism was a constant theme. Many people, it seemed, were true Bohemians at heart, having 'a sneaking fondness for an easy, natural mode of living'. Driving was a pastime 'always associated with Gay Bohemianism'

as railway travelling was not only commonplace but there 'one has to become a passenger in such or such a class, to be a Smoker or non-Smoker, ticketed and numbered in good English fashion'. How glorious it was 'to drive away from the haunts of Industrialism into the sweet fresh air of the country where nature reigns supreme'. The essence of Bohemianism was 'the spirit which prompts one to throw overboard all the formalities of the world and to shock Mrs Grundy'; it was the capacity 'to extract the keenest pleasures from the simplest forms of life'. (85)

On holiday, the true Bohemian would not pack half a dozen shirts, two or three suits and shaving paraphernalia but would dress in his oldest clothes, take no luggage and rest in a barn or shed rather than a hotel. His greatest delight was 'to get away from the city to some distant place, there to live a more natural life, to mix with country folk and do as they do; or by the sea, to become a temporary fisherman'. In short, a Bohemian was 'one who lives a simple life, where he can be in close communion with Nature'; one 'bent on living his own life, unfettered by the tyranny of convention . . . the true Individualist'. (86)

The rejection of the city and the life style which went with it was central to this philosophy. The 'simple life' was essentially life in 'the country'.

'When you have lived in London for many years and have become hardened by the daily crush and turmoil of the city; when you have grown weary of the ceaseless new attractions week by week and when you feel that you are gradually being developed into a machine, you begin to long for 'long calm days and long calm evenings' . . . at your desk in the office it is always the same, week after week, the days to be got through as soon as possible . . . think for a minute of the delight of rising in the country, think of the charms of the meadow in the early hours and then betake yourself with your work, from London, and settle down seriously to country life.

However, as another contributor pointed out, 'living in the country on the whole is not productive of idealism unless you can afford it'. (87)

These ideas, about art, the pressure of social conventions, anti-industrialism, were all symbolised in the magazine's title. In 'A Word about Bungalows', the symbolism was made explicit. It had been said that 'building vertically or horizontally is influenced by social questions'. In the skyscraper, one saw the vertical idea; in the bungalow, the horizontal. There were, however, social factors which

3.28
3.29

influenced these two broadest divisions of building. Nobody, according to the editor, has his liberty but perhaps

'the man in the bungalow has most. There is no limit to his building. Room after room can be added, as he wants and according to the position of the sun, so he can select his position in the shade of the never-ending verandah . . . In the cities of Northern Europe, where men from all parts find themselves thrown together, a limit is at once placed on everything. The houses have to arrange themselves in order and instead of spreading themselves out they must mount higher up, and then comes the fight for the best position! The wealthy first, then the poor - nearer heaven! Everyone is on a level in the Bungalow - you are either above or below in the towering city dwelling'.

Yet Judge was also prepared to recognise the 'realities of life', the urban industrial base on which modern civilisation was built. The bungalow, after all, had originally been erected in India 'as a help to work rather than an encouragement to idleness'.

'We cannot all live in Bungalows and it is as well. If we had done so, the European race would not have developed itself as it has developed, neither would the arts and crafts have flourished if it had not been for that struggle for existence in a thickly populated city. Get away from India and you get away from Bungalows, but we can use the word as typical of a comfortable existence and a free unrestrained life'. (88)

These sentiments - the rejection of the city, the search for nature, for the simplification of life, freedom from social constraints, for the essence in art and a concern for fellow men which, if not yet explicit Socialism was a leaning in its direction, had drawn heavily on the teachings of Morris and Ruskin whose names figure frequently in The Bungalow's pages. When Ruskin died, a long editorial praised the changes that his writings had brought in questioning established conventions that 'everything is to be sacrificed to "respectability" and worldly success'. The race for wealth had too often meant the crushing of the nobler instincts. Ruskin had taught the artist to despise convention and to follow nature; he had proclaimed to rich and poor their common brotherhood and the social responsibility of all members of the community. (89)

Some years earlier, in The Simplification of Life (1884), Morris's friend, Edward Carpenter, had expressed similar misgivings about the

complexity of modern life, its materialism and overbearing social conventions. The tendency in the past had been to accumulate. Yet 'every additional object in the house requires dusting, cleaning, repairing, storing - anti macassars require wool, wool requires knitting needles, needles require a box, the box requires a side table, etc. etc.,'. It was obvious that 'immense simplifications of our life are possible'. The fact that there were so many religious enthusiasts in Arabia was due to the great simplicity of their life and landscape. (90) 'Simplicity of life, even the barest, is not misery but the very foundation of refinement; a sanded floor, whitewashed walls and green trees' wrote William Morris in his essay on 'Art and Socialism' of the same year.

The same ideas had been behind the foundation of 'alternative' communities. In an age of religious doubt, the void was filled by utopian socialism devotion to good works, vegetarianism the reverence for manual labour and, as a substitute for formal faiths, nature mysticism and the implicit religion of 'country life'. Whatever their other beliefs, the devotees of these ideas were firmly convinced that 'the city must go'. Richard Jefferies' own brand of nature mysticism was centred around contact with the earth and solitary communion with nature, to be away from 'the pettiness of house-life - chairs and tables'. A new interest in 'primitive peoples' led to the foundations of anthropology and in the world of letters, R.L.Stevenson went off to seek soliturd in a bungalow in the Pacific. (91)

As Sheila Rowbottom has shown, such ideas were characteristic of a time when the division between ideas on art, politics, religion, nature, cosmic consciousness and politics were far less clear than it became in the 1920s. (92) Just what the readers and contributors of The Bungalow were looking for was not immediately apparent; it was a new kind of life which they were not quite able to express: 'an indefinable, inscrutable, perplexing something which many of us are groping after in a misty haze'.

Yet apart from the discussions on Bohemianism, there were also essays on travel, on 'Ocean solitude', picnicing, art exhibitions, poetry, architecture and book reviews. In 1900, a Bungalow Club was proposed for 'individuals who are inclined to a literary or artistic life'.

It was to be 'a Bohemian institution where the objects are carried out with as little formality and stereotyped method of procedure as possible'. There were to be meetings in London where papers were read, visits to Museums and Art Galleries, exhibitions by members in their own rooms, summer meetings in districts of historic and architectural interest and excursions into Kent, Surrey and Berkshire. During the year, the club members gathered in West Hampstead to hear Mr H.O. Newland speak (once again) on 'Bohemianism'; a paper was read on 'Architecture and History' in St John's Wood and at the Studio of one of the members there was an exhibition of Japanese prints, posters and enamels, some drawings of D.G. Rossetti, lent by his brother William and watercolours by Ruskin. Those present included leading figures in London's literary and art world - Christine and W.M. Rossetti, J.L. Paton and others. 'With tea, art and agreeable company, the atmosphere was passed in true Bohemian fashion'. As it was intended that 'formal and official documents of proceedings should be a negative feature of the Club', (93) little more is known of its activities. Like the fugitive journal itself, it disappeared into the historic past.

The bungalow re-exported

In the later nineteenth century, as industrial production grew, the empire - both formal and informal expanded. Larger markets were necessary and raw materials required for the increasingly sophisticated industries which developed from the 1880s.

Yet to expand overseas markets a basic infrastructure of railways and public utilities were needed. In the later decades of the century, large amounts of capital were exported to set up this infrastructure, particularly railways, much of it transferred from the depressed market in agricultural land. (94) And with the capital to build railways, in South America and the Far East, went British engineers to supervise and maintain them.

Here, and elsewhere, plantations were being set up - in Assam, Ceylon or Brazil, to develop specialised crops for production and export, again to be managed by British staff. The raw materials of the second, electrical phase of industrialisation - rubber, copper, zinc or asbestos - were needed from Malaya, South Africa and Latin America. With other factors, discussed in chapter six, these developments led to imperial

expansion, not least on the African continent.

The managers of these tasks, however, and the officials who, in many cases, were to transform self-sufficient peasants into wage-earning labour, had to be housed. By the later 1880s, the exportable cast-iron bungalow, specially designed for conditions in the tropics, had been developed. As discussed in more detail below, although pre-fabricated iron and timber houses had been exported for almost a century, only in the later nineteenth century did an appropriate, mass produced tropical design emerge. By the turn of the century, firms in London, Glasgow, Liverpool and Norwich were sending bungalows abroad. (95)

Typical of these were Boulton and Paul of Norwich, previously with the manufacture of Victorian conservatories and horticultural equipment. In the overseas investment boom of the early years of this century they supplied bungalows to the managers of rubber plantations in Malaya, the resident railway engineer in Lobito, W Africa and for others in East and South Africa, Chile and the Argentine, as well as despatching bungalows to Messina in South Italy following the disastrous earthquake of 1906. **3-30**
3-31

Costing from four to five hundred pounds, they had drawing and dining rooms, three bedrooms and, surrounded on all sides by a broad veranda, resembled their Anglo-Indian forebears. Wherever British men and money were exploiting the local resources, the bungalow was likely to be found; two German travellers visiting Peru and Brazil in the years before the first war found 'wellblech' (corrugated iron) bungalows 'zwischen Anden and Amazonas'. (96)

Just how far the early twentieth century growth of bungalow settlements in England was stimulated by the production of bungalows for export to the colonies is a question which only detailed study could decide.

Back to the Land

From the early 1870s, overseas competition was to bring about the Great Depression in agriculture. It was to lead to a collapse in the agricultural land market, and the migration of workers from the land. Concern at these developments was to result, in 1906, in a Parliamentary Report on the Decline in the Agricultural Population of Great Britain, 1881 - 1906, where housing for agricultural labour was seen as a central problem. (97) After the 1880s, few houses had been built for farm labourers, either speculatively or by landlords and many cottages were falling into decay. (98)

In middle class circles, concern for agriculture and the condition of its workers was frequently linked with overcrowding in the cities. It gave rise to books such as Ebenezer Howard's Garden Cities of Tommorrow, (1903) where each cottage was to have its own cultivable plot. The promotion of urban allotments and small holdings was seen as a possible solution both to reduce urban overcrowding as well as regenerate agricultural land. The pressures of the international market economy were steadily making themselves felt, with 150,000 people leaving rural areas every year as dairy produce came increasingly from abroad. The Small Holdings and Allotments Act of 1907 was offered as an answer, encouraging the establishment of smallholdings up to 50 acres and smaller allotments of less than 5. For these, Boulton and Paul produced a series of strikingly modern-looking bungalow designs in timber, at prices **3.32** from £83 for a bungalow (22' by 12') with living room, bedroom, food store and verandah to £216 for a larger (50' by 15') three bedroom version. (99)

Yet combined with this concern for the agricultural worker was a parallel interest in getting 'back to the land'. It was all part of the move towards 'the simplification of life', manifesting itself in the establishment of agrarian communities garden cities, the New School movement stressing the value of life in the country, light and air, manual work and, like the hero in Virginia Woolf's first novel, Night and Day (1911), 'the idea of a cottage where one grew one's own vegetables and lived on fifteen shillings a week'. Needless to say, the simple life, back-to-the landers were a small, middle class minority in a society marked by vast conspicuous consumption of the upper class on one hand and immense poverty on the other. (100)

For some, it was a desire for a small-scale farm: for others, simply to live in the country. The motives were similar to those of Briggs' clients, though without the sexual overtones. In the country 'for a time at least, the rattle of the motorbus may be forgotten with the many other obtrusive indications of the triumph of machinery, indispensable as such may be in these days of rush and luxury'. (101) It was an ideology which, in coming years, was to combine with the accumulation of wealth to justify the second home.

The idea of the bungalow as a 'small country house' which Briggs' patrons had adopted from the aristocracy in the 1880s had now, twenty years later, filtered to a lesser bourgeoisie. It resulted from depressed land prices, rising living standards, transport innovations, further developments in pre-fabrication and, with reduced working hours, changes in the social organisation of time with - in the decades spanning the turn of the century - the emergence of the 'week-end'. (102)

Combined with an extensive railway network, the bicycle - or after 1900, the motor bike, car and bus - released thousands of people from the city at the weekends. The logic of these developments was to have not only a particular place to go to (the seaside or the country) but a particular dwelling there when one arrived. For the wealthy middle or upper class who could afford an architect-designed bungalow at £500 or more, or increasingly, a renovated labourer's cottage this was the 'week-end cottage', the earliest reference to which seems to be in 1904. Yet a cheaper market was now developing.

3-34
3-35
3-36
3-37

There had, according to the author of a sixpenny handbook on The Home Beautiful (1908), 'during the past few years, been a very large increase in the number of small cottages intended principally for occupation at week-ends, when the tired business man can get away for a few hours to recuperate in the pure air of the country after the toil and worries of city life'. Formerly, 'expense had stood in the way of those of comparatively little income from indulging in such luxuries, but modern ingenuity had shown that the outlay need not be large'. For example, Oetzmann, of Hampstead Road, London had produced a bungalow cottage, with three bedrooms, hall, kitchen and living room, which could be built for between £200 and £230. For another £45, it could be furnished complete. The brick built bungalow, rough cast in white with red tile roof, the latticed porch fashionably decorated with the Arts and Crafts heart motif, was exhibited at the Anglo-French and Coronation Exhibitions of 1907/10 (104) Reproduced in books and on hundred of postcards it was to make a large impression.

3-39

For others, however, there was the prefabricated wood or wood and corrugated iron bungalow. The more expensive of these, from £240 to £550, with drawing, dining and three bedrooms, and accommodation for servants, became available from the late 1880s. Advertised as bungalows or 'shooting lodges' for 'leasehold property'

they were apparently for the landed estate. (105) The more popular leisure market seems to have developed at the turn of the century with range of cheaper models available.

Thus, Cooper's of the Old Kent Road, employing over 300 men on their six acre premises and selling almost 10,000 greenhouses a year, were making and selling small bungalows at £140 each. In Birmingham, Harrison Smith (telegraphic address in 1904, 'Bungalows, Birmingham') had a three bedroom 'week-end holiday bungalow', 22' by 17', in deal at £103, carriage paid. For £30, one could buy three railway carriages, plus £10 each for delivery and, including modifications, construct a bungalow for £100. (106)

By this time, many new materials were being introduced. In the two decades before the first World War, the technology of cast iron and steel was to be supplemented, if not displaced by a variety of new materials which, combined with timber, were to revolutionise building methods. Though their widespread adoption was not to be felt till after 1918, they were already making an impact before the War. And as the bungalow had gone out to the empire, so some of its raw materials were also derived from there - rubber for 'ruberoid' roofs, asbestos, zinc for corrugated iron as well as the rattan chairs and Indian mats, which furnished the 'simple life' inside.

Combined with existing prefabrication methods, these materials were crucial to the bungalow's development.

Asbestos cement, invented in 1889 and used for making sheets and tiles, was introduced into Britain from Austria from about 1904. In 1910, Turner Brothers, the British Uralite Company and Bell's United Asbestos Company started production in Britain. (107) A year or two later, Bell's were advertising an all-asbestos bungalow. (108) Pre-cast re-inforced concrete blocks had been invented in 1875. To publicise his invention, W.H.Lascelles commissioned the architect, Norman Shaw, to show how the panels could be used. No doubt capitalising on the innovations at Birchington, a member of Shaw's office had produced a design for a 'seaside bungalow'. (109) Concrete tiles were introduced from 1893 and the Belgian firm of S.A.Eternit was also to sell large quantities of his patent tiles in Britain from about the same time. In 1898, the Patent Millboard Company, founded at Sunbury on Thames, began making a material ideally suitable for lining bungalow walls. Plasterboard, a North American invention of 1904, though introduced into Britain made little impact before the first World War. (110) The Ruberoid Roof Company, with their patented rubberised finish, had been

founded in 1891. (111) About the same time, the Wire-Wove Company of London developed panels of expanded steel lathing, covered with plaster, to replace wooden lathes. In 1906, they offered a one bedroom, weekend bungalow for £100. (112) Compared to £200 for a conventional brick bungalow at Herne Bay, (113), Boulton and Paul, using ferro-concrete panels and brick, were offering week-end cottages, at between £134 and £345.

As many of these materials pre-supposed a frame construction rather than load-bearing walls, a single storey design was inherent in their use. This was seen at the Cheap Cottages Exhibition at Letchworth in 1905, held to encourage the design of £150 cottages for rural labourers and the use of pre-fabrication. Bungalows were built using 'Uralite Kent Board' panels and tiles, 'Mack' partition slabs, machine-made roof tiles and internal walls of expanded metal covered with plaster. (114) 3-40
3-41

These, and similar opportunities had been aired by 'Home Counties' in Country Cottages. How to Build Them and Fit Them Up published (and reprinted three times) in 1905. The book had come out of a series of articles in The World's Work and Leisure between 1903 and 4, and had been addressed to a range of weekenders including 'a London clerk, with bicycle, on thirty shillings a week' as well as retired service officers, returned colonial civil servants, 'professional men and merchants', journalists and barristers. (115)

Sites were within thirty miles of London. Essex and Suffolk provided the cheapest; Hertfordshire, Buckinghamshire and Berkshire were more expensive. Sussex, Kent and Surrey, for long the favoured areas for the wealthiest class from the metropolis, were high. Here, the motor-owning class reigned supreme. (116)

The main obstacle to such back-to-the landers came from district councils. Here, local by-laws were used by some to prevent the building 'of any dwelling the external walls of which were not constructed of good bricks, stone or other hard and incombustible materials properly bonded and solidly put together'. (117) The origin of the controversy lay initially in the Public Health Act of 1875 which had introduced regulations governing building structure and materials and was aimed at preventing unstable, insanitary and inflammable buildings. This had been followed by a set of model by-laws issued by the Local Government Board in 1877 and available for adoption by local authorities. (118)

In 1890, however, rural authorities were granted legislative powers

previously only available to urban councils. Thus, by-laws originally designed to govern building methods and materials in towns could, if the district council so chose, be adopted in the very different circumstances of rural areas. The effect was to prevent the use of many of the new materials and construction methods developed during the course of the century. (119)

The attack on the outmoded by-laws came from a combination of interests: people campaigning for cheaper housing for rural labourers; architects objecting to restrictions on innovation in design for middle class clients, middle class 'back-to-the-landers' anxious to build a bungalow in the bush. In many areas, the regulations were apparently used to preserve vested interests. According to 'Home Counties', builders saw pre-fabricated dwellings as a threat to their livelihood; for tradesmen, the settlers search for 'the simple life' was bad for trade (as also was their practice of having groceries delivered from London stores); parsons were shocked by their views and 'irregular church attendance'; landowners' aesthetic sensibilities were offended by 'rambling huts sprawled all over the district'. All interests might therefore combine against these 'wild folk from the towns with no visible means of support'. (120)

How such by-laws were adopted and enforced, however, clearly depended on the social composition of councils. In large parts of Essex, Cambridge and Hampshire (except the sea fringe) there were few by-laws restricting bungalow development in the early twentieth century. Surrey, Sussex, Kent and Berkshire, however, the preferred areas of the metropolitan elite - were 'comparatively by-law ridden'. (121) In 1899, for example, W.S.Blunt, the poet and anti-imperialist, returning home from Egypt, had built a £150 timber and corrugated iron bungalow near East Grinstead in Kent, only to have it demolished by the local Council (on which three of the members were builders). In other areas, however, councils were willing to turn a blind eye to pre-fabricated bungalows or, in the category of 'temporary buildings', to allow them temporary status. (122)

The anti-bungalow lobby, however, was already on the alert, especially among architects, whose professional role as arbiters of taste, was threatened. Reviewing engineer Harrison's book on Bungalow Residences, the Architectural Review thought it 'a doubtful policy to issue books of this kind . . . they give to the layman that amount of knowledge which is a dangerous thing. The thoughtless individual is likely to go to the builder, book in hand, and say "Build me one like that"'. (123)

The controversy over the by-laws eventually resulted in their revision. And in the event, they not only permitted the bungalow to flourish but, in a strange legislative irony, confirmed its distinctive size, location and form. Where wooden houses were built, for reasons of stability, they were only to be of one storey and to ensure stability, they were not to exceed 600 square feet in area nor 6000 cubic feet in volume. To eliminate risk of fire, each had to be at least 200 feet distant from any other building not in the same curtilage. These were regulations which had clear implications for the future form and pattern of bungalow settlements. However, as the Building News complained, 'the isolation of each building in half an acre of land' would mean that the use of such new methods and materials would be restricted to 'country bungalows for moneyed men living in towns'. (124)

Conclusion

When viewed in a long term perspective, the introduction of the country and suburban bungalow in this period can be seen as part - indeed, a **3-42** symbol - of the beginning of the process of 'counter-urbanisation'. (125) Though introduced as a 'country' house, the bungalow was essentially an urban dwelling. It was in the country but not of it. It was a product of the despoliation of the city which industrial capitalism had brought about - environmental pollution, over-crowding and the 'stresses and strains' of urban life.

Though relatively few were built in suburbs and country in the quarter century before the first War, the idea of the bungalow and the philosophy from which it sprang were firmly established. After 1918, the idea immensely gained in popularity and - supported by other developments - vast numbers were to be built.

Over this period, from about 1880 to the 1930s, the perception of rural land, of agriculture and of something which became known as the 'countryside' underwent a change. With almost 80 per cent of the English population urban in 1911, the countryside began to be invested with an aesthetic and ideological identity of its own. For the largely middle class population who assumed this view, it was a perception which was far more widespread, and also different, from the earlier view of the Romantic poets. The journal, Country Life had been established for an urban bourgeoisie in 1896. In 1903, The Country-side, 'a journal of the country, garden, nature and wildlife', edited by E.Kay Robinson, was begun and later, The Countryman established, each devoted to a townsman's concept of country-lore. Like the term 'week-end', 'country-side' in the early twentieth century was

hyphenated. The hyphen gradually disappeared as both institutions became rooted into social and cultural life. With the growth of the media and car ownership, the idea of the countryside as a recreational resource - as assumed by the Countryside Commission or discussed in Marion Shoard's Theft of the Countryside (1980), is accepted. In the last thirty years, to spend 'a weekend in a country cottage', even if not one's own, has become, for many of the middle class population, a form of leisure which rests on the institutions of 'weekend' and 'countryside' established half a century before.

Already in 1902, in a perceptive article on 'The Coming of the Motor', Henry Norman MP had seen the impact which the car would have. Arguing that everyone who kept a horse could keep a car for less money, he demonstrated how the vastly increased travelling radius of the car would lead to 'a revival of country districts'. 'Thousands of the town-dwellers of today will be the country-dwellers of tomorrow . . . to the car-owner, it is virtually the same thing whether his home is one or a dozen miles from the railway station'. The car would 'bring into the market at good prices a great number of country places unlettable and unsaleable today'. In ten years, horses would not be seen on the streets of London. (126)

In these ten years, many country areas were to be turned into commuter suburbs. Hindhead, in Surrey, was typical. A valley close by was 'discovered' as a residential centre and a building boom followed, speculative architects and builders buying up plots of land so that, between 1890 and about 1910, the population of 500 increased to 2000. A once quiet high road, was 'noisy with the motor cars of the richer residents', the country 'invaded by the leisured class'. Where donkeys had grazed in 1900, ten years later, 'the well-to-do have their tennis or afternoon tea'. (127)

Bourne's comments about Surrey were echoed by C.F.G. Masterman. Everywhere, the rural areas were decaying and, as the agricultural population left, 'villas and country houses' were established. On Sunday afternoons, the 'wandering machines, travelling with incredible speed' brought a new population to the country who piled, 'twenty and thirty deep outside the new popular inns'.

On the nearer suburban areas where the smaller bungalows were coming up, Masterman was equally perceptive. 'The Suburbans' were the creation not of industrial, but of commercial and business activities of London. The

middle classes had reconciled the pressure between the standard of comfort and limitation of income by reducing family size. This had led to a 'headlong collapse of the birthrate' in the last twenty years (c 1890 - 1910) in all save the poorest class. There was much to indicate that this decline had gone far among those suburban populations in which a few years before, 'the discrepancy between the standard of comfort and the means available for its satisfaction was most conspicuous'. (128) These were to be the new patrons of the spreading suburban bungalow, both then and in the years to come.

The beginnings of the mass market, purpose-built second home (both in North America and Britain) which the turn-of-the-century bungalow and country cottage represent, is also of major importance. It gives a longer history to an institution previously only located in the 1960s. (129) As part of the trend in counter-urbanisation, the future significance of this process, initiated by the metropolitan leisure society, cannot be over-estimated. It has been suggested by more than one scholar that the trend towards second homes will constitute the most important process of urbanisation in the years to come. (130) At an international level, the growth of second homes located in relatively poor countries or regions, owned and used by people from rich ones, is likely to become a problem of serious proportions. (131)

The ideology behind it - discussed in more detail in chapter seven - is not dissimilar to that of the 'bohemian' and simple life of the turn of the century. It was the product of a bourgeois society, an urban equivalent, as Hobsbawm points out, (132) of the eighteenth century fete champetre: playing at not belonging to it. The 'simple life' has meaning only for those with surplus wealth to attain it.

The period which witnessed the introduction of the bungalow also saw the beginnings of attempts to control the development of cities and towns. The Town Planning legislation of 1909 and the creation of the Institute of Town Planners four years later was the formal, and public response by the state and professional groups to the problems of urbanism in Britain. Yet no attempt was made to change the basis of the market economy or to bring land, urban or rural, into national ownership. Instead, for those who could afford it, the real response to urbanism was both informal and private, and used the institutions of capitalism to escape to far-flung suburbs, country bungalows and second homes. (133) In the decades to come, the urbanisation of the countryside was to lead to constant conflict and reinforce social divisions between country and the town.

Chapter Three Footnotes

1. M.Girouard, The Victorian Country House, Country Life, London, 1972.
2. Between 1790 and 1840, over a hundred books (including new editions) of designs for small houses and cottages were published in England, about half of them between 1800 and 1810. See P.Wrightson, The Small English House, Catalogue 5, B.Weinreb, London, 1977; also P.Wrightson, ed., The English picturesque villa and cottage, 1760-1860, Indianapolis Museum of Art, 1973.
3. W.Bartell, Hints for Picturesque Improvements in Ornamental Cottages, etc. etc., J.Taylor, London, 1804, p.4.
4. R.Elsam, An Essay on Rural Architecture, for the author, London, 1803.
5. T.R.Slater, Family, society and the ornamental villa on the fringes of English country towns, Journal of Historical Geography, 4,2, 1978, pp.129-44.
6. J.T.Coppock, The changing face of England, 1850-1900, in H.C.Darby, ed., A New Historical Geography of England, Cambridge University Press, 1973, p.602.
7. E.Hobsbawm, The Age of Capital, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London 1975, pp. 174-5.
8. See p. 167 below
9. Coppock, p.596.
10. W.H.Fraser, The Coming of the Mass Market, 1850-1914, Macmillan, 1981.
11. Coppock, p.646.
12. P.Robertson, Shell Book of Firsts, Ebury Press, 1978.
13. The Architect, September 17, 1881, p.185.
14. See, for example, L.Davidoff, The Best Circles, Society, Etiquette and the Season, Croom Helm, 1973.
15. The term (in hyphenated form) is first recorded in 1879. For more detailed discussion see A.D.King, 'A time for space and a space for time; the social production of the vacation house', in ibid., ed., Buildings and Society. Essays on the social development of the built environment, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1980, pp. 193-227.
16. C.S.Ward, Surrey and Sussex, Through guide series. Nelson, London, 1913, p.57; Map of Bellagio, c.1890. East Grinstead Society.
17. British Architect, 1888, p.74.
18. R.A.Briggs, Bungalows and Country Houses, Batsford, London, 1891, Preface.
19. British Architect, 1888, p.74.

20. Caterer and Hotel Proprietor's Gazette, Vol 11, Aug 15, 1888. I am indebted to Robert Thorne for this reference.
21. J.D.Kornwolf,
M.H.Baillie Scott and the Arts and Crafts Movement, Johns Hopkins Press, London, 1972.
22. Building News, July 7, 1893, p.6.
23. A.Service, ed., Edwardian Architecture.
24. R.A.Briggs, 'Bungalows', The Studio, Vol 3, 1894, pp.20-6, p.21.
25. Ibid., p.23.
26. Building News, 1893, p.6.
27. Ibid., May 20, 1898, p.700.
28. Ibid., June 10, 1898, p.810.
29. Ibid., Aug 6, 1909, p.191; June 15, 1910, p.67.
30. J.D.Booth, ed., The Works of A.M.Binstead, T.Werner Laurie, London, 1927, p.viii.
31. A.M.Binstead, Gal's Gossip, T.Werner Laurie, 1899.
32. C.G.Harper, Motoring in the South of England, RAC Guide, Burrow, London, about 1914, p.140. Letter from I.D.Margary, E.Grinstead, 12 June 1974.
33. Letter from R.G.Wood, E.Grinstead, 10 June 1974.
34. Letter from P.D.Wood, E.Grinstead, 13 June 1974.
35. Letter from I.D.Margary, 12 June 1974. For additional information on Bellagio, I am grateful to R.H. and P.D.Wood, Mr. R.W.Kidner of the Oakwood Press, E.Grinstead; to Mrs. I.P.Margary, Mrs.D.Leman and the County Records Officer, East Sussex C.C.
36. G.Gissing, The Whirlpool, Watergate Classics, London, 1948. (First published, 1897), especially 59, 72, 76, 83-4, 88, 156-7, 368. On the bungalow, 182, 197-200, 285. I am very grateful to Peter Keating, Edinburgh University for this reference.
37. e.g. see Building News, 1890, p.71; 1891, p.428; The Builder, 1891, pp. 392-3; British Architect, 1896, p.442.
38. P.Thompson, The Edwardians, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London 1975, p.13.
39. The Builder, July 11, 1891, p.33.
40. Building News, June 28, 1878, p.685. The similarity of two innovative house designs of this period to this description also suggests some inspiration from the bungalow. See R.N.Shaw, Sketches for Cottages & Other Buildings. Lascelles, London, 1878; and J.M.Richards

41. R.Kerr, Section I, in G.L.Sutcliffe, Ed., The Principles and Practice of Modern House Construction, Blackie, London, 1898, p.52.
42. Building News, 22 March 1895, pp.399-400, on which the following paragraph draws.
43. Ibid.
44. e.g. 'The Bungalow', Oakwood Grove, Leeds LS8 built about 1900-1. The occupants were firstly, 'provision dealers' and subsequently the proprietors of a large carpet merchandising firm.
45. Royal Agricultural Society Meeting, Leicester, 1895. Catalogue; Architectural Review, 9, 1901, p.250.
46. M.Girouard, Days of Victorian Glory. Cromer, Country Life, Aug 26, 1971, pp.502-5.
47. C.Scott, Three Sisters by the Sea, Lawrence Greeney, London, 1897, pp. 3, 15.
48. Girouard, 1971, op.cit.
49. Scott, p.15.
50. Pimlott, p.176-9.
51. Walvin, p.91.
52. D.Friedlander, Internal Migration in England and Wales, Population Studies, 19, March, 1966.
53. S.B.Saul, House building in England, 1890-1914, Economic History Review, 1962, 15, 1, pp. 119-137.
54. J.Walton, The Blackpool Landlady, Manchester University Press, 1978.
55. The World's Work and Leisure, 1903, 18.
56. Walvin, p.91.
57. S.Perks, Residential Flats, Batsford, London, 1905, p.55.
58. G.Herbert, Pioneers of Prefabrication, Yale University Press, 1978, pp. 65, 115.
59. Ibid., p.116.
60. H.Meller, Leisure and the Changing City, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976.
61. Ordnance survey maps, Sussex West, 1897 (survey, 1896); 1912 (survey 1909); Building World, November 1, 1902, p.1.
62. Bartholomew's New reduced survey for tourists and cyclists, Sussex 2 miles to 1". n.d. but about 1914.
63. H.L.Adams; Railway carriages as houses, The Harmsworth Magazine, Brighton Public Library, Sussex Pamphlet Box, n.d. but about 1910-20.

64. Building World, Nov 1, 1902, p.1.
65. P.T.Harrison, Bungalow Residences. A handbook for all interested in building, Crosby Lockwood, London, 1909, pp.1-3.
66. Westminster Gazette, April 8, 1908.
67. Howell, p.121; J.Walton, forthcoming study on the development of British seaside resorts.
68. Ibid.
69. Pimlott, p.180.
70. C.Scott, loc.cit.; See also Howell, p.175.
71. Building News, February 16, 1912, p.233. P.Robertson, Shell Book of Firsts, Ebury Press, London, 1978.
72. H.Cheal, The Story of Shoreham, Ginbridges, Hove, 1921, p.21.
73. H.Clunn, Famous South Coast Resorts, Past and Present, Whittingham and Co., London, 1929, p.371.
74. A.Rice, The heyday of bungalow town, Country Life, April 19, 1973, 1099-1100, indicates that the annual rental of a bungalow at Shoreham in the early twentieth century was £17.20. W.Cooper, Illustrated Catalogue of Goods, etc. 747-55 Old Kent Road, London. Horticultural providers, 1903, pp.410-11.
75. Building News, Feb 16, 1912, p.233; July 10, 1914, p.42.
76. Information from picture postcard, c.1910.
77. Information from picture postcard, c.1910-4.
78. Private communication, Dr.J.Walton, January 1982.
79. Westminster Gazette, April 8, 1907. Private communication, Dr.J. Walton, January 1982.
80. Information from picture postcard and Building News, April 8, 1908, p.485.
81. C.Scott, Poppyland, London, Jarrold, 1895, pp.112, 119.
82. H.G.Wells, In the Days of the Comet, Macmillan, London, 1906, pp.159-64.
83. Ibid.,
84. The Bungalow, 1899, p.1.
85. Ibid., July, 1899, p.2; no.6, p.6.
86. Ibid., Sept, 1899, no.10, p.10.
87. Ibid., March, 1900, p.18.
88. Ibid., November, 1899, p.12.

89. March 1900, p.1.
90. E.Carpenter, The Simplification of Life. Writings selected by H. Roberts, Treherne, London, 1905, pp.34-5; also W.H.G.Armytage, Heavens Below. Utopian experiments in England, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1961; D.Hardy, Alternative Communities in Nineteenth Century England. Longman, London, 1979. Also F.A.Morton, The Simple Life on Four Acres, London, 1906; F.McCarthy, The Simple Life. C.R.Ashbee in the Cotswolds. Lund Humphries, London, 1981.
91. J.Marsh, Edward Thomas. A poet for his country. Paul Elek, London, 1978, pp.30-5.
92. The Bungalow, October, 1899, p.11.
93. Ibid., July, 1900, p.27; November p.36; June, 1901, pp.23-4.
94. P.L.Cottrell, British Overseas Investment in the Nineteenth Century, Macmillan, London, 1975, pp.35, 40-1, 64.
95. Herbert, op.cit. See also catalogues of David Rowell, London, Francis Morton, Liverpool, Frederick Braby, Glasgow, Boulton & Paul, Norwich.
96. G.Hesse-Wartegg, Zwischen Anden und Amazonas, 1915, p.454.
97. Coppock, op.cit., p.608.
98. J.Burnett, A Social History of Housing, 1815, 1970. David & Charles, Newton Abbott, 1978, p.132.
99. Boulton and Paul, Homesteads for Small Holdings, Catalogue, 1908.
100. Marsh, op.cit., pp.35-6. 'Home Counties', Country Cottages. How to build, buy and fit them up, William Heinemann, 1905.
101. Harrison, op.cit.
102. King, op.cit., pp.204-5.
103. Ibid.
104. A.S.Jennings, The House Beautiful. A practical guide to the artistic decoration and furnishing of moderate-sized houses on inexpensive lines. Greening, London, 1908, pp.119-20.
105. Boulton and Paul, Catalogue of Horticultural Buildings, etc. Rose Lane, Norwich, 1889.
106. Wm Cooper, Illustrated Catalogue of Goods, London, 1903; Harrison Smith buildings, Vauxhall Works, Birmingham. Illustrated Catalogue and Price List, n.d. but about 1904-6; 'Home Counties', op.cit., p.100.
107. M.Bowley, Innovations in Building Materials, Cambridge University Press, 1960, pp.118-9.
108. Country gentleman's association, Artistic Country Buildings, Vol V, CGA, London, n.d. but about 1912-14.

109. R.Norman Shaw, Sketches for Cottages and Other Buildings designed to be constructed in patent cement slab system. W.H.Lascelles, London, 1878; see also A.E.Morris, Pre-cast Concrete in Architecture, George Godwin, London, 1978.
110. Bowley, p.120
111. 'Home Counties', xvii.
112. 'Home Counties', p.95.
113. The Country Gentleman, The Book of the Cheap Cottages Exhibition, published for the Committee of the Country Gentleman and the Land and Water Co. Ltd., 1905; Home Counties, p.89.
114. Cheap cottages and the exhibition at Letchworth, Architectural Review, 18, 1905, p.155-7; T.Potter, Buildings for small holdings, Batsford, 1909.
115. 'Home Counties'. pp.1-4.
116. Ibid.
117. 'Home Counties', p.4.
118. R.Harper, The conflict between English building regulations and architectural design, Journal of Architectural Research, 6,1,p.24-33.
119. Ibid. See also discussion in 'Home Counties'.
120. 'Home Counties', p.8.
121. Ibid, p.15. Also Building News, Feb 13, 1903, p.246.
122. Ibid., p.24.
123. Architectural Review, 26, 1909, p.310.
124. Building News, August 25, 1899, p.250.
125. B.J.L.Berry,ed., Urbanization and counter-urbanization. Sage,London, 1976.
126. The World's Work and Leisure, Vol 1, 1902-3, pp.362-7.
127. G.Bourne, Change in the Village, London,Duckworth, 1912, pp.6,16,129.
128. C.F.G.Masterman,The Condition of England, London, Methuen, 1960. First published 1909, pp.57,69,161.
129. See King, 1980, op.cit.
- 130 E.Lichtenburger,The changing nature of European urbanization, in Berry, 1976, op.cit., pp.81-108; also G.Martinotti, Introduction to special issue on 'Historical patterns of reaction to urbanism', International Journal of urban and regional research, 4,4,1980.
131. See Chapter seven.
132. Hobsbawn, 1975, p.297.
133. A.D.King, Historical patterns to reaction to urbanism:the case of Britain 1880-1939. International Journal of Urban and regional research,4,4, 1980, pp. 453-66.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE BUNGALOW IN AMERICA 1880 - 1980

Introduction

I Summer Cottage

The bungalow as summer cottage

Back to nature: the bungalow as product of Arcadian myth

Arts and Crafts and 'The Craftsman' Bungalow

II Suburban Home

Suburbanisation: the Los Angeles experience

The Californian Bungalow

The bungalow as suburban mass house

The Californian image in Britain

The bungalow in decline

III Appraisal

The American bungalow in social perspective

Architectural significance

CHAPTER FOUR

THE BUNGALOW IN AMERICA 1880 - 1980

Introduction

If the development of the modern bungalow had taken place in Britain, then it certainly matured in the USA. Here, in a way that is only now being realised, its significance was immense. As in England, it was not only a precursor of the contemporary purpose-built vacation home; of more economic and social importance, it was instrumental in the development of the modern mass suburb. The prototype for this, the 'fragmented metropolis' with its tens of thousands of low density, single family dwellings, was Los Angeles: it is therefore no coincidence that something called the 'California Bungalow' developed in the early years of this century as a new and distinctively modern form of home. In this guise, it was - in the words of a recent authority - 'to exert the greatest influence upon the domestic architecture of the country', (1) to be a harbinger of modern house design. The bungalow's later popularity in Britain was not unconnected with these developments.

In recent years, considerable interest has been shown in the three main topics with which this chapter is concerned. In architecture, the American bungalow has become the subject of increasing attention; (2) in geography and leisure studies, vacation homes are in important field of research. Thirdly, in the political economy of urbanisation, a renewed interest has arisen in understanding the relation of suburbanisation to the functioning of the market economy. (3)

This chapter aims to throw light on all these themes and, if only in an implicit and indirect way, to show the inter-relations between them. Previously, architectural studies have - with some exceptions - primarily considered the bungalow from a somewhat narrow viewpoint of 'style'; its economic and social importance have been largely overlooked. Where earlier writers have classified the phenomenon according to region, designer or style, this chapter suggests that its significance can be more clearly understood by using the simple functional distinction suggested above, namely, the bungalow as summer residence and its use as permanent suburban home - even though the distinction was not always so

clear cut. It was, for example, the image of the bungalow as a 'simple, yet artistic' summer dwelling that was at least partly responsible for its adoption as a suburban home.

A study of this second role provides some interesting insights into the large-scale suburbanisation which took place in North America in the early years of the twentieth century. What recent studies have brought out is the function of suburban development in attracting investment capital and generating market demand. Yet whilst capital is obviously essential for their development, the actual shape which suburbs take depends on many influences, social cultural, technological, political and, not least, ideological. It is this last factor, ideology, understood simply as the prevailing ideas and beliefs of dominant interests in society, with which much of this chapter is concerned. Other research will be needed on the economic basis of suburban expansion and the development of the mass vacation house in the early years of the twentieth century. What this chapter explores is the role of the 'bungalow ideology' in promoting both and, in the process, bringing about architectural change.

The first theme of this chapter then, is the relation of ideology to architecture: how do social and intellectual beliefs mould the dwellings and landscapes in which people live? The second theme concerns the relationship of a dwelling to its setting: in the massive growth of early twentieth century suburbs which technology, cheap energy and the free play of market forces brought about, the bungalow was developed as an ideal suburban home. Finally, the chapter considers the role of the American bungalow in the emergence of modern architectural design.

I Summer Cottage

The bungalow as summer cottage

In the opinion of two leading historians, the modern American city emerged between 1860 - 1910. In these years, the percentage of city dwellers increased from less than twenty to over forty-five percent (4)
the rapid

growth of the 1880s partly resulting from the building up of a national system of transport. In the same decade, as the forces of capitalist industrialisation increasingly concentrated production in cities, railroad mileage doubled and the migration of rural people moved citywards rather than to the West. Not only were Americans increasingly urban but the size of the largest cities grew. In the second half of the century, the number of 100,000 plus cities rose from two to seventeen. (5) This was especially so in the north east where America's oldest, largest and wealthiest metropolises - New York, Boston, Baltimore and Philadelphia - were located. (6)

It was near these cities - and Chicago - that the summer resorts of America had developed, mainly since the Civil War. The expression of conspicuous consumption and surplus capital, they lay along the north-east seaboard, or, for Chicago, on the larger lakes. Of them all, Newport, Rhode Island, was probably the most well-known and here, from the 1840s, visitors began building their villas and 'cottages', the small houses placed round hotels to accommodate the overflow of guests. Later, the term came to be applied to the huge mansions and palaces serving as 'summer cottages' for New York and other elites. (7)

The 1880s brought a big increase in these developments. 'The eastern coast', wrote Charles D Warner in 1885 'with its ragged outline of bays, headlands, indentations . . . from Watch Hill . . . to Mount Desert, presents an almost continual chain of hotels and summer cottages. In fact, the same may be said of the whole Atlantic coast from Mount Desert to Cape May' (i.e. from Maine to New Jersey) (8) As in Britain, the growth of industrialised production had swelled the ranks of the commercial, professional and rentier class, providing architects and builders with a growing clientele. But too, the increase in building activity at this time seems also to have been linked with the international movement of capital and its investment in the built environment. As Brinley Thomas has shown, in the 'Atlantic economy' of the nineteenth century, the long waves of investment in the built environment moved inversely to each other in Britain and the United States. In England, the bungalow had been introduced as part of larger urban developments in the early 1870s when investment in building was on the increase. As this declined in Britain during the 1880s, it rose rapidly in the United States. The two movements were not independent of each other but tied via the migrations of capital within the framework of the international economy of the time. (9)

Though further research would need to be done on the financing of summer homes and resorts, it seems more than a coincidence that the bungalow was introduced in America at this time.

The earliest known American bungalow to be named as such was part of ~~4-1~~ these resort developments. Built in 1880 at Monument Beach, Cape Cod by a Boston architect and probably for a Boston client, (10) its simple structure, broad verandah and location on the shore suggest that, for both, 'bungalow' meant a simple seaside vacation house, irrespective of its two and a half storey form. That the term is apparently first used in North America in this way suggests not only that the idea had come from England but, with neither explanation of the word nor description of the house in the American Architect and Building News where it was illustrated, readers were expected to be familiar with its use.

Yet in the middle eighties, the idea of the bungalow as a simple summer cottage, a purpose-built 'vacation home', was still comparatively new. When the second known example appeared, in a book of cottage designs by ~~4-2~~ New York architect, Arnold Brunner, in 1884, it figured as the frontispiece and received a definition. 'Bungalow, as the one storey houses used in India are called, seem adapted to some parts of America particularly as summer cottages'. For New Yorkers interested in up-state country relaxation, it was seen as 'attractive to those disliking going up and down stairs', the verandah 'a particular American feature'. (11)

Noting that the cottage habit had diffused to the less affluent bourgeoisie, Brunner had produced designs for 'medium and low cost houses' (the latter between 500 and 1000 dollars) by various architects and directed to a growing New York middle class. About this time, this might have included insurance clerks with 1,800 dollars a year up to lawyers with about 4,000. (12) 'In view of the rapid growth of "Art Ideas" and the general improvement in taste in the last years', he believed there was 'a demand for dwellings reasonable in cost yet artistic and homelike'. If these remarks anticipate the social and aesthetic ideas of the 'Arts and Crafts' ideology, other comments seem to confirm them: 'during the last few years . . . our conception of what a country house should be has entirely changed. Simplicity, elegance and refinement of design are demanded and outward display, overloading with cheap ornamentation, is no longer in favour'. (13) Though at about three and a half to four thousand dollars, his bungalow was hardly for the mass.

This concern with simplicity and artistry, echoing back to the early

1870s in Kent and, as we shall see, forward to California and the new-style American home of the 1900s, forms a key to later developments. And whilst Brunner reaffirmed the single-storey definition, his own bungalow had one and a half storeys with bedrooms in the loft - a feature to become characteristic of the American type. Yet the term also suggested a simply built summer residence or 'second home' with strong horizontal lines, informal appearance and either attached or incorporated verandahs. Of less than a dozen bungalows known to have been designed in North America in the nineteenth century, and mainly in the last decade, (14) all apparently functioned as 'summer cottages', in the mountains, the country or by the sea, and practically all in the North Atlantic states. The reasons are not hard to seek.

4.3
4.4
4.5

At one level, the actual idea of the bungalow seems to have arrived in North America by way of an increasing professional network, an interchange of books and journals, including the English Building News and The Studio, with Briggs' article of 1894. Brunner, for example, seems likely to have picked up the term from Shaw's Sketches for Cottages (1878), and by 1901, Briggs' Bungalows and Country Residences had gone into five editions since it first appeared in 1891. Yet the 'need' for something called a bungalow, or at least the perception of that need, and the preconditions for it, had had to be created as well. 'Everyone wants some little place, some little corner in this big world which can be called his own' wrote Frank Lent, in Summer Homes and Camps at the end of century. 'The idea of home is each year entering more and more into arrangements for the summer. It is often the case that the members of the family see more of each other during the leisure of the summer than during all the rest of the year. Many families make it a point to gather under one roof at least every summer, and there are many cases where the summer residence is the only home, the family living there six or eight months continuously and spending the remainder of the year in travelling or living in hotels'. (15) Such, according to one of their architects, was the plight of wealthy bourgeois families fleeing from the city. In 1890, New York, with well over two and a half million inhabitants, was, next to London, the largest city in the world. Of an increasingly urban population, half were concentrated in the North Atlantic states where Massachusetts, with two thirds of its inhabitants in towns and Boston a growing city of half a million, was the most urbanised state of all. Other states where summer cottaging developed - Rhode Island, New York and New Jersey -

contained the largest number, and wealthiest section of the country's city population. (16) On the west coast too, 'getting back to Nature' was equally in vogue. (17)

About a hundred years later, a study of the second home phenomenon in the USA concluded that 'sufficient income and sufficient leisure time' provided the opportunity for vacation house ownership in the later twentieth century. Other factors, including 'capital accumulation, status attainment and the desire to engage in outdoor recreation' provided the motive, while improvements in transport, and the availability of vacation house types and sites offered the opportunity. (18) Yet with the architect-designed bungalow at Monument Beach providing the chance to fish, gaze at scenery, boat or chat idly in the verandah, most of these opportunities and motives seem to have been present, for some at least, in the 1880s if not before.

Back to Nature. The bungalow as product of Arcadian myth

These few examples, however, only hint of things to come. Apart from Brunner's scanty reference, there seems to have been no discussion let alone theorising about the bungalow in America until the early twentieth century. From then on, between about 1905 and 1915, bungalow books and articles - as well as the phenomenon itself - proliferated on all sides.

The full impact of urbanisation seems to have struck America's intellectuals and writers at the close of the nineteenth century. In his study of American reactions to urbanism, Peter Schmitt describes how the modern metropolis not only refashioned the physical environment of townspeople but also profoundly altered the way in which they perceived the natural world outside the city. (19) For its inhabitants, there developed an 'Arcadian myth', a 'back to nature' movement which attracted wide support amongst the urban middle and upper middle class, creating institutions and attitudes which remain firmly entrenched today. It was similar, yet also different, from what was taking place in Britain at the same time.

The urge for the out-of-doors, the rugged life and the rustic was not a rejection of city life. In Schmitt's words, the middle class city dwellers who looked 'back to nature' at the turn of the century did so to escape the minor irritants not 'the problems' of urban life. 'Poverty, crime and disease disturbed them less than did the press of crowds along antiquated sidewalks, the rattle of wheels on cobblestone streets or soft coal smog.

Such folk heartily approved the opportunities for social and economic success, the education and . . . cultural advantages that accompanied urban life. They simply realised, as every suburban mother knew, that the city is no place to raise a family'. (20)

The attraction of 'nature' was, of course, not new; it had flourished in the eighteenth century and in Romantic thought of the nineteenth. But as the twentieth century drew close, the back to nature movement shifted from being a luxury of the rich to a preoccupation of the urban middle class. Nature and the country were redefined to suit urban tastes; 'Nature Study' was introduced into city classroom, 'Country Clubs' established on the edge of towns, bird lore encouraged for city ornithologists and the 'wilderness novel' developed to give city men 'the breath of real life but without its inconveniences'. (21) And for city gents who could afford it, it encouraged a temporary return to the wild, a search for solitude in the bush.

It was these ideas which led, from the turn of the century, to the flood of nature and 'wilderness writing'; if W.H.H.Murray's Adventures in the Wilderness: or Camping Life in the Adirondacks (1869) was an early manifestation, the build-up occurred in the first decades of the century with titles like In the Open (1908), Outdoor Philosophy: The Meditations of a Naturalist (1912) and Tenting Tonight: a Chronicle of Sport and Adventure(1918). The most well-known, Jack London's Call of the Wild (1901) was one of the six best selling novels between 1900 and 1930. Newly founded family and home-maker magazines such as House Beautiful (1896), House and Garden (1901) and American Homes and Gardens (1905) regularly contained articles on nature lore and the 'simple life'. (22) It was these which helped to promote home ownership, encouraged the pursuit of nature in the suburbs and, when it arrived, sang the praises of the bungalow.

The 'back to nature' movement was related to another ideology affecting intellectual circles at this time, the social and aesthetic movement of the 'Arts and Crafts' which had developed in England from the 1880s. In rejecting the consumer society, it was a moral and humanist attack on bourgeois civilisation and materialism, its belief in 'unity with nature', the pursuit of simplicity and the handmade being the source for changes which later took place in the arts.(23) By the early 1890s, the ideas behind the 'spiritual crusade' of the Arts and Crafts were being taken up in the USA. (24)

It was from these two ideological strains that, after the hesitant

start outlined above, the bungalow as 'summer cottage' was really to blossom out. The second more or less simultaneous development - the bungalow as suburban dwelling - was not unconnected with the first.

Arts and Crafts and 'The Craftsman' Bungalow

Of all the house and architectural journals founded at this time, one of the most important for the bungalow's development was The Craftsman, edited by Gustav Stickley from New York.

Just what connection there was between the ideas behind The Bungalow published in London between 1899 and 1900 and those of the English artists and writers associated with the 'Arts and Crafts' only more detailed research might disclose. Further digging might uncover the links between these names and their aesthetic and social ideas as they crossed the Atlantic (with Gustav Stickley for example, who visited England in 1898) to emerge in North America and especially in the pages of The Craftsman. For where The Bungalow was an ephemeral literary gazette having no connections with building or design, The Craftsman, fusing architecture with social reform, was devoted to the development, both in theory and practice, of the three main principles of the Arts and Crafts philosophy - simplicity, harmony with nature, and the promotion of craftsmanship. The bungalow was to become the incarnation of all three.

'Published in the interests of art and labour', The Craftsman ran from 1901 to 1916. Stickley, the founder of the United Artists and Craftsmen, aimed 'to promote and extend the principles established by Morris in both the artistic and socialistic sense'. (25)

4-6

From the start, The Craftsman's pages were sprinkled with quotations from Kropotkin, Walt Whitman, Ruskin, Edward Carpenter and Arts and Crafts enthusiasts such as C.R.Ashbee; in 1905 it added the sub-title, 'an illustrated monthly magazine for the Simplification of Life'. From 1903 on, regularly included in its issues were designs, plans and discussions of the bungalow.

'Of late years it has become more and more the approved thing to own the country home or camp and to go there year after year' reported the journal in 1906; and 'for any place, whether in mountain or valley that is really "in the country" the best form of summer house is the bungalow'. Here was a dwelling which embodied the essence of the Arts and Crafts

philosophy. It was 'a house reduced to its simplest form where life can be carried on with the greatest amount of freedom; it never fails to harmonise with its surroundings . . . it was never expensive because it was built of local material and labour; and it was beautiful as it was planned to meet the simplest needs in the simplest way'. (26)

Three years earlier (1903) Stickley had made the point even more explicitly: the American bungalow was 'nothing more or less than a summer residence of extreme simplicity, economic construction and intended for more or less primitive living'. With its low-pitched, sweeping roof, the single-storey dwelling was literally closest to Nature both in form and in site. The stress on low-lying horizontality was 'a subject of congratulation that the countryside is no longer affronted with lean, narrow, two-storey houses'. Similarly, the simple wood construction, cedar and redwood shingles (which in time 'came to look like autumn leaves') combined with 'the rough stone of the large chimney to tie the building to its surroundings and give it the seeming of a growth rather than a creation.'(27)

This close identification also influenced the interior: walls might be in dull olive yellow burlap, the exposed ceiling in wet mossy green, woodwork should be of hemlock or cypress, the exposed stonework fireplace of weathered limestone.

The design for the 'Craftsman Bungalow' used field stone set at random, rough hewn timber walls, a stone fireplace with an elk's head over it. Stencilled on the one and a half foot frieze were 'conventional objects relating to primitive life' . . . 'Great care should be taken . . . to omit every article that is not absolutely essential to the comfort or convenience of the occupants, it not being intended to make the building . . . a cheap museum . . . as frequently happens in the summer cottage to the great disturbance of the simple life'. (28)

Between 1905 and 1907, designs for 'Forest', 'Craftsman', 'Hillside' and other bungalows appeared among Stickley's 'Craftsmen Homes'. Though the prices ranged from 300 dollars upwards, Stickley's sympathies were for the simplest which he saw as appealing to the rising number of middle class professionals like the young lawyer building a bungalow a thousand feet up from the shore of Lake Michigan. There was a growing concern to develop the bungalow as a natural, essentially American product, appropriate to 'the new wilderness areas being used by vacationers'.

Going back to Nature was 'part nostalgia and part therapy'; the country was a place where wealthy city dwellers could live for a time the

uncomfortable life which none of them would ever dream of making permanent. As early as 1878, C.D. Warner's In the Wilderness had described 'the instinct of barbarism that leads people periodically to throw away the habits of civilisation and seek the freedom and discomfort of the woods'. It was not so easy to understand, however, why such passion should be strongest in those who are most refined and trained in intellectual and social fastidiousness'. (29) Yet it was just this group, secure in health, wealth and social position for whom 'the primitive' had an appeal:

To those of us who live and work amid the artificiality of city life there is something irresistably attractive in the idea of being close to the heart of nature, wearing old clothes and living for a time the free and easy life which we like to imagine was lived before the call of the city became insistent.

wrote Robert Court in an early reference to 'Vacation Homes in the Woods'. (30) Similar sentiments were expressed by Bliss Carman writing on 'The Use of the Out of Doors' in The Craftsman in 1907: 'we are crowded and hustled and irritated to the point of physical desperation in our thoroughfares and markets, our tenements and tiny apartments, our shops and street cars . . . Give us more air and sun and ground under foot and we will give you fewer instances of unfortunate morality, knavery, greed and despair. (31)

This concept of 'the primitive' and 'the rugged life' is best illustrated by such books as William Comstock's Bungalows, Camps and Mountain Homes (1908, 1915) or Henry Saylor's Bungalows. Their Design, Construction and Furnishing (with suggestions also for camps, summer homes and cottages) (1912). Bungalows according to Saylor, had become 'a fad for many wealthy city men who want some sort of retreat in the woods where they can entertain as freely as in the city'. (32) Here, irrespective of cost, they constructed their own idea of 'the simple life' which, as some cynic observed a few years earlier, was 'a final evolution reached by a system of unlimited complication'. (33) It was in the same spirit that someone else had defined a bungalow as 'a house that looks as if it had been built for less money than it actually cost'. (34)

What such simplicity and ruggedness meant was a low rambling mass, wide verandahs and over-hanging eaves; a building of a picturesque and informal type buried deep in the wood or by a lake or the seashore.

Wherever it was, the natural environment should be undisturbed, trees left standing and materials chosen to secure 'the intimate relationship between home and surroundings that conveys an impression of peace and stability rather than strife and unfitness'. (35) **4-8**

Living simply required complex thought. Time was worth spending on planning as, while avoiding the formality of the city household, the bungalow had still to be as comfortable, and with all its convenience and privacy. It was an important point, best expressed perhaps by Elon Jessup's book, Roughing it Smoothly (1923) or an article in the Woman's Home Companion in 1916, 'The old-fashioned log cabin is the new-fashioned summer camp, with all the comforts of modern life and all the picturesqueness of pioneer days'.

Sleeping out of doors was the touchstone of the outdoor philosophy. 'To sleep outdoors for a month' was, according to Bliss Carman, 'better than a trip to Europe', (36) a comment presumably meant for those who could afford the luxuries of both. To fulfill this need, the sleeping porch became an essential feature of the bungalow, whether as summer cottage or suburban home.

Whatever the outside - hewn logs, brick, stone or shingles, provided it 'harmonised with nature' - the interior should reflect 'the simple life'. At all costs, plastered walls had to be avoided in favour of raw brickwork, 'natural' timber or boulder finish. The fireplace - meriting a whole chapter in Saylor's account - was the symbolic centre: 'a bungalow without a fireplace' was like 'a garden without flowers'. The ideal was a large, ceiling-high mass of plain bricks, stones or rough boulders, finished with a suitable mantel, 'an old railroad tie' for example, 'supported on five or six wrought iron spikes'. Sturdy 'craftsman furniture' of brown oak was best for the living rooms, as also were other 'natural materials' such as willow, wicker or woven grass. 'If there was one place more than another where white and gold vases or gilt clocks or other symbols of city wealth were unfitting' wrote Stickley, 'it was in the bungalow living room'. Except for a few - especially handmade - oriental rugs, floors were bare. On the porch, carefully contrived informality prevailed: potted plants, a coarse woven grass mat. One table might have 'a few good books and the current magazines'. (37) **4-9**
4-10
4-11
4-12

Such basic requirements were supplemented by the owner's props, well illustrated in the interiors of Comstock's Mountain Bungalows. Here, for the urbane, educated city dweller, were the - essentially male - symbols with which he transformed himself into 'primitive man', a Daniel Boone or a Davy Crockett. Fishing nets hang from the ceiling, snow shoes

and frying pans on the walls, hardwood chairs, guns, fishing rods, shooting hats - symbols of what the Great Outdoors man, President Theodore Roosevelt, called 'the strenuous life'. Here too are the clues to the intellectual origins of it all - the college penants bearing 'Swarthmore' or 'Yale', the beermugs, the shelves of books on built-in cupboards. Small wonder then that the greatest 'wilderness writer' of them all, Jack London, 'the ideal of strenuous Americanism, apostle of scientific socialism, spirit of world-wandering', ex-coal heaver, worker on the Yukon goldfields and best-selling author of Call of the Wild decided in 1906 to come to Sonoma County in California where 'out of his own rock and sand he purposes to erect a spacious bungalow'; Here to find 'the wild joy of living'. (38) 4-13

For those unable to afford such architect-designed bungalows, Saylor's book included more modest versions, the portable bungalow, the camp shack or tent-house. For city folk, more used to working at a desk than a bench, manual toil took on its own romantic appeal. Building-it-yourself became a popular middle class urban philosophy, typically expressed by the wilderness writer S.E.White in his trilogy The Forest, The Mountain and The Cabin completed in 1911. White's cabin in the mountains, became 'the measure of himself. Building it, he learned the restraint of careful craftsmanship, the value of axe and adze, and the caution of brewed time and solitude'. There was 'a real joy in the smell of the newly cut wood and its gradual transformation under the tools that never palls'. (39)

In 1907, with 'the bungalow fever still upon us', Indoors and Out devoted almost its entire issue to the phenomenon. 'We have contracted (the fever) in daily intercourse with our friends; the germ continues to reach us through our evening mail. We want every one of our readers to own a bungalow . . . and we shall continue to publish bungalows so long as our readers impart to us the bungalow bacillus'. It was time for 'our savage selves to go outdoors and whoop. City life and indoor conventionalities should be forgotten'. Using a haphazard collection of bungalow pictures and drawing freely on Briggs' book, the editor discussed 'the word, bungalow . . . one that was in everyone's mouth who talks of rusticity and ease in the country . . . conveying a sense of roughing it a bit, living more or less in the open air for pleasure, a hint at extemporised conveniences with a suspicion of Bohemianism and a laxity of conventional conduct'. (40) 4-14

4-15

II Suburban Home

Suburbanisation : the Los Angeles experience

It was a somewhat different version, however, which became the typical suburban home for millions of Americans in the two or three decades after 1905. If universal car ownership combined with federal support for private developers to establish total suburbanisation after World War II, (41) the origin of the phenomenon - tracts of small, single family, privately-owned dwellings, each on its own plot - was in the age of the electric streetcar of half a century before. (42)

In the early nineteenth century, American cities had been fairly compact. From the 1830s, economic, social and technological developments had led to gradual suburbanisation. Suburbs had not developed simply because of improvements in transport: investments of capital were also required and the economic and social motivations of people moving to them also need considering. The steady change to industrial and capitalist forms of production encouraged a growing division of labour and, as the surplus wealth which industrialisation created combined with the steam train, horse railway and cable car to produce the suburbs, the emerging social hierarchy of the work place was increasingly reflected in the different residential areas round the town. The growing social differentiation which suburbanisation brought about - to become the typical pattern for free market societies in the twentieth century - was to be exploited for profit by all those with interests in property and land - developers, builders, estates agents and architects, and not least, by the house-owners themselves. (43) All benefitted from the growing market in suburban land and the higher values which social segregation introduced.

Hence, though transport developments were not the only reason for the expanding suburbs, the introduction of the electric streetcar in the late 1880s and early 90s was nonetheless a major impetus to their growth. (44)

Suburban living, previously limited to a wealthy few, became available to the many. By the end of the century 'middle class suburb' had become an acceptable social category; the large-scale production of the automobile was to follow - not create - the emergence of the modern mass suburbs in the early years of the twentieth century. (45) Though suburbs had grown immensely in Eastern and Mid-Western cities, the classical case of suburban

explosion was California: Los Angeles became the prototype, and archetype, of the fragmented suburban metropolis now typical of the USA. (46)

Until the 1850s, California had been a barren land, the territory of neighbouring Mexico. The Gold Rush brought the first real influx of population and, in 1850, the incorporation of the state into the American Union. In the following thirty years, growth was relatively small but with the transcontinental railway linking California to the East in 1885, the great migration began.

The reasons why people came, who they were and where they were from, all, in their own way, contributed to the kind of residential environment which later emerged - not least to the development of the California Bungalow. At the turn of the century, newcomers to Los Angeles were mainly middle class, rural mid-Western or at least native white Americans. 'Unlike the typical American metropolis, Los Angeles did not have at any time in its modern history a vast group of European immigrants'. (47) Mexicans, Japanese and blacks also migrated to the city but they were a minority confined, in the early years, to downtown areas.

For the majority of newcomers, the motivation to migrate was not just economic; some came to retire - wealthy people from the mid-West or East, attracted by the warm, dry California climate and the attractive suburbs of Los Angeles or the more upmarket Pasadena, a fashionable resort in the 1890s and soon to provide the setting for the exotic California bungalows of the architects, Greene and Greene. Others came for a holiday, spurred by the health-giving properties of Southern California. Between 1890 and 1910, the proportion of over fifty-fives in the 'city of the angels' doubled from 8% to 17% and by 1920, at 21%, it was larger than in most other Eastern or Western American cities. (48) From the start, California seemed to attract a self-selected population - the innovative, creative, entrepreneurial and democratic. More easy-going than their countrymen in the east, the new Californians were less formal and perhaps more idealistic. (49) Late nineteenth century San Francisco had a reputation of being free and open, artistic and with its own 'Bohemian Club'. (50) At the turn of century, discarded tramcars set on floating rafts made pleasant houseboats for the arty: 'there are', reported World's Work in an article on the 'Open Air Life' in 1903 'worse things than a railway car as the foundation for a bungalow'. (51) A few years before and contemporary with Shoreham's Bungalow Town, an entrepreneur had set up a 'streetcar village' in the shadow of San Francisco variously called Ocean Side, Ozoma or Carville. Other 'carvilles' had mushroomed on the Atlantic seaboard, as well as America's rivers and lakes. (52) Robert Fogelson describes how, at the

turn of the century, there seems to have been a profound change in American values: people were less willing to devote their lives to simply improving their material condition of life. Though not renouncing wealth, there was nonetheless a shift in favour of self-realisation, a move to a life that could be enjoyed. California, with its benign climate, open society, exotic landscape and a familiar developing suburban environment offered 'an easier, more varied, less complicated and well-rounded life'. (53)

After the collapse of an initial land boom in the 1880s, the real development of Los Angeles got under way. In the first three decades of this century, the city population soared from just over 100,000 to well over a million; the largest increase, of over 200%, occurring between 1900 and 1910 with a massive surge between 1904 and 1906. (54) Overall in the USA, there was a spurt of investment in building. (55) It was precisely in these years that the suburban bungalow boom seems to have begun.

Suburbanisation, as has been suggested, resulted from a variety of factors. One authority suggests that it is best explained by reference to four factors, all of them related: the availability of resources; prevailing values - both individual and social; particular institutions and the availability of technologies, especially transportation. (56) In terms of all four, early twentieth century California provided an ideal setting. Its resources included almost endless supplies of relatively cheap land, made available by the electric railway, a buoyant economy and a fairly wealthy population; for its inhabitants, the 'Arcadian dream' of life in a rural setting and of owning one's own single family home, were the values which encouraged suburban growth; of the institutions, the free operation of the private market - of developers, sub-dividers and railway companies - provided the plots on which people could achieve their dreams; and technology was there in the form of the new modes of transport.

In California, electric railway interests combined with real estate development led to rapid and extensive suburban development round Los Angeles. Men such as Henry Huntington, with his Pacific Electric Railway and Huntington Land and Improvement Company, as well as lesser developers, provided the tens of thousands of plots on which people could build their homes. Elsewhere, other developers put up bungalows and houses which newcomers later bought. Though the car was to supersede the railway, it was the private sub-division of land, and the shared assumptions of railway companies, city authorities, highway builders and, not least, the

million inhabitants, which were to create the most widely scattered metropolitan suburbs up to that time. In the words of Robert Fogelson

'the unique dispersal of Los Angeles reflected not so much its chronology, geography or technology as the exceptional character of its population - relatively affluent and secure, the native Americans had a much wider choice than European immigrants of housing and communities, to both of which . . . they gave a conception of the good community which was embodied in the single-family houses located on large lots, surrounded by landscaped lawns and isolated from business activities'.

As much as anything, it was a reaction against the city they knew.

Not for them, the multi-family dwellings, confined to narrow plots, separated by cluttered streets and interspersed with commerce and industry. Their vision was . . . the residential suburb, spacious, affluent, clean, decent, permanent and homogenous - not the congested, impoverished, filthy and immoral great city'. (57)

Developers interested in profits, responded to these aims. Hence California's vast countryside was transformed into Los Angeles' sprawling suburbs; the purchaser brought his lot and on it he, or someone else, built his home. By 1930, Los Angeles had more single-family, and fewer multi-family dwellings than any comparable metropolis; of its more than a third of a million families, a staggering 94% were living in single-family homes. (58) Instrumental to the emergence of this new suburban ecology was an innovative, small, single family 'simple but artistic' dwelling - inexpensive, easily built yet at the same time attractive to the incoming middle and aspiring middle class population: the California Bungalow - a term in use by 1905 if not before. (59) It was these developments which explain the thousands of five to twenty five dollar bungalow drawings and plans which appear in increasing profusion from about this time.

The California Bungalow

The metamorphosis of the bungalow from vacation home to permanent house was helped by transferring the ideology which had brought the first about - the idea that one could live 'close to nature' in a 'simple but artistic home'. It was the 'Back to Nature' syndrome applied to the commuter's house. The idea was best expressed in Radford's Artistic Bungalows, one of many similar books published in 1908.

The bungalow is the renewal in artistic form of the primitive 'love in a cottage' sentiment that lives in some degree in every human heart. Architecturally, it is the result of the effort to bring about harmony between the house and its surroundings, to get as close as possible to nature.

It was 'a tangible protest of modern life against the limitations and severities of humdrum existence'. And 'though primarily intended for the wilds, this style of home has been seized on eagerly by home builders in every hamlet of the land, in every town and city'. (60) It was 'a radical departure from the older style of cottage, not only in outward appearance but in inside arrangement'. (61)

Until the early twentieth century, in the East and mid-West of the USA, 'bungalow' had simply meant a summer house, 'a temporary country house of ample dimensions . . . perhaps of somewhat unfinished or inferior construction', a low building with an air of informal charm. (62) Even the 'comfortable bungalows in California', the best at between 3000-5000 dollars, though with cheaper versions at 300-2,200 in the influential Ladies Home Journal of January 1904 - an early reference to the phenomenon - were apparently for summer homes. (63) Yet it also seems to have been taken up as a permanent residence about this time. 'Instead of being perched on a hill top and surrounded by rocks and grass, it was situated on a street and surrounded by suburban villas'. Low and spacious, simply built, inexpensive and 'trying to be "artistic" ', the one or one and a half storey suburban bungalow was set snug to the ground, with overhanging eaves, shaded porches and rough stones for chimneys and foundations. (64) The essential feature was that 'there should be as little distinction between indoors and out', an effect achieved not only by the design, location and materials, but by covering it all over with vines. (65) In describing 'the bungalow at its best', one architect had planned his dining room so that

'the occupant will feel as much as possible that he is out of doors. The walls are converted into large windows, quite unbroken by sashes and designed so to frame the views of grass, trees and foliage . . . In this instance, the wooden enclosure of the room is so far as possible broken down so that its inhabitants may live, at least with their eyes, out of doors'. (66)

In May, 1906 The Craftsman published an article on 'The Bungalow . Its possibilities as a permanent home'.

The bungalow as suburban mass house

This ideology - to become increasingly adopted in domestic design of the twentieth century - was not only behind the architect-designed bungalows of California; it was also in the folk culture of the suburban house. The bungalow, in some American cities at least, was to be the ultimate development of social and architectural trends already in motion. As Gwen Wright has recently shown, between 1873 and 1913, the form of the American middle class house underwent a major transformation 'from an exuberant, highly personalised display of irregular shapes, picturesque contrasts and varieties of ornament, supposedly symbolising the uniqueness of the family, to a restrained and simple dwelling, with interest focussed on its scientifically-arranged kitchen. The twentieth century model house was more visibly like others in a planned, homogeneous community'. (67)

The bungalow, after all, was not just simple and artistic; it was also cheap. The ideology behind it combined with, even if it was not just produced by, the economic interests of both owners and developers. For the crowds flocking to California, it offered the opportunity of a detached, single family dwelling which they had never experienced before. The 'simple life', 'back to nature' ideology legitimised an economic choice. Advances in pre-fabricated building following the development of the steam-saw, and industrialised production, meant that self-built bungalows could now be constructed from as little as 400 dollars. In Practical Bungalows for Town and Country (1906, and reprinted three times in the next ten years), the first of literally dozens of American bungalows books published before the end of the twenties, (68), Frederick T. Hodgson described the Californian bungalow as 'the best type of cheap frame house which had been erected in this country since the old New England farmhouse went out of fashion'. Coming from one of the foremost building-journalists in the country, such a statement must have carried some weight. Hodgson (1836-1919) was a self-trained Canadian carpenter-builder who went to New York in 1880 to edit the American Builder. Subsequently, he moved to Chicago to become editor of the National Builder and produced more than fifty books on construction techniques and architectural styles. (69)

Though only about thirty out of Hodgson's three hundred designs were actually for bungalows, these could be constructed for between 700 and 1,100 dollars compared to over double the price for two-storey houses. Plan prices were a mere five dollars. In the mild dry climate of California, where much of life was lived outdoors, the construction could be relatively

flimsy and substantial foundations and cellars ignored. Moreover, the new, informal lifestyle of California meant that 'much of the interior finish . . . considered necessary to the adornment of the house, even of a mechanic' in other parts of the country could be dispensed with, and redwood sheathing, for example, substituted for plaster work. (70)

In the ten years after 1906, bungalow books and articles (many originating in California) flooded on to the market, helping to disseminate the idea throughout the States. (71) Radford's Artistic Bungalows, 1908, contained over 200 designs; H.L.Wilson's Bungalow Book, 1910 included ' a short sketch of the evolution of the bungalow from its primitive crudeness to its present state of artistic beauty and cosy convenience'. Bungalow books were issued by the Standard Building Investment Company, the Building Brick Association of America, the Architectural Construction Company, Bungalowcraft, California Ready-Cut Bungalows, amongst others. Bungalow articles proliferated, not only in the building and architectural journals but in the new home-making magazines, House and Garden, House Beautiful, Ladies Home Journal or Keith's Beautiful Homes Magazine, stimulated by massive suburban development, and the incessant drive of families to achieve their arcadian, property-owning dream. In April 1907, Indoors and Out devoted their entire issue to the bungalow with pieces on 'The evolution of the bungalow in California', 'the word bungalow - whence it came and what it has come to mean', a bungalow 'in Gothic style', 'Bungalow entertaining' and 'How to furnish a bungalow'.

Worried about what was happening to the image, journalist Felix Koch went off to make a survey, 'In search of bungalows. What we found' (House and Gardens, 1908). His results were none too reassuring. The name was being adopted for any small house, simply as a fashionable cachet. So widespread had both the term and the phenomenon become that many must have asked with the readers of Arts and Decoration in October 1911, 'What is a bungalow?' Everyone had his own garbled version of its origin - whether in India or in the indigenous Californian barn - though few seem to have been conscious of its diffusion via England: the only authentic account resulted from the chance visit of Rudyard Kipling's father to his son in the United States in 1911. In 'The Origin of the Bungalow' written for Country Life in America just before he died, John Lockwood Kipling, Curator of the Bombay Museum, brought the only informed account to a country with little direct acquaintance with the genuine Anglo-Indian dwelling. (72)

Not that such academic discussions troubled the rapidly growing suburbanites, for whom the bungalow had become the ideal home. According to Country Life in America (July 1912) there was 'a rampant craze for the Bungle-oh' and when Mary Austin visited California 'the land of the sun' about this time, it was the results of this craze which left one of the strongest impressions:

'In this group of low hills and shallow valleys between the Sierra Madre and the sea, the most conspicuous human achievement has been a new form of domestic architecture.

This is the thing that strikes the attention of the traveller; not the orchards and the gardens which are not appreciably different in kind from those of the Riviera and some favoured parts of Italy, but the homes, the number of them, their extraordinary adaptability to the purposes of gracious living. The Angelenos call them bungalows, in respect to the type from which the latter form developed but they deserve a name as distinctive as they have in character become. These little, thin-walled dwellings, all of desert-tinted native woods and stones, are as indigenous to the soil as if they had grown up out of it, as charming in line and the perfection of utility as some of those wild growths which show a delicate airy fluorescence above ground, but under it have deep, man-shaped resistant roots. With their low and flat-pitched roofs, they present a certain likeness to the aboriginal dwellings which the Franciscans found scattered like wasps nests among the chapparal along the river - which is only another way of saying that the spirit of the land shapes the art that is produced there'. (73)

The Californian image in Britain

As a popular dwelling specially created for the suburbs, the bungalow became established in America a generation before it took root in Britain. In the process of diffusion, the Building News again seems to have played a role. In May, 1912 a glowing account of 'The American Bungalow' appeared suggesting the reasons for its success:

'To the dwellers in city streets, or in suburban districts around our large towns, in which dwellings of three or more stories, closely huddled together, seems to be the order of the day, the delights of the Bungalow, as it exists in the favoured spots in the United States, and notably in such a paradise as Pasadena, are absolutely undreamt of. To those who love a simple life, in which comfort obtains without the chains of ceremony and in which empty pretensions find nothing to feed upon, there is no dwelling so absolutely congenial and restful as a well-planned, one-storey, and roomy bungalow.

Here, for British readers, was summoned up the Californian ideal:

'Picture such a dwelling, in a garden of flowers, growing in all the freedom of uncultivated Nature; surrounded with peach and orange trees laden with golden fruit; and with its pergola almost bending under its load of luscious grapes - picture all this under an azure sky, and fanned with a perfume-charged breeze - and compare it with the best our speculative builders are offering today in the so-called 'garden suburbs'.

Although the English climate could not be transformed into that of Southern California, 'we can', suggested the author, 'easily learn a lesson from what architects of that country are accomplishing in the direction of domestic accommodation and home comforts, at very moderate expenditure. We can surely accomplish something of a kindred nature, especially in districts where land is plentiful'. The editor of The Builder, H.H. Statham, was equally impressed by the California Bungalow when writing his Short Critical History of Architecture (1912) about the same time.

The plans accompanying the account showed what might be done. The *A.25* smallest American bungalow usually comprised a single living room, opening directly from a veranda, a kitchen, two bedrooms, one of which could be very small, a bathroom, and two or more closets. For all-the-year round bungalows, a small cellar could house the central hot-air apparatus. The most important feature was the general living room which occupied a similar position to the old English 'house-place' still seen in some dwellings on the dairy farms of Cheshire and elsewhere. The living room entered directly on the verandah and two windows looked out onto it. In addition, there was a large projecting window at the west end (the verandah always faced south) fitted with box seats, and two windows in the "inglenook" adjoining the fireplace at the east end. The dining room was usually entered from the living room through a wide opening, framed by book cases and often hung with portières and the large window in this room was also fitted with a box seat. The kitchen communicated directly with the dining room by a swing door, and was fitted up with cupboards, drawers, a sink and two washing tubs, in addition to the stove and hot-water cylinder. The two bedrooms were provided with the usual wardrobe closets.

The living room had a large fire-place; on each side of the chimney breast were low cupboards and drawers surmounted by glazed bookcases. The roof of the verandah was supported on square posts of wood, resting on

stone piers. These, as well as the foundations, were commonly built of rough rubble or cobble stones laid in cement and producing 'a good rustic effect'. Chimneys were often similar. (74)

Many bungalows were of one and a half storeys with two additional bedrooms in the roof. The type was sufficiently widespread to be illustrated for many years in Funk and Wagnall's famous dictionary, along with different bungalow forms from Africa (Belgian Congo) and the East Indies. Typically, the average Californian and suburban variety was of timber, stained green or grey, or earthy brown with asphalt dissolved in turpentine. (75) In 1907, a four roomed bungalow with electric light and gas heating could be built for about 800 dollars; a ten-roomed one for about twice that sum. (76)

Compared to the older town houses from which many of their purchasers had come, the main difference in the bungalow was the open plan which increasingly characterised American houses in the twentieth century. Victorian hall and parlour had disappeared. Instead, the often centrally-placed living room, linked by open arch to dining room, took on a new symbolic function as the family room. Many features were 'built in' - sideboard, bookcases, folding wash-stands, disappearing beds and a kitchen full of labour-saving gadgets. The kitchen cabinet, by Hoosier, McDougall and others - to make such a major impact in England in the twenties, was already being advertised in America in 1903. (77) The more expensive bungalows boasted a sleeping porch, a major concession to the philosophy of 'out of doors'.

The greatest rationalisation of space took place in the bungalow kitchen - a good decade before it was to follow in Britain. Servants had disappeared, not just because of labour shortages but, to a lesser extent, from the 'progressive' rejection of the master-servant relationship in the home. And as most of the household tasks had to be performed in the kitchen, 'every step saved there saves untold energy through a lifetime of occupation in domestic duties. Where possible, everything should fold away : the ironing board was hinged and folded into a wall closet; a linen dryer slides into a ventilated drying closet; a folding table was fixed against the wall. The kitchen cabinet took the place of a pantry or others might prefer a 'pantryette'. With only two or three people in the house, a 'breakfast nook' could be squeezed into the kitchen plan. Fittings for the bungalow kitchen should be 'as condensed as the equipment of a yacht'.(78)

Later, as the technology of electricity developed it had increasing

effect on kitchen design. The telephone, giving immediate communication to shops, made storage space less necessary: stocks stayed on grocery shelves rather than those of suburban homes. In a dozen areas electricity was applied, including the kitchen cabinet, range, oven, percolater, sewing machine, fridge, heating system, washing machines, cleaners, to create the modern functional bungalow of the early 1920s. (79)

At the front, especially in California, a pergola disguised the transition between 'in' and 'out' of doors, integrating the bungalow carefully into the suburban bush. Other bungalows were built round a patio or in the form of a bungalow court, two of a variety of new types of lay-out which architects and others thought would lead to new democratic and progressive communities at this time. (80)

If the accommodation was fairly uniform, the styles were certainly not. Individuality in facade, form, or colour, and style was the attribute which gave it an appeal. Though beginning as 'a simple home', over the years the styles developed - Swiss chalet, Old English, Spanish, ^{4.29} Japanese-Swiss, Mission style, Tudor and Colonial. What most recommended it was the scope for individual expression: 'each individual can construct himself a shell that fits his personality in a way that no conventional architecture will admit of, at a price within the limits of the smallest purse . . . the individual who can express himself in his environment is greatly developed by the process - happier in himself and more interesting to his neighbour'. (81)

The bungalow in decline

The 1920s were to see the biggest bungalow boom as well as its decline. When, as Robert Winter reports, in the early part of that decade Woodrow Wilson described American President Warren Harding as 'bungalow-minded' (a comment on his limited capacity to think) the term had obviously fallen from grace. Yet in the United States as a whole, this was the most rapid period of suburbanisation to date, stimulated by the enormous growth in automobile ownership and the consumer boom which went with it. In seven years from 1922, car production in America doubled to reach over four and a half million, a level not attained again until the middle of the twentieth century. (82) Though central cities grew by under 19%, areas ^{4.26} outside them expanded at double that rate. In Los Angeles in the 1920s, many suburbs grew by a staggering three or four hundred percent. (83)

In Los Angeles, the sixth - and last - edition of the Bungalowcraft Company's New Spanish Bungalows appeared in 1930. By then, an unprecedented decentralisation had set in. Industry, department stores, and hotels, keen to cut down costs and simultaneously increase profits, were pursuing both labour and consumers out to their far-flung suburbs. In response to the influx of single people, entrepreneurs began to maximise their investment in land by building apartment houses. From the early, and especially mid-twenties, single family houses as a proportion of all dwelling units decreased as the proportion of multiple-family dwellings rose. (84) Early bungalow developments, like the areas north and south of Wilshire Boulevard, were already being 'apartmentised' in the early twenties. (85)

According to Clay Lancaster, probably more bungalows had been built in the quarter century after 1905 than cottages in the 125 years before. (86) Since its introduction, however, the range and meaning of the American bungalow had matured, an impression confirmed by the last significant monograph, C.E.White's, The Bungalow Book, published in New York in 1923. After some twenty years of development, here were some perceptive reflections. 'All that bungles is not bungalow' wrote White with some feeling. The word had become 'hard-worked, vacillating, meaningless but it has become so firmly rooted in American minds that it is now practically sanctioned by good usage'.

By the early twenties, the bungalow had acquired sufficient social meaning for Scott Fitzgerald to locate his hero in one in the early pages of The Great Gatsby. According to White, the bungalow was

'accepted in America as an ideal. Beginning in a small way it had swept the country. For several years now the bungalow has held high place in the esteem of the public . . . these little dwellings have come to stay and one may safely say that the bungalow of the early days has developed into a really sensible type of domestic architecture. suitable to American living conditions . . . founded not on cost merely but on convenience, appearance and comfort'.

Apart from having all the rooms efficiently planned on one floor (a development increasingly perceived by apartment dwellers) it had other benefits: the possibility of 'charmingly picturesque design'; adaptability to any site, with 'the low horizontal, simple roof line partaking of the spirit of the prairie'; less expensive materials could be used without offending

aesthetics, and a free and less laborious manner of design could be employed. (87) 4.27

So widespread had the bungalow idea become in California that the image was applied elsewhere: a bungalow church, and a bungalow school. The bungalow court - a series of bungalows grouped round a central place - had, in 1909, pioneered what might today be seen as 'sheltered housing'. 4.28 And as Robert Winter suggests, it was from this idea that the motel (the term was first coined in 1925) was to develop. (88)

By the 1930s, all this was past, the term out of fashion, replaced by 'cottage' or house. The introduction of the bungalow duplex (or semi-detached bungalow in England) was seen to bring degeneration. With the depression, suburban development dramatically declined. Following the Second World War, and especially from the sixties, bungalows began to be swept away; rising land prices brought in apartment houses and after the Second World War, the condominium. The shopping centres, freeways, and wholesale redevelopment encouraged by powerful interests as well as the federal government, (89) were all to take their toll.

III Appraisal

The American bungalow in social perspective

The two leading authorities on the American bungalow both agree that it was from this dwelling form that the later 'ranch house' was to develop. (90) Though far more spacious, and consuming an infinitely larger site, the fundamental characteristics of the latter were the same: a single family, predominantly single-storey dwelling, located in its own grounds, and evolved specifically for the modern suburb.

Recent research on post-war suburbanisation in America, and to a lesser extent, on that of earlier decades, has demonstrated fairly conclusively the connection between the suburban process and the dynamics of the capitalist economy. (91) The automobile and truck industries, tire companies, oil interests, highway engineering and construction firms, mortgage finance companies as well as a host of interested professionals - lawyers, estate agents, surveyors, architects - all depend on continuing suburban sprawl.

Once constructed, the tracts of suburban housing provide a captive

mass market for everything from a motor mower to a barbecue set, and other consumer goods essential to the suburban way of life.

In the emergence of the bungalow, as also other middle class housing of the time, changes resulted from market forces. In the later decades of the nineteenth century, various activities were gradually moving out of the house. The commercialisation of bread-making, of some food preparation (with the introduction of tinned foods) combined with the availability of department and grocery stores to reduce duties in the house. Ready made clothes and commercial laundries dispensed with other tasks. As more women were drawn into the labour market, servants became less common. Children's education was increasingly subsumed by nurseries and kindergardens, and the state made high school education compulsory. These and other factors brought a gradual shift to smaller dwellings, with fewer and smaller rooms. Feminists and other housing reformers endorsed the idea of simple, more efficient houses and apartments. Simplicity and rationale design were also a product of the 'germ culture'; progressive social and political ideas suggested that ostentatious houses were disapproved. These and other factors were to result in the notion of the 'minimal house' in the first decade of this century. (92)

Yet as this chapter has suggested other ideological factors were important as well. Not the least of these were enduring American values in the separate single-family home. At a time when apartments were regarded as 'communistic', the vast majority of Americans endorsed the single family, separate house as their ideal.

In the fifty years before the bungalow arrived, metropolitan city centres like Chicago or New York had got steadily denser and higher. The five storeys of the 1850s grew to seven and eight in the seventies before the arrival of the skyscraper in the next decade. For their poorer inhabitants, life was spent in uniform row houses, 'three deckers' and tenements in overcrowded multi storey streets. The development of the small, cheap yet nonetheless attractive and individual bungalow was to extend the rustic suburban ideal to millions. It embodied a form of modern popular architecture, conferring the respectability, privacy and sense of territorial possession sought by an aspiring middle class. For an increasing number of people it became their main symbol of home, the psychic fulfilment of the American dream. And California was attractive because it provided the ideal conditions for the fulfilment of that dream. (93)

In this sense, it became a suburb for the rest of the country, even indeed, for migrants from the crowded cities of Europe.

Simply stated, suburb is just a geographical expression; suburbia, on the other hand, connotes a combination of suburbs and inhabitants in a distinctive way of life. It is a style of life often depicted as middle class, family-centred, conformist, alive with humdrum social activity, the acquisition of status symbols and a drive to 'keep-up-with-the Jones's'. Whether this image is true or merely a myth has exercised scholars for three decades. (94) In the 1950s it was thought that middle class suburbia would become the dominant life-style of the consumption-orientated, post-industrial society of America, a life-style represented by 'the ranch house, lawn, barbecue and two-car garage' and the 'functionally-designed churches, schools and shopping centres'. With such symbols would be a set of activities: long-distance commuting, transience of residence, an obsession with the repair and appearance of the home, 'not to mention lack of privacy and an intolerance of the offbeat'. The bureaucratisation of work was paralleled in the suburbanisation of residence: both attracted society's least venturesome souls, moving to further standardisation and the suppression of individualism. (95)

This classic theory of suburbia was later rejected as a myth: living in a particular place can hardly, in itself, induce a particular style of life. More recently, however, this 'suburban myth' has again received support as a viable representation of suburban life. (96) Yet missing in this discussion is a consideration of the actual dwelling forms in which suburbanites live. The suburbs in these discussions are of a particular kind: a land of privately-owned, not rented property; though in theory multi-family apartments could cover the suburbs, in practice it is the single family, detached ranch house, with its own lawn and surrounding plot which permits the barbecue, the 'obsession with repair and appearance of the home'. The question, therefore, is not whether a particular kind of 'residential area' encourages a certain life-style but whether this middle class, 'suburban' life style is associated with a particular type of tenure and dwelling. (97) Without an understanding of the ideology behind the development of the bungalow (and implicitly, the contemporary ranch house), the emergence of the suburb both as a social as well as physical and spatial phenomenon cannot fully be understood.

The bungalow has been described as California's 'first truly suburban vernacular' (98). Yet it was also a nationwide type. Much more than the earlier American cottage, it was devoid of regional variation; the pattern

books, the bungalow firms, the magazine articles and advertisements, the growing mobility of the population ensured that, after the first world war, the bungalow - and later, the ranch house-became familiar all over the USA. Whilst Chicago's centre might be different from that of Philadelphia, the suburban bungalows of each were increasingly the same. People moving from one suburb to the next were assured of the same type of dwelling and culture. (99)

The bungalow became in fact, a distinctively national type, a fact recognised by Stickley and fostered by others like Matlack Price: 'If architects would take the bungalow more seriously . . . there may be evolved a highly desirable and essentially American type of dwelling, bearing no similarity whatever to the tropical affair from which its name has come'.(100) All over North America, the bungalow replaced distinctive regional types. Entrepreneurs like Jud Yoho, 'The Bungalow Craftsman' or 'The Bungalow Man' from Seattle spread the idea. Radford's 'artistic bungalows' were built 'as far north as Hudson Bay and south as the Gulf of Mexico', as well as the Pacific and Atlantic coast and in Australia and South Africa. (101)

By 1912, the bungalow had taken root in Canada, the Vancouver Sun popularising Jud Yoho's Craftsman Bungalow designs. The newly established Bungalow Finance and Construction Company of Vancouver not only adopted the housing model from California but also the Los Angeles Investment Company's system of sub-division. Between 1895 and 1915, such companies had paid out over 600% cash dividends on suburban developments and with the new garden suburb idea imported from England, the Californian bungalow proved the ideal house. The Prudential Investment Company established a million dollar syndicate to deal in land and homes in Western Canada and used modern, pre-fabricated factory produced bungalows in its various suburban schemes. As in America, it provided an equally suitable vehicle by which immigrants abandoned the house styles of previous cultures, adopting the Californian bungalow as their new, self-chosen image of home.(102)

Contemporary studies of the bungalow's popularity have seen in it an expression of 'individualistic democracy', a form of populism in housing and symbol of the Progressive era in politics. (103) Clay Lancaster too, suggests that 'the eventual manifestation of the bungalow . . . was inherent in the establishment of democracy on this continent. . (104)

If these assumptions are generally true, they also require a footnote. A dwelling can be understood only in relation to the settlement of which it is a part, (105) a settlement which is both a physical and social entity.

In the classic early twentieth suburbs of Los Angeles, developers saw that a homogeneous population and compatible use of land were no less essential to the suburban vision than a proper layout. Hence, restrictions were devised prohibiting Blacks and orientals and fixing minimum costs for houses in order 'to group the people of more or less like income together'. They also forbade commercial and industrial activities and, in many suburbs, outlawed all but single family homes, the foundation, according to most Los Angeles residents 'of this country's security'. Hence, for the thousands of Mexicans, Japanese and Blacks who lived amidst commerce and industry in the ghettos of central Los Angeles 'there were a million white Americans who resided in the suburbs sprawling north to Hollywood, east to Pasadena, south to Long Beach and west to Santa Monica'. (106)

The suburb, and the bungalows of which many were created, was not simply an American arcadian dream; it seems also likely to have provided the means by which the most effective form of social segregation could be achieved. Early twentieth century bungalows in Los Angeles were almost certainly built for middle class whites; (107) as restrictive covenants and deeds excluded blacks and other racial minorities, (108) a question which needs examining is whether the social contribution of the cheaper bungalow extended the 'privilege' of segregation to a much larger proportion of the white, Anglo-Saxon population of California.

Moreover, in the male-dominated world of the time, few men reflected on the likely consequences of distant suburbs for the female members of their family. The image of the bungalow as a cosy, family-centred haven of rest was one which emerged from the masculine province of the city. 'Not only to the gender of its daytime population (does) suburbia owe its essential femininity, but also to the domesticity which is its very raison d'etre'. (109) Moving to their rustic bungalow bliss in the early decades of this century, women especially soon found that there were two sides to the coin: being far from the madding crowd could also mean isolation and loneliness. 'The suburban husband and father is almost entirely a Sunday institution' complained a writer in Harper's Bazaar in 1900; life in the suburbs could discourage 'the young wife in lonelyville' wrote a contributor to Good Housekeeping some years later. The men left on trains to work among their associates in the city but for the wife 'left standing behind the struggling vine of her brand new piazza' the day was often dreary. (110) It was not just that the cosy houses and bungalows encouraged this 'family centredness' but the covenants restricting industry and commerce deliberately

excluded the possibility of local employment for wives. Prevailing ideas of male dominance with its image of rural domesticity, kept some women firmly at home, despite feminist pressures to the contrary. (111) On the other hand, the ample provision of schools and churches were to be instrumental in fostering the type of female community activity associated with middle class suburban life-styles prior - and even subsequent to - the feminist revolution of the 1970s.

As with suburbs, there had been an equally long tradition of 'summer cottaging' in North America well before the bungalow arrived, and many of such cottages had been purpose-built. Yet the significance of the bungalow as vacation house is that the ideology that both created it and determined its form has persisted right up to today. Earlier cottage designs had drawn their inspiration from historical sources such as the 'Gothic'. Though such styles also had their ideological underpinnings, the shape, site and materials of the bungalow drew far more on the modern understanding of 'function' and the ideology of the arcadian dream. The idea of 'living with nature', with 'natural materials blending with the environment' still pervades some of the basic architectural canons of today. (112) The ideology of the vacation bungalow in the woods of 1910 persists in the American Forest Code of the present: vacation cabins, it states, should 'harmonise as much as possible with the natural environment . . . (they) fit the ground more readily when horizontal lines predominate and building outlines are low and sprawling . . . rough wood and stones are considered the best materials . . . smooth materials lack the rugged appearance necessary in most mountain sites'. (113) Provided these rules are observed, such vacation housing in America seems likely to increase; 'besides a second bathroom, second telephone and second car, many American families either own or are planning to acquire a second home'. (114)

Architectural significance

It is not the aim of this thesis to examine what, in a somewhat restricted sense, might be called the architectural significance of the bungalow or its relation to questions of style. This has already been expertly done. (115) Yet equally, it would be perverse not to make some comment.

More perhaps than in any other field of historical writing, explanations for changes in architecture frequently rely on a 'Great Man' theory of causation. With regard to early twentieth century developments

in America, many writers have focussed on two areas, the 'Chicago School' featuring Frank Lloyd Wright and the 'California School' dominated by Charles and Henry Greene. The latter have been credited with the invention of the California bungalow and the former, the 'prairie house' which, in Lancaster's view, is virtually a bungalow. (116)

Since 1970, however, various scholars have recognised the California bungalow as one of the mainsprings of modern domestic architecture in the USA. Its development was to exert 'the greatest influence on the domestic architecture of this country'; another writer suggests that the redwood bungalow was 'the first indigenous domestic architecture in California' and the vogue for bungalows in general has been seen as one of three key factors in the development of the 'Prairie School' of Frank Lloyd Wright and his contemporaries. (117)

What should be apparent from this chapter is that the idea and form of the bungalow resulted not from a single person or source but from a **4.30** wide range of inter-related economic, cultural, ideological, social and **4.31** technical factors. (118) Many of the bungalow book designs were anonymous or the product of little known draughtsman or architects. The actual shape of the bungalow drew on many sources: in its more sophisticated 'high-style' form, Japanese influences were important. (119) It was also - as was the case in Britain (and Anglo-India too) - a continuation of an older cottage form, the product of a long-established cultural tradition. Frederick Hodgson suggested something of this as early as 1906: 'The little bungalows of which we are speaking are rarely designed by architects at all . . . they are . . . the sort of thing that the ordinary California country carpenter knows how to build . . . the result of a popular tradition . . . a genuine expression of popular and wholesome habits of country life and habits of country building'. (120)

The name, however, was important. It came, via England, from India and it carried a positive image. It was exotic, new and had 'the same sort of charm as the word "Mesopotamia" to a lady in Maine'. (121) Though many adjectives were added to describe the bungalows' styles, it remained a unity: a modern, informal, individual and artistic house, picturesque in setting, suggesting simplicity and style. (122) Whatever the various influences, there can be no doubt that the American bungalow marks a clear watershed in the domestic architecture of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. On one hand, the tall, vertical, formal, cluttered and historically-derived styles of the Victorians; on the other, the low,

horizontal, informal, 'open plan' and functional design which has come to characterise 'modern' architecture of today; the first, in the inner railway suburbs of the city, the second, in the far-flung auto suburbs of the metropolis, or the more distant setting of the 'second home'.

For those further interested in pursuing these themes, including the diffusion of the bungalow ideology both to and through the USA, a closer examination of the ideas and people associated with the 'Arts and Crafts' might yield something new. Wright's first 'Prairie House' was built in 1901; the Green brothers began building their earliest bungalows about 1902-4 following a visit to England by one of them in 1901. (123) Whatever their individual contribution, these architects all seem to have shared the widely-held economic, social and cultural assumptions of the time - the arcadian dream, a commitment to the expansion of suburbs and a deep-seated belief in the institutions of both the family and of private property which, as part of a long-established American cultural tradition, have been historically expressed in the detached, single family house. The expanding capitalist industrial economy of late nineteenth century America encouraged both the widespread adoption of these aspirations as well as the socialistic revolt against the bourgeois, industrial urban system itself. Research on these economic factors might repay dividends.

It is, indeed, only in this context that the original bungalow idea can be understood. It was produced by what might be called an industrial or urban 'dialectic'; 'nature' had meaning only for city folk living apart from it; 'living simply' made sense only to those with a surfeit of material goods; having a 'simple' informal second home was attractive only to those with a complex, formal city house; raw wood, grass matting and coarse fabrics derived their meaning only in contrast to the elaborate decor, finished materials and consumer luxuries of the urbane city; the 'Great Outdoors' appealed only to those with warmth and comfort within. How could people be 'different' if they had nothing to be 'different' from? Yet too, the bungalow was also a genuine protest by an artist-intellectual class, with no great means or second home, against capitalistic materialism. Their goal was 'conscious or ostentatious simplicity'. (124)

When suburbanisation surged again after World War Two, it was a more affluent society in which it took place. For this, the small bungalow was far too modest. As the Wirtschaftswunder of post-war Germany saw a transition in mass transit from the moped to the Mercedes by way of scooter and VW 'Beetle', so, in the consumption-orientated society of North America

the split level executive ranch house took over from earlier forms. Though enclaves of bungalows were left, many disappeared through fire, road-widening and freeways. With ever-increasing land-values, bungalows were razed to the ground and the economic pressures of capitalism replaced them with apartments, condominium flats and further out, by split-level ranch houses.

Current interest in the bungalow comes from a second phase of just those social forces which originally brought it about: a revolt against what are seen as 'urban excesses' - 'high rise, cubby-holed apartments, restless travel, incessant amusement, the pointless accumulation of gadgets'. (125). In the United States of today, bungalows take on a new lease of life: local amenity societies in California arrange walks to admire their charms, whilst others are designated as historic monuments. (126) *4.32* According to the author of 'Lyric encore for a dated house' (House Beautiful May, 1973) 'Millions of bungalows stand in our cities waiting for imaginative eyes to recognise their potential for contemporary living'. The recycling movement has obviously begun.

4.33

4.34

Chapter Four Footnotes

This chapter could not have been written without the generous help of American friends to whom I owe my great thanks: Clay Lancaster sent copies of all his publications on the bungalow and corresponded on many occasions. Bob Winter lent the pre-publication copy of his manuscript and answered many queries. Finally, both very generously commented on my draft manuscript.

1. W.R. and K. Current, Greene and Greene, Fort Worth, Amos Carter Museum of Western Art, 1974, p. 10.
2. M. Whiffen, American Architecture Since 1780. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 1969, p. 220. Robert Winter, The California Bungalow, Los Angeles, Hennessey and Ingalls, 1980; Current, op.cit., Clay Lancaster, The American Bungalow (forthcoming); Laura Chase, 'Eden in the Orange groves. Bungalows and courthouses of Los Angeles', Landscape, 25,3,1981, pp.29-36.
3. On vacation house, see bibliography in A.D. King, 1980, op.cit. On suburbanisation, D. Harvey, Social Justice and the City, E. Arnold, London, 1973; R.A. Walker, 'The transformation of urban structure in the 19th century and the beginnings of suburbanisation', in K. Cox, ed., Urbanisation and Conflict in Market Societies, Methuen, London, 1978, pp. 165-212; *ibid.* 'A theory of suburbanization: capitalism and the construction of urban space in the United States', in M. Dear & A.J. Scott, eds., Urbanization and Urban Planning in Capitalist Society, Methuen, London, 1981, pp. 383-430. M. Gottdiener, Planned Sprawl: Private and Public Interests in Suburbia, Sage, London, 1977.
4. T.N. Glaab & A.T. Brown, A History of Urban America, London, Collier Macmillan, 1976, p.99.
5. Walker, op.cit., p. 185.
6. Glaab & Brown, p. 100; A.F. Weber, The Growth of Cities in the Nineteenth Century. Cornell University Press. New York, 1967, Chapter 2,1.
7. C. Amory, The Last Resorts, New York, Harper, 1952, p.11; A.F. Downing & V.J. Scully, The Architectural Heritage of Newport, R.I. 1640-1915, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1952.
8. Quoted in R. Wolfe, Recreational Land Use in Ontario, Ph. D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1956, p.504.

9. D.Harvey, 'The urban process under capitalism: a framework for analysis', International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 2, 1, 1978, pp. 101-31, p.118.
10. American Architect and Building News, March 27, 1880, discussed in Clay Lancaster, The American Bungalow, The Art Bulletin, 40,3, September 1958, pp.239-53.
11. A.W.Brunner, Cottages or Hints on Economical Building, New York, W.T.Comstock, 1884, passim.
12. G.W.Wright, Moralism and the Model Home. Domestic architecture and culture conflict in Chicago, 1873-1913. University of Chicago Press, 1980, p.83.
13. Brunner, preface.
14. Lancaster, forthcoming. As in England, pre-fabricated 'sectional-portable' bungalows had been made in the USA (e.g. by Ducker & Co., NY) from the mid 1880s. *ibid.*
15. F.T.Lent, Summer Homes and Camps, Boston, Frank T.Lent, 1899, p.10.
16. Weber, *op.cit.*, pp.27-31.
17. L.M.Freudenheim & E.Sussmann, Building with Nature. Roots of the San Francisco Bay tradition. Peregrine Smith, Santa Barbara, 1974.
18. R.L.Ragatz, Vacation Housing. A missing component in urban and regional theory, Land Economics, 46, 2, 1970, pp.118-26, p.119.
19. P.J.Schmitt, Back to Nature. The Arcadian Myth in Urban America, New York, Oxford University Press, 1969 (with an Introduction by R.C.Wade, pp.vii-x) from which the following pages are largely drawn. See also K.Starr, Americans and the California Dream.
20. Schmitt, *op.cit.*, p.3.
21. *Ibid.*, p.125.
22. *Ibid.*, pp.28-9, p.125.
23. G.Naylor, The Arts and Crafts, Thames and Hudson, London, 1972; E.Kaufman, The Arts and Crafts. Reactionary or progressive, in R.Judson Clark, Aspects of the Arts and Crafts movement in America, Record of the Art Museum, Princeton University, 34,2,1975, pp.6-12. P.Davey, Arts and Crafts Architecture, Architectural Press, London, 1980.
24. R.Winter, The Arts and Crafts as a Social movement in America, in R.Judson Clark, *op.cit.*, pp.36-40. See also R.Judson Clark, The Arts and Crafts in America, 1876-1916, Princeton University Press, 1972.
25. The Craftsman, volume 1. See also G.Wright, *op.cit.*

26. The Craftsman, 1906, p.109.
27. Ibid., 1903, in 'How to build a bungalow', p.253.
28. Ibid., p.260; also 1905, pp.305,391,737; 1907,p.393.
29. Schmitt, op.cit., p.8.
30. In Independent, 72, June 6,1912,p.1239. Quoted in Schmitt, p.3.
31. The Craftsman, 1907,pp.523-5.
32. H.M.Saylor, Bungalows, their design, construction and furnishing, etc. Grant Richards, New York. 1912, p.58.
33. Schmitt, op.cit.p.17.
34. Saylor, op.cit.,p.1.
35. Ibid., p.48.
36. The Craftsman, 1907,pp.423-5.
37. See Saylor, op.cit. and The Craftsman, passim.
38. The Craftsman, 1904,pp.614-9.
39. Schmitt, op.cit.,p.169; also Saylor,op.cit.,p.154.
40. Indoors and Out, 4,1,1907,p.2.
41. B.Checkoway, 'Large builders, federal housing programmes and postwar suburbanisation', International Journal of Urban and Regional Research,4,1,1980,pp.21-45.
42. Glaab and Brown, op.cit.; Walker, op.cit.; Gregory H.Singleton, The Genesis of suburbia. A complex of historical trends, in L.H.Massotti & J.K.Hadden, The Urbanisation of the Suburbs, Beverley Hills and London, Sage Publications, 1973, pp.29-50; B. Schwartz,ed., The Changing Face of the Suburbs, Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press, 1976.
43. Walker,op.cit.
44. Glaab and Brown, op.cit., p.145.
45. Gary A.Tobin, Suburbanisation and the development of motor transportation, in Schwartz, ed., op.cit, 1976,pp.95-111.
46. Robert M.Fogelson, The Fragmented Metropolis, Los Angeles, 1850-1930, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1967, from which much of the following is taken.
47. ibid., p.33.
48. Ibid.

49. On California, see C.McWilliams, Southern California. An Island on the land, Peregrine Smith, Santa Barbara, 1973.
50. Starr, op.cit.
51. World's Work, 1903, p.217.
52. C.Lancaster, Architectural Follies in America, Tuttle, Rutland & Tokyo, 1960, p.215.
53. Fogelson, op.cit., pp.64-75.
54. Fogelson, op.cit., p79.
55. Harvey, 1978, op.cit.
56. Tobin, op.cit., p.95.
57. Fogelson, op.cit., pp.144-5.
58. Ibid., p.146.
59. See The California bungalow, Architectural Record, 19, May 1906, pp.394-5. This was apparently written by Fdk T.Hodgson whose Bungalows for Town and Country, 1906, contains the same article as Introduction. Many of the illustrations in the Architectural Record article were also reproduced in an earlier one page feature on 'The comfortable bungalow in California' in Ladies Home Journal, January 1904.
60. Radford's Artistic Bungalows. The Radford Architectural Bungalow Company, Chicago and New York, 1908, p.3.
61. H.L.Wilson, The Bungalow Book, Wilson, Chicago, 1910, p.2.
62. Some California Bungalows, Architectural Record, 18, September 1905, pp.217-23, p.217.
63. Ladies Home Journal, January 1904, pp.24-5; also May 1904,p.29.
64. Architectural Record, 1905,p.222.
65. Arthur C.David, An architect of bungalows in California, Architectural Record, 20,October,1906, pp.307-15 which referred to the work of Greene and Greene.
66. Architectural Record, 20, October 1906, pp.297-305,p.305.
67. Wright, op.cit.,p.3.
68. According to Robert Winter, there were 'hundreds' of such books. Some of the more accessible include F.T.Hodgson, Practical Bungalows and Cottages for Town and Country, Chicago, F.J.Drake, 1906,1912,1916; Ladies Home Journal, Journal Bungalows,

Philadelphia, Ladies Home Journal, no date; Radford's Artistic Bungalows, The Radford ARchitectural Company, 1908; W.T.Comstock, Bungalows, Camps and Mountain Houses, New York, W.T.Comstock, 1908, 1915; J.H.Daverman & Co, California Bungalows. The book of the real bungalow, Grand Rapids, 1908; Max L.Keith, Bungalows and Cottages, Minneapolis, M.L.Keith, 1908; Bungalow Plans, as designed and built exclusively by the Bungalow Colony of neighbourly Metuchen, New York, New York, 1909; H.L.Wilson, The Bungalow Book, Chicago, H.L.Wilson, 1910; The Bungalowcraft Company, Homes not Houses, Los Angeles, Bungalowcraft Company, 1910; H.H.Saylor, Bungalows, etc. Philadelphia, John C.Winston Co., 1911; E.E.Sweet, Sweet's Bungalows, Designing and Building Company, Los Angeles, c.1912; W.E.Allan, Allen Bungalows, Los Angeles, W.E.Allen, 1912 California Ready-Cut Bungalows, Los Angeles, c.1915; Jud Yoho, The Craftsman Bungalow Book, Puget Sound News Co., Seattle, 1913, 1916; Bungalowcraft, Colonial and Swiss Chalet Bungalows, Bungalowcraft, Los Angeles, 1917; Little Bungalows, Stillwell and Co., Los Angeles 1920; W.G.Truettner, Beautiful Homes, published by 'The Bungalow Man', Milwaukee, 1921; C.E.White, The Bungalow Book, New York, Macmillan, 1923; R.D.Weston, Weston's Double Bungalows, Los Angeles, 1925. Between 1909 and 1918, The Bungalow Magazine came out monthly, at first from Los Angeles, later from Seattle, containing plans, designs etc. at a cost of 10 cents, then 25 cents.

69. Wright, op.cit.,pp.184-5.
70. F.T.Hodgson, Practical Bungalows for Town and Country, 1906.
71. Lancaster, op.cit., 1958.
72. Country Life in America, 19,8,February 1911,p.309.
73. M.Austin, California. The Land of the Sun, London, Adam & Charles Black, 1914,pp.29-30.
74. G.A.Audsley, The American Bungalow, Building News, May 24,1912, pp.725-6. I have also drawn on Robert Winter's description here, as also for a number of the bungalow books listed above, Winter, op.cit., pp.39,53.
75. M.H.Lazear, The evolution of the bungalow in California, Indoors and Out, 4,1,1907,pp.7-12,p.11.
76. Ibid.
77. Ladies Home Journal, April, 1903, $\frac{1}{4}$.39.
78. C.E.Schemerhorn, Planning the bungalow, in Comstock, 1908,op.cit., pp.15-22.
79. C.E.White,The Bungalow Book, New York, Macmillan, 1923.
80. Wright, op.cit., chapter 9; Winter, op.cit.

81. Lazear, 1907, op.cit., p.73.
82. Tobin, 1976, op.cit., p.104.
83. Ibid., p.103, Fogelson, op.cit., p.146.
84. Fogelson, op.cit., p.151.
85. Winter, op.cit.
86. Lancaster, forthcoming.
87. C.E.White, The Bungalow Book, New York, Macmillans, 1923,pp.2-8.
88. Winter, op.cit., p.77; also Lancaster forthcoming. The bungalow court was a particular Los Angeles innovation, an economical space saving compromise between an apartment building and single family houses. With low construction and development costs, these courts were especially attractive to the less affluent white immigrants who nevertheless aspired to a single family dwelling. In the second decade of the century, they were recommended by the Los Angeles Housing Commission concerned with improving social and moral conditions because 'they greatly helped to preserve the individual home idea as against apartments and tenements'. The first were constructed about 1909 in Santa Monica and Pasadena; some architects, like the brothers Heinemann, specialised in the form and also incorporated parking room for automobiles. The very size of the site, however, was subsequently to mean they were re-developed for apartment houses. See Laura Chase, 'Eden in the Orange Groves. Bungalows and Courtyard Houses of Los Angeles, Landscape, 25,3,1981,pp.29-36.
89. Checkoway, op.cit.; Winter, op.cit.,p.78. Lancaster, forthcoming.
90. Winter, op.cit.,p.77; Lancaster, forthcoming.
91. Gottdiener, op.cit.; Walker, op.cit., 1977,1981; Checkoway, op.cit.
92. Wright, op.cit., p.125 and passim; J.Hancock, 'The Apartment House in Urban America', in A.D.King,ed., Buildings and Society. Essays on the social development of the built environment, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980, pp.151-92.
93. Winter,op.cit.,passim.
94. B.Schwartz, Images of suburbia. Some revisionist commentary and conclusions, in Schwartz, ed., 1976,op.cit.,325-40.
95. Ibid.,p.327. For an earlier discussion of suburbia and its associated myths, see D.C.Thorns, Suburbia, London, MacGibbon and Kee, 1972.
96. Schwartz, op.cit.,p.326.
97. Though there is some discussion of house-types in S.D.Clark, The Suburban Community, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1964.
98. W.R. And K.Current, Metamorphosis of a style. The California Bungalow, in the same authors' Green

97. Though there is some discussion of house-types in S.D.Clark, The Suburban Community, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1964.
98. W.R.& K.Current, Metamorphosis of a style, The California Bungalow, in the same authors' Greene and Greene, 1974, op.cit., p.10.
99. Schwartz, 1976, op.cit.
100. C.Matlack Price, The Practical Book of Architecture, Philadelphia and London, H.P.Lippincott Company, 1916, p.202.
101. R.Rees and C.J.Tracie, The Prairie House, Landscape, 23,3,1976,pp. 3-8, Radford's Artistic Bungalows, 1908, p.7.
102. See D.W.Holdsworth, House and Home in Vancouver. Images of West Coast urbanism, in G.A.Stelter & A.F.J.Artibise, The Canadian City, McClelland and Stewart, Toronto, 1977, pp.186-211; also ibid., 'House and Home in Vancouver: the evolution of a West Coast urban landscape, 1886-1929', unpublished Ph.D.thesis, University of British Columbia, 1981. Chapter 5. I am grateful to Dr.Holdsworth for this information.
103. Winter, op.cit.; c.f.also Wright, op.cit.
104. Lancaster forthcoming.
105. A.Rapoport, Human Aspects of Urban Form, Pergamon, London,1977.
106. Fogelson, op.cit., pp.145-7.
107. R.Fogelson, Personal communication, January 1980, also Chase, op.cit.
108. Fogelson, 1969, op.cit., p.145.
109. Schwartz, 1976, op.cit., p.335.
110. Schmitt, 1969, op.cit., pp.20-1.
111. Wright, op.cit., passim.
112. See A.D.King. A place for time and a time for place. The social production of the vacation house, in A.D.King, ed., 1980, op.cit.
113. Ragatz, op.cit.
114. H.Walton, How to Build Your Cabin or Modern Vacation House, Barnes & Noble, New York, 1964, p.13.
115. See note 2.
116. Lancaster, forthcoming.

117. W.R. and K.Current, 1974, op.cit.; H.Kirker, California's Architectural Frontier, New York, Russell and Russell, 1970, p.129; H.Allen Brooks, The Prairie School. Frank Lloyd Wright and his Mid-West contemporaries, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1972. As early as 1916, C.Matlack Price in The Practical Book of Architecture (Philadelphia & London), under the chapter on 'Native American architecture' discussed the bungalow and related it to the work of the 'American Secessionists', who manifested enmity to historical styles. These were centred on Chicago and the Mid-West and F.L.Wright was the greatest exponent of the style, following 'Craftsman' architecture, and the 'creed of the simple life'. See pp.198-202.
118. Gwendolene Wright, whose book Moralism and the Model Home, appeared after this chapter was written, comes to a similar conclusion, p.137 and passim.
119. Clay Lancaster, The Japanese Influence in America, New York, Walton H.Rawls, 1963; for the bungalow as a continuation of the cottage tradition, Lancaster, 1958, op.cit.
120. Hodgson, 1906, op.cit.,p.8.
121. Architectural Record, 18, September 1905, p.222.
122. Lancaster, forthcoming, op.cit.
123. For details on the architectural work and biographies of Charles and Henry Greene see R.L.Makinson, Greene and Greene. Architecture as a fine art, Salt Lake City and Santa Barbara, Peregrine Smith Inc., 1977; also R.L.Makinson, The USA, in F.Russell, ed., Art Nouveau Architecture, London, Academy Editions, 1979.
124. Winter. Personal communication, April 1980.
125. Lancaster, forthcoming, op.cit.
126. Winter, op.cit. p.78.

CHAPTER FIVE

BUNGALOID GROWTH : ENGLAND 1918 - 1947

Introduction

I Bungaloid Growth

The setting: the interwar building boom

The California connection

Bungalow types

The ideological appeal

Economic factors: state subsidies

Economic factors: land, materials and labour

Bungalows by the sea

Weekend retreat

II Environmental Control

The bungalow under attack

The Council for the Preservation of Rural England

The Town and Country Planning Act, 1932

Conclusion

CHAPTER FIVE

BUNGALOID GROWTH, ENGLAND 1918 - 1939

'the bungalow now stands for all that is vile and contemptible'

Thomas Sharp, Town and Countryside. Some Aspects of Urban and Rural Development, London, 1932, p.32.

Introduction

In the first half of the twentieth century, the bungalow was the most revolutionary new dwelling type to become established in Britain. * During this time, and especially between the wars, it took its place in the vernacular building tradition. Its widespread adoption was due to economic, social and other changes and, not least, its suitability for the areas of residential development which expanded during these years: the outer suburbs, along main roads, the coast and previously undeveloped countryside.

Yet the bungalow was more than an innovatory dwelling form. It became, for an influential social elite, the focus of ridicule and wrath, a symbol of environmental change which they altogether deplored. With other new features in the landscape, the proliferation of the bungalow and especially, its siting, materials and form, gave rise to major changes in the law: control of the appearance of buildings and the extension of statutory planning from 'town' to 'country' environments. In helping to bring about the most important planning legislation up to that date (the Town and Country Planning Act of 1932), the bungalow had a significant part to play.

This chapter continues the themes pursued earlier, namely, the effect of economic and social change on the built environment, though it takes up demographic and political change as well; conversely, it also shows how changes in that environment give rise to new institutions and ideas. It explores the question of control over the aesthetic quality of that environment, highlighting the inherent conflict of interest between people

* The other obvious innovation, the multi-storey block of flats, did not make its impact till the 1960s and by the 1970s, its impetus was fading. (1)

with different ideas and the power to carry them out. Finally, it pursues the theme of 'dual residence', developed in chapter three.

The first part of the chapter examines the reasons for the phenomenal growth in numbers and popularity of the bungalow between the wars; the second demonstrates how this expansion raised more fundamental questions relating to control over building development. In the conclusion the larger social issues reflected by these developments are explored.

I Bungaloid Growth

The Setting: The Inter-War Building Boom

The environmental changes which took place between the wars were arguably the most substantial and far-reaching than any occurring in a similar period before. True, the growth of industrial towns in the previous century had had immense social and physical effects and throughout that century, industry and railways had, by 1891, made England by far the most urbanised country in the world. (2) The proportion of almost 80 per cent of the population living in towns which the 1901 census recorded was not to change significantly in the following fifty years.

Yet it was precisely this distinction between town and country, the 'built up areas' and 'rolling countryside' which, for certain people living at the time, became so obviously blurred in the decade after 1918. With electrification of railways and the huge extension in motorised traffic, unprecedented building began. The most rapid and noticeable increase in this traffic happened between 1919 and 1929 when the largest percentage rise so far registered in the number of motor vehicles (230,000 to over two million) had taken place. Of these, the number of private cars multiplied from 78,000 to just under one million. Before 1914, motoring had been a luxury enjoyed by a few: there had been no cheap car for mass transport in Britain. Yet by 1926, a small Ford cost less than £130 and by the end of the twenties, the Austin Seven and Morris Minor were selling at about the same price; 1930 saw the largest number of public service vehicles on the road up to that time. (3)

The break-up of landed estates, a process begun with the agricultural depression of the 1870s, continued unabated. Rising taxes and death duties were only some of the reasons why the landed aristocracy rationalised their finances, selling off huge tracts of land to invest the money more profitably both at home and overseas. In 1914, only some 10 per cent of

agricultural land in England and Wales had been occupied by its owners. By 1927, this proportion had risen to 37 per cent; one quarter of England and Wales had passed from being tenanted land into the possession of its farmers in a hectic flurry of selling in the years after the war. A transfer on this scale, and so rapidly, had probably not occurred since the Norman Conquest. (4)

These changes, brought about by developments in the international economy, resulted specifically from the imperial connection. The increasing international division of labour, referred to in Chapter Three, with the development of urban industrial countries on one hand and rural agricultural ones on the other was fully recognised at the time. As Prime Minister Baldwin stated in 1936, 'the United Kingdom is today predominantly an industrial and commercial country . . . our overseas trade consists in the main of the exchange of industrial goods for food and raw material from Empire and foreign sources'. (5) The cutting off, during the war, of Russian and Danubian supplies of grain, had encouraged an expansion of overseas producers to meet British and other European markets. Canadian, Australian and Argentine producers enormously expanded their markets, flooding the world with cheap grain. With agricultural prices in Britain falling, despite protection, 70 per cent of the value of British food was imported. The arable area fell by a third between the wars and as the flight from the land continued, the number of agricultural workers was reduced by a quarter. (6)

With these developments, low density suburbs expanded into previously rural land and new by-pass and arterial roads provided cheap roadside sites. Remote stretches of coastline came within reach of mobile city populations. Subsequent studies were to show that between 1920 and 1939, the total acreage of built-up, urban land in Britain increased by 50 per cent, from 2.2 to 3.2 million acres, or from 5.9 per cent to 8.6 per cent of the total area of land, a far greater increase than that of subsequent years. (7) And whilst these changes continued through both decades, it was in the middle 1920s that their effects, at least for some, first became apparent. It was no coincidence that 'ribbon development' and 'bungaloid growth' were terms both coined between 1925 and 1927.

The housing boom was central to these developments. In 1918, there

had been some eight million houses in Britain. In the twenty years that followed, half as many again were to be built, three quarters by private enterprise, the rest by local government. The rate of building was unprecedented. In the half century before 1914, the stock of housing had increased by 10 to 15 per cent each decade. In the 1920s, this rose to 18 per cent and in the thirties, to 25 per cent. In 1927, the 258,000 houses constructed exceeded all previous annual records - until 1933 (304,000). Between 1936-8 over 360,000 houses were being planted annually on the ground.(8)

There were many reasons for this boom. The housing shortage of 1914 had been exacerbated during the war; by 1919, there was an estimated shortage of over three quarters of a million homes. The coalition government's response was the (Addison) Housing Act of 1919 giving generous subsidies to local authorities to build publicly owned 'council' houses. Later Housing Acts (1919, 1923, 1924) subsidised both public and private development.

Whilst an overall population growth took place in Britain between the wars, it was the increase of three and a half million separate families which, with generally rising real incomes, falling building costs and the expanding building societies, helped to fuel housing demand. Both the number and size of building societies increased tremendously, with shares and deposits growing ninefold in the years between the wars. Throughout the period, there was a general, though uneven tendency for interest rates to fall, with 6 to 7 per cent prevailing in the twenties and 5, even 4 percent in the early 1930s. As others have shown, houses could be purchased for a deposit of less than 5 per cent (£20 on a £400 house) and in some cases, with hardly any downpayment at all. (9) In 1931 for some 20 per cent of the population earning £4 or more a week a house had never been cheaper to acquire. (10)

Economic change, the result of national and international events, brought related social and geographical change. Whilst the North East, North West and Wales with their heavy industries were in decline, the new, electricity-based industries and service sector of the economy was growing rapidly in the South. Other developments enlarged the size of the middle and lower middle class, the main beneficiaries of the housing boom. The realm of

government was being extended, multiplying the number of Ministries and the civil servants which they employed. As commerce and trade expanded, the number of white collar jobs increased. The growing building societies, insurance firms and banks all enlarged the salary earning class. Teaching, scientific work and public services added further to middle class ranks. Between 1911 and 1951, the proportion of 'non-manual' occupations grew from 20 to 30 per cent. (11)

The widespread adoption of bus services and, in London, the extension of the electric train, meant that the effective area for building was greatly increased, the bus encouraging circular rather than tentacular development round towns. (12) Here, land previously of little use for building was cheaply bought for speculative development; in the years between the wars, over 800,000 houses were built in rural districts, seven eighths of them by private developers. (13)

If these were some of the main factors behind the general expansion of housing - not least, the universal 'semi' - there were others which particularly favoured the bungalow.

The California Connection .

How far was the adoption of the bungalow as a permanent suburban dwelling influenced by the earlier example of the United States? The evidence is slight but worth examining.

As we have seen, the suburban bungalow phenomenon occurred a generation earlier in the United States than in Britain. There, the huge output of bungalow books and plans took place long before 1920 when the first British book to treat the bungalow as a serious suburban proposition was produced. Only in a later one of these, published in 1924, did W.I.Chambers suggest that, contrary to prevalent belief, 'bungalows originated in California and not in India'. (14)

There are other odd clues: the promotion of the California bungalow in the Building News in 1912 (p.203 above); the depiction, on a postcard, of a seaside bungalow estate and a pub in Norfolk about 1930, both called 'California'; copies of Fred.T.Hodgson's Practical Bungalows and Cottages (1916) and Charles E.White's The Bungalow Book (1923) in the British Museum. More curious, a 1920 edition of H.H.Saylor's influential Bungalows, published in New

York, was discovered (1980) in a second hand bookshop in a centre of 1930s bungalow development at Uxbridge. The most substantial evidence is from Peacehaven, begun in 1915 by a Canadian developer. This will be examined below. More important perhaps than the proven connections is the fact that, in both these technologically developed, free market societies, one perhaps a decade or so ahead of the other, similar influences were at work. It was part of what later was increasingly referred to as 'the Americanisation' of English life. (15)

Bungalow types

The bungalow boom began straight after the war and continued throughout the twenties and thirties. Essentially a private enterprise phenomenon, it apparently peaked towards the end of the 1920s. On both sides of the Atlantic, bungalow consciousness was at its height, figuring in popular fiction with Carolyn Keene's, The Bungalow Mystery (1930) published in New York and Taffrail's The Lonely Bungalow (1931) in London.

In Britain, the bungalow was basically a non-urban, suburban or rural dwelling ideal for permanent housing and for temporary weekend or holiday use. Three common categories might be identified distinguished roughly according to size, location, materials and form.

Most prevalent was the small, often square, brick or brick and rendered concrete 'builder's vernacular', with slate, clay or asbestos tiled roof. If slate, the lines of the hipped roof were typically marked by ridge tiles in contrasting red or cream. This might be found in outer suburbs, singly or in groups, along arterial or country roads, on isolated country sites or flanking early twentieth century suburbs of popular seaside towns. Low, often with round-headed porch and garden to front, back and sides, this often filled up the roadside plot which developers had left behind. A sprinkling, or maybe just one, announced the entrance, and exit, to country villages and towns.

Less common was the more lavish 'architect's bungalow'. Larger, 'individually designed', more expensive to build, this was noticeable

5.1

5.2

because of its site: in the country, on rising ground, with more extensive, often landscaped garden. Alternatively, it was in the 'better' suburb or wealthier seaside resort where the lack of height was compensated by a larger, more privatised plot.

For use, though less frequently, as permanent home was the semi-or fully prefabricated form. This might be brick-based, make greater or lesser use of timber cladding, concrete panels or asbestos sheets. Roofs were of asbestos tiles (in green, red or grey), diagonally laid, or sheeting of 'ruberoid' finish, felting or corrugated iron. In this class, a wide variety appeared depending on the economic status of the owner, availability of materials and degree of local authority control. Found on the edge of seaside or rural towns, on semi-marginal land or isolated country tracks, this class included the converted railway carriage, country bus and self-built weekend hut. 5.3

Throughout the period, a myriad reasons favoured the proliferation of all three types: social and economic needs, prevailing ideologies, the structure of the building industry, developments in materials, new modes of transport and the availability of sites. It was a combination of these and other factors which, in rapidly encouraging its growth, forced the image of the bungalow to the forefront of a hostile, upper middle class mind.

Ideological Appeal

In a society committed to a belief in private property, the bungalow - irrespective of size - had an obvious threefold appeal. Possession of even the smallest often provided the cheapest entry into the property-owning class. Moreover, as a symbol of private property, the detached and territorially-separate bungalow - the irreducible minimum of a house within its own grounds - was patently second to none. And for the middle class who could afford it, the 'bungalow in the country' provided the perfect opportunity to emulate the style of a country-house owning elite.

At a time of unprecedented increase in home-ownership, this appeal was never very far away. Thus, the author of An Ideal Bungalow (1927) writes, 'it is good to feel the land is your own and that you can hand it down to your descendants with all that has been built on it'. Keeley's Bungalows and Modern Homes (1927) begins with a quotation from Cowley:

'I never had any other desire so strong, and so like covetousness... that I might be master at least of a small house'. (16) The shift to private ownership was a major trend of the time. Before the war, some 80 per cent of all households had lived in rented housing: owner occupiers, at only 10 per cent of the whole, were few and far between. Local authority tenants, perhaps 1 per cent of all, were concentrated in large cities, London, Liverpool and the North. The years during and after the first world war saw the rapid demise of privately rented housing with rent control, high building costs, alternative forms of investment and the rapid growth of building societies deterring the private landlord. With the provision of council housing on a large scale in 1919 the tenure situation changed drastically between the wars. Twenty years later, over 30 per cent of all households were owner-occupiers and 14 per cent were council tenants. The polarisation between forms of tenure had begun. (17)

The bungalow, therefore, spread the pride of ownership to thousands who had not had it before. In 1926 for example, May Figgis of Brighton, sent for her Christmas card to Mrs Maslem, of 'Chalfont', Frand Avenue, Bournemouth a photograph postcard of her pebble-dashed asbestos-tiled bungalow, 'Killiney' in Chatsworth Road, writing on the back 'This is a photo of my little place - to bring you all good wishes of the season'. Another proud new owner in the crescent of Kingsdown Park (which could be anywhere around the coast) marked his with a cross on the postcard sent to friends: 'ours is the sixth bungalow from the front of the picture. I can see the name 'Clarendon' under the magnifying glass and I have counted them up from there'. (18)

The belief in private property was backed by a second ideological appeal. This was the almost universal commitment, among governments, the public, developers and the majority of architects and planners, to the ideas of the 'garden city': low density, open development with twelve or fewer houses to the acre, each surrounded by garden, trees and grass. The Garden City movement, a cause as much for social as environmental reform, had emerged at the turn of the century. Bourgeois in composition, it combined an upper class preference for country living with prevailing social concern about the depopulation of agricultural land. Expectations of increasing land values in garden cities were combined with social assumptions about the community benefits supposedly gained by detached, cottage-type houses arranged in the semi-rural,

village type of setting. The claims made by garden city proponents regarding higher standards of health, with their emphasis on space, light and air, were based on unproven and unscientific reasoning. (19)

Expounded by contemporary architects and the newly founded (1914) planning profession, the Garden City idea provided a model for emulation by private developers. 'You have often cherished the desire to live in the open unspoiled country rather than amid the dull monotony of London's suburban streets' advertised one builder on the cover of R. Rawling's **5.6** Houses and How to Buy One (1925, price sixpence). Essentially an ideology, the garden city syndrome was promoted as a science of town planning, its basic assumptions adopted in official housing and planning legislation, its chief architectural proponent, Raymond Unwin employed by government. (20) When town extension schemes were adopted under planning laws, the continuous street or terrace, characteristic of eighteenth and nineteenth century urban development, was outlawed: 'not more than four dwellings shall in any place be built under one continuous roof'. (21) With little dissent, the combined, 'town-country' idea, characteristically expressed in the reproduction, en masse, of the detached house or 'semi' situated within its own grounds, was to become an experience shared by representatives of all social groups: demonstrated by the aristocracy at the top; aspired to, and often achieved, by the middle class in between; and imposed, in the new council estates, on the working class at the bottom. The bungalow was very much part of the trend.

Economic factors: state subsidies

The large-scale provision of council housing began effectively in 1919. The 'Addison' Housing Act of that year offered substantial subsidies to local authorities, requiring them to provide housing for working people at rents which they could afford. Yet with labour scarce and building costs high, private enterprise housing was slow to get under way. As a stimulus, the Housing (Additional Powers) Act was passed later that year. At a time when houses were being built in Essex and Cambridgeshire for £500-£600, if somewhat more expensive elsewhere, (22) this provided a lump sum subsidy of between £130 and £160 to 'anybody who builds a house in a satisfactory manner', according to a specified size, before the end of 1920. (23) Within a year, this had been raised

to £230-260, the dwelling to be finished by the end of 1921.

By July of that year, between 25,000 and 30,000 private subsidy houses had gone up. To the annoyance of some MPs, however, many of these hardly conformed to Parliament's intentions. 'Weekend bungalows, chauffeur's cottages and gamekeepers' houses were surely not meant to be paid for by subsidies from the taxpayer', complained a leading member of the Commons. Only about one third of the subsidy houses had been occupied by what he called the working class. 'Many were really houses of the middle class type built by people themselves'. (24) Many, indeed, were probably middle class bungalows, both large and small.

'The extraordinary interest which is being taken in bungalows', began R.R. Phillips' Book of Bungalows (1920), 'gives the occasion for this book'. Addressed to 'the needs of one class - that middle class upon whose shoulders every new burden is thrust' it ran into two further editions (1922, 1926) whilst other government subsidies were in force. 'In the matter of housing', said Phillips, 'the middle class have to shift for themselves and many are turning to the bungalow as a solution to their difficulties' a statement somewhat belied by giving the conditions of the government grant. 'With the aid of a government subsidy...many people contemplate building a bungalow for themselves'. (25)

The grants were generous with between £230-£260 available for bungalows and houses of not less than 700 or (for £260) 920 superficial feet, depending on the number of rooms. The largest bungalow qualifying for a grant might have a floor area of 1,400 feet overall, and have four bedrooms, one of which Phillips thought would do for a maid. Reduced by one third, the subsidy was also available for timber bungalows and converted ex-army huts. For this, both Phillips and Gordon Allen (The Cheap Cottage and Small House, 1919) provided plans showing how the standard hut (60' by 15') 'can be economically converted into a comfortable bungalow'. Boulton and Paul were typical of a number of firms commissioned by the Ministry of Health to erect pre-fabricated housing in timber, concrete and asbestos sheeting to meet the shortage. (26) Their standard wooden bungalow (46' by 19') contained four bedrooms, living room, bathroom, kitchen and other offices, with asbestos slate roof and asbestos cement interior lining. Without the cost of land it could be erected by the owner for about £460 or by the firm for another £115. (27)

Most of Phillips' architect-designed examples, however, conformed to the Ministry's conditions that they should be of brick, stone or concrete, thereby qualifying for the full amount.

Whilst the subsidy no doubt stimulated bungalow growth, the government's main policy was to provide local authority estates. With the Conservative government and Housing Act of 1923, this was completely reversed. Less generous than the Act of 1919, Chamberlain's measure provided a subsidy to private builders and local authorities of £6 per house for 20 years; alternatively, on completion, the cash would be paid as a grant of £70 to £100 to the builder. But local authorities might build only if they convinced the Minister that they could make better provision than private enterprise. (28)

Chamberlain's aim was to stimulate the private sector until it could eventually provide housing unaided by the state. It is clear from his words in Parliament that, by reducing the size of houses qualifying for the grant (now lowered to a superficial area of 620 square feet) and by specifically referring to one storey dwellings in the Act, the aim was to house the maximum number of families in small, separate dwellings. Larger houses took more labour and capital to build. And though single storey dwellings had to be between 550 and 880 superficial feet, in certain circumstances the minimum area could be reduced to 500. The stage was set for a further small bungalow boom. Despite warnings that, as before, loopholes would be found to subsidise 'seaside cottages' and 'country bungalows' for use as 'a secondary house', (29) the Act went on to the books.

The first Labour Government came to power the following year. Housing policy was again turned on its head. Wheatley's Act of 1924 restored to local authorities their earlier working class housing role yet the government continued to give private grants. As the new (1926) edition of the Book of Bungalows pointed out 'assistance is given also in respect of private ownership and bungalows come within the scope of the grant'. In order to qualify, the applicant had to satisfy the local authority that it was needed, yet as there was no set method by which this was done, 'it is primarily a matter for the applicant's conscience...and the local authority's consideration'. (30)

Seizing the opportunity, the Concrete Association republished (1924) six thousand copies of their earlier (1918) Concrete Cottages and Bungalows. For the more popular market, however, there were other manuals such as The Builder's book of Bungalow Designs (1923), W.I.Chambers

Bungalows (1924), or 'Economists' one shilling special, An Ideal Bungalow. How to Build it well and at lowest cost and pay for it in a few years as rent. (Eligible for the Government Subsidy) of 1927. **5.7**

Combined with reduced building costs, the subsidies were to have telling effect. Between 1920 and 1922, some 80,000 houses a year had been built, the majority by local authorities. Between 1924 and 1927, the number rose from 146,000 to an unprecedented 258,000, most of them privately built. And when the private subsidy was stopped in 1929, some ninety per cent of all houses finished in the previous five years had been subsidised by government. (31)

Just how many of these, whether subsidised or not, were bungalows seems impossible to say. Yet the grant was obviously worth proportionately more for a cheaper than a more expensive house. It might be noted in passing that of some twenty eight books (including new editions) on bungalows ever published in Britain before 1939, at least twenty appeared between 1918 and 1932. (32) The evidence lies elsewhere: the elitist attack on the bungalow began in 1926, the term 'bungaloid' coined the following year. The real proof, however, is on the ground; to misquote the memorial to Sir Christopher Wren, 'Si bungalum requiris, circumspice'.

Economic factors: land, materials and labour

Apart from subsidies, there were other economic factors favouring bungalow growth. With the effective area for development opened up by bus, train and car, outer suburbs provided cheaper land. In London, the better sites, closer to transport terminals, commanded a higher price, meriting larger detached houses or at least a 'semi'. Yet further out, on cheaper, less desirable land, the bungalow provided semi-rural advantages at considerably lower cost. In the far-flung suburbs of London, served by electric train (Upminster, Hornchurch, Rainham, Uxbridge or Hayes), bungalows were thick on the ground. (33) Given the annual **5.8** cost of a season ticket 'the further out one lives, the cheaper should be the house'. (34)

Another opportunity presented itself with the extensive programmes of road-building. In London, the Ministry of Transport plans for 1920-4 involved an outlay of over four million pounds on a network of some 200

miles. By 1926, many arterial roads and by-passes were completed or under way: Eastern and Western Avenues, the Kingston and Watford By-passes, the Great West Road and others for Croydon, Orpington and Bexleyheath, to name only a few. Similar developments were taking place elsewhere. (35) Here, following commercial logic, builders bought land fronting the road, building bungalows and houses and saving considerable costs on service roads, sewers, electricity or water pipes. Other cheap sites became available because of developments in the bungalow itself. Light, pre-fabricated materials were readily carried to marginal land. Wooded hills were especially attractive and hillsides, as a leading town planner pointed out in 1926, previously too steep for horse and cart to labour up, were now within reach of a truck carrying pre-fabricated materials. (36) Elsewhere, as by the upper reaches of the Thames, land too unstable for permanent building or liable to occasional floods, was just right for weekend bungalow sites.

Freed by motor bike or car from the major transport routes, the bungalow, unlike more substantial housing estates, was not confined to areas with services already installed. New technologies now made these dispensable. 'There is no need to hesitate about buying or building your ideal bungalow "far from the madding crowd" on the score of "no lights" or having electricity expensively laid from the town' announced the promoters of Carbic gas. Gas could be generated in a lean-to shed and light produced by acetylene lamp. Alternatively, mini generating sets 'suitable for the smallest bungalow or the largest country house' were on sale in 1922. Water could be piped from the nearest farm or well and the Elsan Closet and cesspool coped with sanitary needs. (37)

The pre-fabricated bungalow was part of a quiet revolution in materials and construction which had started before the first World War. Post-war shortages of skilled labour and its continuing high price were important factors encouraging the use of substitutes for traditional materials and methods. Now, with improvements in road transport, pre-fabricated materials became much easier to move. The Daily Mail Bungalow Book of 1922 included a host of advertisements for new materials which cut down on labour-intensive skills, especially brick-laying, roofing, plastering and joinery.

Asbestos cement tiles, available from about 1910, were a popular innovation. Reducing roofing costs by 40 per cent, they were light (one sixth the weight of ordinary slates, one third of roofing tiles) and relatively large. They thus reduced the costs of labour to lay them as well as the roofing structure below. Easily transported by truck or cart, they could be carried to sites well off the beaten track. Asbestos sheeting, wood and fibre board, jointless flooring, 'machine reduced standard stone' (for facing walls), cavity bricks, were all available to simplify, cheapen and, above all, release the bungalow from dependence on skilled labour, specialised plant and access to major transport routes. They also offered scope for personal taste. 'A dining room, furnished in Jacobean style receives the completing touch when panelled in "Sundea" wallboard with oak-stained wooden strips covering the joints'. (38) 5.9

Whilst lightweight panels were unsuitable for two-storey houses, they were ideal for the bungalow out in the fields. Asbestos tiles meant a lighter roof truss; this, in turn, could rest on breeze block or timber-framed, weather-boarded walls. Concrete blocks offered more permanent possibilities. With improved efficiency and severe competition, the price of cement fell by almost one third in the years between the wars. (39) Though making limited impact on conventional housing its importance for single storey buildings can be seen in A. Lakeman's Concrete Cottages, Bungalows and Garages, (1918, 1924, 1932) of which some 11,000 copies circulated in the years between the wars. 5.10

Bungalow construction was also appropriate to the talents of the typical small building firm. In the inter-war years, this was short on skills and had little or no heavy plant. In 1930 over 80 per cent of all building firms employed less than ten men and half of all building labour was unskilled. (40) For the small-time firm, the bungalow had a triple financial attraction. It was subsidised: it cost little to build and whilst a pair of 'semis' required two buyers for the builder to recoup the costs involved, the bungalow needed only one. Simple to construct, it required little more than a barrow and ladder, in terms of specialised plant. At a push, they could be tackled by a handy man and his family, as contemporary records suggest. (41) 5.11

It was this small size, enabling the owner to exercise total control

over his property which helped to give the bungalow such an appeal. In this respect, it had considerable advantages over the alternative - the ubiquitous semi-detached. The bungalow owner controlled the site, the full height of all four walls and even, the whole of the roof. All were literally within reach. The marks of ownership, the identity of possession, could thus be made complete.

5-12
5-13

Social factors

A variety of demographic and other social developments were also promoting the growing popularity of the bungalow. In the fifty years after 1871, average family size had been falling steadily; the birthrate, 35.5 per thousand in 1871 and 25.4 in 1911, had fallen to reduce the average number of children per family from 3.5 to 2.2. Yet if class differences are taken into account, it was in the non-manual, middle and lower middle families where the pattern of one or two children increasingly became the norm. (42) For whatever social or psychological reasons, birth rates plunged in the years after the war, from about 23 per thousand in 1921 to an all-time low of 14.4 in 1933. The greatest percentage fall (from 17.8 to 16.7) occurred between 1926-7 when the bungalow boom seems to have been at its height. (43) There seems good reason, therefore, for the Dean of St. Paul's to link the increasing lack of babies to a preference for bungalows and cars (see below) Yet marriage was more popular than ever. In 1901, only about 35 per cent of the population had been married. By 1931, this had risen to some 43 per cent and in the next twenty years, the proportion was to exceed 50 per cent. (44) The small bungalow was the aspiration for many about to get wed, as Henry Hall and the BBC Dance Orchestra recorded in 1933

Underneath your window
Every night I stand
Pleading for your wonderful caress
Listen at your window
And you'll understand
What it takes to bring me happiness

Three little things are all I desire, dear
A bungalow, a piccolo and you
Three little things set my heart on fire, dear
A bungalow, a piccolo and you

(45)

The numbers of elderly were also increasing with the population of over sixties growing from about one and three quarter million to three and a quarter million between 1901 and 1921 (46) All over the country, but especially in the seaside towns of North Wales, the East Coast and especially in the South, for those who could afford it, the bungalow became the place to spin out the last years.

In terms of housing aspirations, it was a dwelling with a broad-based social appeal. It allowed the working class to 'move up' and the middle, to 'move down', both social strata combining as patrons of the new form. For the better off middle class, hit by increased taxes and poorer since the end of the war, the bungalow's advantages were regularly spelled out. It was not 'over-costly to build...was less expensive to furnish' and, with all rooms just on one floor, it was 'the easiest house to run'. In the over-worked phrase of the time, it was a 'labour-saving' home. (47)

According to The Ideal Bungalow (1927), many people had learnt to appreciate this aspect by living in war-time army huts, a viewpoint confirmed by correspondents to the Daily Mail. (48) Moreover, as suggested above, many such huts had filled the housing gap in the years just after the war. Yet by 1922, a volume of correspondence to the Daily Mail was suggesting that the army hut and corrugated iron and wood building had had their day. 'A big public demand was growing for the bungalow of the better type' and there was a need for designs to meet it.

For the impoverished post-war middle class, domestic service had become increasingly dear and difficult to find. The growth of shop, light factory and clerical work had provided alternative jobs for younger girls. And in the more democratic atmosphere after the war, they were not only more expensive, but were less willing to be exploited than formally. In the ten years before 1920, the number of servants for every hundred households in the commuter areas of London had shrunk by half .(49) Not without cause did the author of the popular Book of Bungalows (1920) also produce three editions of The Servantless House. (50)

Social attitudes were modified to accommodate these changes. 'One does not lose caste these days by moving into a smaller house' wrote Gordon Allen in The Small House and Cottage (1919). Old urban and

suburban houses had become obsolete: they were too large, lacked newly available technology, were costly to maintain and often in the wrong place. Now, with the help of bus, train or car, dwellings could be twenty miles away from one's work. (51) By contrast, **5.14**
 the bungalow was small, compact and had no stairs. Not only did it **5.15**
 reduce areas to be cleaned; without the presence of servants, the need for social space separating employer from employed also disappeared.

As Americans had discovered twenty years earlier, the major labour-saving area was the kitchen. Here, a range of new equipment was introduced, much of it via the USA. High, cavernous wall-cupboards of old were replaced by the 'Easiwork' or 'Hoosier' kitchen cabinet. **5.16**
 The latter, obtainable from the Bungalow Department, Ideal Furniture Stores, Liverpool, with its 'forty work-reducing features ... saved miles of steps...providing places for 400 articles within arms length, saving the journey from larder to cupboard, or cupboard to the sink'. The 'Bungalow Stove' boasted over-hanging plate racks where just-washed dishes dried and warmed for later use. Dirt-producing coal ranges were replaced by gas or electric stove. Electricity, with its boiling plate, kettle, toaster, iron or fire 'gave an absence of dirt' and was 'immensely labour-saving both in cleaning time and the laying of fires'. Serving hatches and the 'service trolley' dispensed with the need for servants to carry things about and vacuum cleaners were easily pushed around one floor. Where a maid was kept, in a dwelling now with far fewer rooms than before, each room had to perform multiple functions. Here, new technology helped out. The 'Servall' grate 'cooks, roasts, **5.17**
 boils and heats 30 gallons of water' then, after various folding operations, 'as an open fire, transforms your kitchen into a cosy sitting room'. (52)

'Simplicity' was the recurrent theme in furnishing and planning. 'Let it be remembered that if the bungalow stands for anything, it stands for an unaffected sort of life'. Pretentious furniture should be avoided, as should 'essays in a Jacobean or Georgian manner' appropriate to a country house. The emphasis was on simplicity and directness, with 'no more furniture than you actually need'. Walls should be of plain paper or coloured distemper and stains for floorboards were 'simple, hygienic and artistic and also economical'. The necessity of economy was made into a virtue.

Nothing more clearly conveys the continued validity of Briggs' maxim that 'a cottage is a house in the country' but 'a bungalow is a small country house' than the illustrations in the middle class bungalow books of the time. (Keeling, Phillips, Philpotts). Each stands complete, a miniaturised version of the country seat, with no other buildings in sight. In plan descriptions, the key words are simple, neat, convenient and compact; yet also roomy, ample, quiet, dignified, old-world and picturesque.

Private ownership and simplicity were important attractions of the bungalow style of life. A third was explained by prevailing ideas of health: a belief in sunshine, fresh air and the merits of open air life. This meant not only a country or a seaside setting but a site, if possible, on gently rising ground. Activities previously pursued indoors were now, weather permitting, taking place outside: eating, sleeping and everyday social life. The changes with their implications for design, were similar to what had earlier occurred in the USA.

For eating and relaxation, the verandah was important and to ensure **5.18** all-day access to the sun, two or even three were ideally preferred. (53) If this was well-sheltered, meals - in all kinds of weather - might be taken out of doors. Verandahs were usually at the semi-private area at the front; for outdoor sleeping, a more private 'Sleep out' was provided round the back. (54) A 'Sun parlour' was attractive and as the bungalow 'leads one to live an outdoor life' chairs should serve equally well in and out of doors. Casement windows were preferable to sashes as, being thrown open, they gave an 'abundance of air'. With no servants available, breakfast might have to be in the kitchen, in which case 'a large east window should admit the morning sun'. (55) The horizontal, wide window allowing more sunshine than the narrow vertical sash was gradually introduced. The obsession with sunshine was no doubt also responsible, if subconsciously, for the symbolic rising sun which decorated the gates, gable ends and garage tympani of thousands of bungalows in the thirties.

Such bungalows were for the better off middle class, the managers and senior executives earning £500 to £600 a year. Though the cheaper of **5.19** Phillips' examples cost £550 to build, the majority of these architects' designs were in the £1000 - £1500 range, with more over the higher than the lower end of the limits. (56)

For the larger market, a more modest version was around. This was the 'spec built' builder's vernacular which expanded on all available sites. Untroubled by architect's worries, this was often the cheapest form of house. For £25 down and between nine and twelve shillings per week, the bungalow appealed to a previously property-less class: senior clerks, supervisors, lower grade civil servants, young teachers and skilled workers if they were earning more than three pounds ten shillings a week. (57) In distant London suburbs (Hillingdon, Greenford or Uxbridge), in the middle 1920s bungalows were selling for £450 to £475, compared to £685 to over £1000 for a detached or semi-detached house. In the early thirties, entire bungalow estates went up at Upminster, Hornchurch and Hayes. Better class two and three bedroomed bungalows were on sale at £550 in the far commuter zones of Watford, Harrow or Orpington in 1938. In 1930, the Evening News was offering five hundred "Bungo-palaces" at Sidcup (Kent) and for the more exclusive client, 'Bungalettes' at Ewell (at £695) in 1935. Outside London, prices were much cheaper. For £395, one could have a bungalow in 'sunny Worthing' or elsewhere on the South Coast and in some Midland towns, the price was as low as £250. (58)

For those willing to build themselves, there were plans and instructions around, such as Economists' An Ideal Bungalow. In these, the same criteria applied by the rural aristocracy were, if possible, to determine the choice of the site. This should have 'open country', be 'well wooded and have pleasant scenery around'. If, in the suburbs, this was somewhat unrealistic, 'have a site with an open space or at least a gap in the houses on the opposite side of the road'. To establish territorial rights, 'do what is necessary to enclose your property - a low fence in front of neat paling or feather-edged boards'.

The sense of ownership was enhanced by visibility, from within and without. For health, aesthetic and social reasons, the site should be 'a little higher than the surrounding country and one that rises slightly from front to back'. External appearance was governed by both tradition and economy. Granite chippings or pebbles could be thrown on the cement rendering and the whole painted cream, the spaces between 'black and white work' finished in white cement paint. With a government subsidy, the capital cost was almost none!. Building societies would advance 75 to 80 per cent of the total cost of £500; alternatively, money could be borrowed from a Life Assurance company or the district council. The

plans, obtainable from the author, cost a mere two guineas. (59)

With motor traffic now flooding the countryside, new entrepreneurial opportunities opened up. Set back from the road, the bungalow, fronted by different distributors' pumps, was ideally suited for a service station or for the ambitious couple supplying thirsty travellers with teas. For motorists, wheeling along at a slightly greater height than today, the triangular expanse of grey or blue-slatted roof was exactly right to notify, in large white letters, the presence of PETROL, TEAS or CAFE. For the smallholder, encouraged back to the land with promises made in the war, and given even more generous subsidies in the Housing Act of 1924, the slightly set-back bungalow gave room to advertise eggs, tomatoes or bags of fresh manure. Behind, the poultry sheds, greenhouses or garage could expand almost infinitely.

Encouraged by rapid improvements in transport, many firms were producing fully pre-fabricated bungalows for more rural areas, whether for permanent or weekend use. In 1926, Jennings of Bristol were advertising a basic three bedroom 'portable' bungalow for £120. In the late twenties, the South West Appliance Co and Hurlingham Bungalow Company, both of Fulham, advertised weather-boarded, asbestos tiled models, 33' by 22', with five rooms at between £110 and £155 in the popular press. Where the purchaser built it himself, the cost of foundations, carriage and construction hardly exceeded £250.

5.20

Bungalows by the sea

The most prolific area for expansion was the seaside, both hinterland and coast. By the mid 1930s, there were four main areas for permanent and vacation bungalows, each within fifty to seventy miles of major centres of population: the Sussex and Hampshire coast, North Wales (between Llandudno and Prestatyn) and the coastal strips of Lancashire and Yorkshire, centering on Blackpool and Scarborough. Shorter working hours, the growth of holidays with pay, better rail and road provision and, between 1931-35, an almost forty per cent increase in motor vehicles, were seen as some of the principal reasons.

5.21

Between the wars, a double migration was taking place. On one hand, people were moving from the declining industrial north and south Wales to London and the Home Counties; the latter gained some one and three

quarter million people overall. (60) Yet at the same time there was a shift within the south east region itself, with a drift towards the coast. With immense transport improvements to the South coast resorts, functions only nascent before the war now rapidly grew in size: to their role of pleasure ground, they added that of retirement resort, suburb for London commuters, and destination for thousands of day excursionists. All favoured building development, not least, of bungalow estates.

A major factor in this development resulted from the growing numbers of the old. In the forty years before 1901, the proportion of over sixties in England and Wales had remained steady at just over 6 per cent. With falling birthrates, improved medicine and higher standards of living, this had doubled by the later 1930s to reach almost 14 per cent in 1951. In the early twentieth century the average expectation of life had been about 55 years; by 1951 it was rising to 70. (61) Where, for those rich enough to choose, could they spend the final fifteen years of their lives?

In the later nineteenth century, the wealthy had retired to inland spas like Bath, Cheltenham and Tunbridge Wells, though by the early 1900s they were increasingly moving to the coast. In 1921, the population of Worthing, Hove and Hastings contained twice as many over-sixties (over 14 per cent) as were in the population of England and Wales as a whole (7.8 per cent). In the following ten years, these and other towns on the Sussex coast (Bexhill, Eastbourne and Bognor) took over the role of 'retirement resort' from the older inland spas. *5.22*

The people who retired to the drier, sunnier climate of the coast were both healthier and wealthier than those they left behind in the towns. Compulsory retirement at 65 became common from the 1920s and occupational pensions were increasingly introduced to supplement those that had been started by the state. The seaside bungalow was to meet a ready market and a growing specialised need. Sampling a proportion of retired people by the sea in the early 1970s, one researcher found over 40 per cent at Bexhill and even 70 per cent of those at Clacton were living in bungalows built since the 1920s. (62)

The ageing and commuters helped to swell the growth of Sussex resorts during these years. The population of Battle, Shoreham and Worthing grew by almost a quarter in the decade after 1921, East Preston by over a half

and Newhaven Rural District by more than 90 per cent. (63) Of these cases of 'bungaloid growth', none was more famous than Peacehaven.

The site of Peacehaven, lying at the foot of the Downs between Newhaven and Rottingdean, had been bought by a Canadian developer, Charles Neville, in 1915. The development provides most evidence for the influence of North American real estate practices - and the role of the bungalow in them - on interwar British urban development. The atmosphere of 'a mid-Western prairie town', conveyed by the sprawling rectangular layout and haphazardous development, which one observer detected in 1975 (64) was more than a coincidence.

Neville was a Canadian, with land interests in Saskatchewan where, in 1913, with the North American bungalow boom getting under way, he had developed estates known as Belgravia, Coronation and the Garden Suburb of Mayfair. One of a number of entrepreneurs operating along the south coast at this time, he bought 415 acres of Sussex coastline in 1915 at £15 an acre. The following year, he held a grand national competition for the name of the resort which he was proposing to develop, with £20,000 as the first prize and fifty freehold building plots for other prizes. Instead of fifty, some two and a half thousand 'prize' plots were given away, with each of their recipients required to pay three guineas for the conveyance entitling them to the site. As a result of these and other dubious practices, Neville made profits of £30 an acre, £12,000 overall. (65)

Despite Establishment protests, an area of 3000 acres was laid out, in the words of Peacehaven Estates Limited, as 'a Garden City'. In 1921, the first bungalow was built, according to Neville, the first anywhere in England after the war (66) - a doubtful claim, though one perhaps suggesting that Neville believed he was introducing the bungalow from America. Indeed, a few of his designs, with pylon pillars and pergola, were evidently inspired by California even though the majority were in the emerging British Vernacular tradition. (67) The dwellings were in fact 'mostly of the bungalow type, neat, pretty and clean', a type equally suitable for the bank, butcher's, golf house and shops. According to Neville's own newspaper, The Peacehaven Gazette, the incentive to purchase was 'to own a little bit of England'. The newly-established cement works, converted from an aerodrome hangar, provided ready-made

5.23

5.24

building blocks which went well with the asbestos tiled roofs.

Amongst the 'rush of settlers' were those who had 'retired from business and wanted a healthy home by the seashore', Londoners, 'professional men wanting a place where their families can stay in the bad months and whom they can join at the weekend'. Other 'shrewd friends' had purchased plots to sell at a profit within a few months. Plots were priced according to location 'all the cheaper class of bungalows are congregated together, superior structures are on the better class land'. A speciality was the 2 bedroomed bungalow with verandah and cellar, complete on a 25 by 100 foot plot for £500 though others could be had for £350. Between 1922 and 1929, the population grew from 25 to over 4000. By then, Peacehaven was appealing not only to the retired and weekender but to commuters, contrasting the clean, quiet and relaxed life of the town with the strain, stress and noise of London streets. For amusement, there was the Lureland Dance Hall, the Hotel ('a Mecca for Motorists'), golf course, three churches and a cinema. The major attraction, however, was domestic:

When the golden sun sinks in the West
In its glow I can see from afar
My bungalow sweet
In its rural retreat
Like a bright and insidious star

As the shadows of eve gently fall
And the toilers turn homeward to rest
Sure the thoughts of my heart
Take the flight of a dart
To that gay little Peacehaven Nest

Its the place for a kind loving wife
And for children a haven of bliss
And the rich fertile ground
Makes all products abound
Never Eden of Dreams was like this

After 1925, a 'gift house' worth £1,200 was offered each year in a national lottery to boost sales. The lucky winners in the first two draws were a South London music teacher and a South African businessman. (68) Neville had an obvious gift for publicity, with his promotional concert parties - with Flora Robson - and booklets and postcards which circulated throughout the country. In 1936, he unveiled a cliff-top

memorial to King George V which lies on the Greenwich meridian: one side of this records the event; on the other are listed the distances to various parts of the empire(69), a fitting and prescient acknowledgement of the emerging significance of the bungalow which he did so much to promote. 5.26

Bungalow development was also related to the introduction of the inner city, multi-storey flat. Among business people, according to L.H.James, 'The evolution of the town flat is a real indication of the coming demand for bungalows' for the weekends, he wrote in the preface to The Modern Bungalow (1936) For those wealthy enough to own both, each type of residence had, for W.Heath Robinson, its distinctive social function: the flat, 'for entertaining people through whom they hope to obtain introductions to members of the Peerage' and the bungalow, 'for weekend relaxation' (How to Live in a Flat, 1936). Others explained the growing phenomenon of dual residence by reference to social and economic changes. The small service flat had been made possible 'by the dissolution of the old, binding family loyalty which kept the middle class in acrimonious association until marriage or death parted its members'. The growth in womens' employment meant that 'the business girl prefers to share a flat with some other girl' rather than face a boarding house or 'the horrors of a hostel'. Increasing affluence and the pressures of industrial capitalism were seen as encouraging young married couples to live in a service flat, run a car, patronise the cinema and 'streak along the great traffic roads, down to the sea and back, in a haze of fuel fumes' to visit 'their week-end bungalow by the sea or country cottage'. For the 'active children of the Commercial Machine Age', 'movement occupies their leisure'.(70)

Weekend retreat

In the more relaxed years after the war, the open air lifestyle became increasingly popular, with the cult of hiking, camping and youth hostels (founded in 1930), partly influenced by the wanderbewegung from Germany. Habits established at the turn of the century now had a wider social appeal.

According to Professor Adshead (1923)

'Young married people of the middle class flock to bungalow towns. There they can live a sort of aboriginal existence for a time. There is always a great attraction in a primitive existence, and it is here that the bungalow craze comes in. The demand is increasing very rapidly. The whole of the hill-side behind Douglas, in the Isle of Man, is now utilised as a summer encampment, where thousands of tents are erected, and fortunes have been made in running this primitive town. In other places there are very large developments in bungalow buildings - for instance, at Shoreham. The enormous demand for tents and bungalows is far ahead of the supply, and a bungalow city, where a sort of 'Swiss Family Robinson' existence can be lived for a few weeks in the year, is a demand ... which town planners must direct their attention to very seriously'. (71)

In the course of some forty years, the notion of 'countryside' as a 'vast park or pleasure ground' had moved down the whole social scale. Briggs' 'country bungalows' of the 1880s were bourgeois versions of the elite's country seat; Phillips' 'weekend country bungalows' of 1920 were geared to middle class needs; by the later 1920s, there were plenty of proletarian bungalows around. Though many firms supplied portable versions, for the more enterprising weekender it was possible to make one's own. A 'simple, weekend bungalow', with a living room, two 12 by 12 foot bedrooms and kitchen could, exclusive of site, water and sanitation, be built by one man, unaided for less than £90 in 1929. (72) All that was needed was a sympathetic farmer and a truck to take one to the site.

5.27

Near large cities, informal settlements of self-built housing providing pleasure and recreation for the mass grew up. For Liverpool, there was a Bungalow Town at Moreton, in the Wirral. At Whitesand Bay in Cornwall, working families from Devonport and Plymouth built a holiday village of asbestos chalets and bungalows. Similar settlements developed in Sussex at Rye, Winchelsea, Sheppey, Tatsfield, Biggin Hill and Fairlight, and a cluster of railway bungalows at Pagham Beach. All round the coast, within reach of major towns, a proletarian colonisation of seaside land was taking place. Other chalet towns developed at Withernsea near Hull, and along the upper reaches of the Thames, though here, the 'bungalow towns' were of a better class and, according to a leading town planner, were places where actors and actresses went for the weekend. (73)

5.28

5.29

5.30

5.31

One of the largest of the villages was that at Pitsea and Laindon,

at the eastern end of Essex. Here, in the late 1920s, came people from London's East End, buying land for as little as £5 per plot and, after establishing possession with a tent, built their weekend bungalow for a cost of less than £50. By 1945, inflated by war-time migration, some 25,000 people were living in 8,500 houses, a settlement which became the nucleus of Basildon New Town. Equally organised was Jaywick Sands, south of Clacton-on-Sea. Here, in 1930, **5.32** a farmer bought twenty four acres of tidal land and, after advertising **5.33** in the East London papers, sold it off in 30 by 15 foot plots, at £30 each. The place of the motor car was commemorated in its narrow avenues, each named after leading makes of cars, Austin, Hillman, Vauxhall, Bentley or Daimler. Without drainage and water supplies, the bungalows at Jaywick, at first only for holidays, were gradually improved and used for permanent occupation. (74)

As time went by, the owners, making use of waste or re-cycled materials, as well as their craftsmens' skills, turned what were initially weekend chalets into bungalows for permanent use, homes to which they later retired. Not having the money to buy more conventionally built dwellings, or the requisite economic and social status to qualify for a mortgage, the house-builder (and often his family) substituted their labour for capital. In years to come, as the houses were improved, they came to match - and even surpass - in accommodation as well as market value, the 'professionally ' built dwellings of the speculative developer.

Comparable, in many ways, to the self-built settlements of so-called 'Third World' cities today, the history of these inter-war bungalow settlements has, with rare exceptions, been largely overlooked. (75) A combination of cheap land and transport, pre-fabricated materials, and the owner's labour and skills had given back, to the ordinary people of the land, the opportunity denied to them for over two hundred years, an opportunity which, at that time, was still available to **5.34** almost half of the world's non-industrialised populations: the freedom for a man to build his own house. It was a freedom that was to be **5.35** very short-lived.

5.36
5.37

II Environmental Control

The bungalow under attack 1925 - 39

Mushrooming bungalows were only part of the widespread landscape change taking place during these years. Advertisers had seen the potential of prominent roadside sites; garages, petrol pumps and restaurants blossomed along country lanes. New roads were built, existing ones widened out, trees chopped down to hasten traffic flow. Poultry farms, rural industries and small holdings were established, hillsides enriched with extensive plantations of pines and electric pylons carried power across the landscape. 'Historic houses' were sold and transported, stone by stone, to the United States. In country towns and villages, council estates grew up, housing rural workers; in city suburbs, private and council developments expanded in all directions.

From the mid 1920s, these changes became the object of a small but increasingly powerful campaign. Mediated through the establishment and professional press - The Times, Observer, Spectator, Country Life, Architectural Review, Architects' Journal, Garden City and Town Planning - the attack came from the architectural and planning professions, landed interests, 'country' activists and an intellectual and literary elite.

The focus was on what was generally described as 'the spoliation of the countryside', a protest, on aesthetic grounds, about the environmental changes taking place. Of these, the widespread proliferation of the bungalow seemed somehow to epitomise the developments which the campaigners deplored.

'Every road is becoming a nightmare of ugly hoardings or still more ugly individual designs' protested a spokesman of the campaign 'another factor...is the extraordinary ugliness in many villages of garages and petrol pumps...of peculiarly conspicuous colouring... The distressing sacrifice of rural beauty involved in the uncontrollable erection of bungalows and unsightly buildings in conspicuous positions should be dealt with by a joint body representing the whole of the artistic, learned and other societies interested in the protection of rural England (The Observer, May 30, 1926).

A frequent topic for criticism was 'ribbon development', a term apparently coined about this time by Patrick Abercrombie, Professor of Town Planning at Liverpool, to describe continuous roadside building. 'Soon this green and pleasant land will only be glimpsed from our country roads through an almost continuous hedge of bungalows and houses' he wrote to The Times (April 6, 1925).

Architects were at the forefront of the attack. In pre-war days, the 'chief lament of the housing enthusiast' had been the operation of by-laws which had controlled the sizes of rooms and forbidden the use of cheap materials. With the post-war need for housing, this control had largely disappeared. Yet 'everyone who loves the English countryside must be appalled by the rash of squalid little bungalows which disfigures even remote beauty spots' wrote an influential member of the profession. (76) Whilst the large, architect-designed bungalow costing £800 to £2000 was perfectly permissible, the self-built or folk vernacular of the builder ought not to be allowed. The great majority were 'banal with embellishments of the most monstrous kind...worried with "features" and dotted with bits of carving, coloured glass and flower baskets...One begins to deplore the whole genus to which it belongs'. There were 'whole collections of them, by the seaside especially, which stand as evidence of what a bungalow ought not to be. (77) Colonies of weekend and summer chalets were, according to Professor Abercrombie, springing up all over the country, representing a natural desire of town folk for country life. Though this trend was 'better sociologically' it was 'artistically deplorable'. The preserver of rural amenities could not allow 'any sort of old junk cabin to deform his choicest beauty spots'. (78)

A cause célèbre at this time was the proposal to develop some 470 acres of land on the South Coast, fronting the Seven Sisters, east of Beachy Head, as a bungalow town. 'The Sussex Coast has enough of these experiments' protested Garden Cities and Town Planning. (79) Rural areas should be 'sterilised to prevent them turning into ugly bungalow towns' wrote the Librarian of the Garden City Association to the Observer (September 7, 1926), an opinion apparently shared by the paper's middle class readers. Holiday makers, returning home from the seaside resorts in September 1926, had come back, according to the editor, 'surprised and indignant at the blindness of local authorities...

many of the beauty spots in the South Coast, Cornwall, Devon, Wales were being disfigured by badly designed bungalows erected by speculative builders with or without the state subsidy'.

Taking up the theme, the 'Weekend' page ran a readers' competition. According to the Oxford Dictionary, the bungalow was a lightly built, one-storeyed or temporary house. However, 'in the light of later knowledge of its nature and habits on the south coast and elsewhere' the Observer offered a prize for a new definition. The entries were 'rich in the critical and uncomplimentary': 'the superlative of hut, i.e. positive, hut; comparative, railway carriage; superlative, bungalow'; 'a cross between a small country house and a marquee; has inherited the vices of both'; 'a slight parasitical excrescence on the fair face of Nature; sometimes infectious'; 'a small collection of rooms sprawling over the garden, a little higher than the hollyhocks'; 'a domestic building on which the builders bung a low roof and a high price'; 'a one storied house built to admit light, air and rainwater'. Most perceptive, though understandably not winning the two guinea prize, was 'the poor man's home; the middle man's pleasaunce; the rich man's abomination' (September 26, 1926)

For the preservationists, the problem was as much to do with the decline of agriculture as the growth of holidaymaking. In promoting a policy of zoning areas for development and 'sterilising' others against it, the critics had found in the bungalow a rallying symbol for all they deplored, 'ribbon development', lack of architectural control, infiltration of 'country' areas and urbanisation of the coast.

Whilst these criticisms were based on the shared aesthetic values of middle and upper middle class groups, a prominent member of the Establishment saw the bungalow as a symbol of social and moral decay. It represented an upheaval in the social order manifest in landscape terms. For William Inge, Dean of St. Paul's, writing in the Evening Standard on 'social life in the next hundred years' the middle nineteenth century had been 'the golden age of the middle class' but now

'under universal suffrage, the helplessness of the middle class is painfully apparent...Before the end of the century we may see such a state of things as exists in America'. Increasingly high death duties made it impossible to found a family which 'has always been

the main object of an Englishman's ambition'... 'Now that the possession of wealth is treated as some sort of crime, the old ostentation is rapidly disappearing... in the next twenty years, there will be very few country houses left. They are among the few beautiful things that we have to show our visitors but they are doomed. The whole face of the country will be spotted with bungaloid growths within which childless couples will sleep after racing about the country in little motor cars (September 7, 1927)

The Dean's mellifluous-sounding phrase was quickly absorbed into the language of environmental pathology. The medical analogy was expanded; the bungalow was 'infectious'; areas 'broke out into a rash of red-roofed bungalows; there was a 'fever of bungalow-building'; places were hit by 'an outbreak' or 'plague' of bungalows. Bungalows and 'other fungoid growths erupted all over the landscape'. According to the Evening Standard, in the spring of the following year

'Motorists...lured by the fine weekend into making their first country excursions of the year have returned to London with almost blood-curdling stories of what they saw revealed by the clear February sunshine along the great arterial roads. They report the existence there, in distressing numbers, of what Dean Inge has so admirably called "bungaloid growth" and...wonder how these are permitted to come into being'.

Something had gone awry with the scheme of arterial roads where there was arising 'a ragged fringe of paltry and shabby buildings'. The low rateable value this created had the effect of depressing the area; in addition, a magnificent opportunity, civic and aesthetic, to create different development was being thrown away (20 February 1928). The passion for arterial roads was being indulged in 'without sufficient safeguarding against the reflex consequences' reported Garden City and Town Planning (February 1927). The Ministry of Transport and County Councils were cutting these through more or less virgin land at vast public expense without providing proper use of the frontages, upon which, 'there settle down, like bees, swarms of bungalows, built by speculative housing companies, without serious control of lay-out or external design'. (80) Other protestors broke into verse

The jerrybuilder lay dreaming
 In his golden fourpost bed;
 He dreamt of an endless ribbon
 Of bungalows pink and red,
 With fancy work on the gables
 To every purchaser's choice:
 And he dreamt in the back of his conscience
 he heard old England's voice -

"Don't build on the By-Pass, Brother:
 Give ear to our last appeal
 Don't advertise where it tries the eyes
 And distracts the man at the wheel.
 You've peppered the landscape, Brother,
 And blotted out half the sky:
 Get further back with your loathsome shack,
 Let the By-Pass pass you by!"

The jerrybuilder made answer:
 "I'm English, I wants me rights.
 Wot are the by-pass fields to me
 But Desirable Building Sites?
 I've peppered the landscape proper,
 But me pocket 'as to be filled.
 If I wants to build on the By-Pass,
 I'm bloody well going to build!"

"Don't build on the By-Pass, Brother:
 It won't suit anyone's book;
 An endless street is nobody's treat,
 With roofs wherever you look.
 Before you smother the country
 We only hope you'll die:
 You ought to be hung with the ribbons you've strung...
 Let the By-Pass pass you by!"

They swung out a big new By-Pass
 When the first was a choke-full street:
 The glorious day isn't far away
 When London and Liverpool meet,
 And nothing remains of England
 Where the country used to be
 But the roads run straight through a housing estate
 And a single specimen Tree.

"Don't build on the By-Pass, Brother;
 Allow us a breath of air:
 We like to see an occasional tree,
 More so as they're getting rare;
 You're poisoning all the country
 Like a dirty bluebottle-fly:
 Don't clutter the tracks with your loathsome shacks:
 Let the By-Pass pass you by!"

For the self-appointed guardians of architectural taste, the bungalow had become the symbol of all that was bad. In the most widely-read of their manifestos, England and the Octopus, 1928 by architect, Clough Williams-Ellis, bungalows were said to constitute

'England's most disfiguring disease, having, from sporadic beginnings, now become our premier epidemic. So few areas are still immune that it is unnecessary to give instances, though Peacehaven...(is) the classic examples of this distressing and almost universal complaint'. Having begun as 'a perfectly reasonable type of building' it had been 'meanly exploited to its own degradation and the disfigurement of the country at large. For besides being the cheapest sort of human habitation...the reach-me-down, "carriage-paid-to-any station" bungalow is also extremely adventurous...in fact, the intrusive impertinence of the bungalow knows no bounds!'

Before the War, rows of villas had sprung up

along the lines of the public services...as do weeds along an open drain; but the bungalows are not thus regimented - they penetrate into the wildest country as lone adventurers or in guerilla bands.

Though the demand for bungalows was 'very reasonable' whether for a weekend or holiday camping place or regular home,

it is only with the anti-social placing of these little buildings and their gratuitously flashy or exotic appearance that fault is found. Laid out with sense and designed with sensibility, a seaside "Bungalow Town" might be charming. (82) **5.38**

Increasingly influential, the lobby recruited the Prime Minister, Stanley Baldwin, whose speech on 'the destruction of the English countryside' was reported in Garden City and Town Planning under the heading, 'Bungaloid Growths'. At Brighton, according to the Town Planning Advisory Committee, there had been, since the war 'an appalling change for the worse in the appearance of the coast line, from the Solent to the South Foreland

What Dean Inge calls "bungaloid growths" - the phrase seems likely to be called a technical term - have sprung up to such an extent and with such rapidity that... it will not be long before the entire coast is one long line of ferro-concrete and Ruberoid roofing.

By 1929, the opprobrium attached to the term by this influential Establishment had become so strong as to induce self-defensive postures in authors catering for a larger, if less influential holidaying public. 'On every hand there are complaints of bungaloid growths' apologised S.Vant, in Bungalows and How to Build Them (price 6d); 'it is to be regretted that the word "bungalow" seems, in many areas, to have been confounded with the shorter and aptly descriptive word, shed'.

The campaign gained increasing momentum. Aired regularly in the establishment press, it was taken up by the intellectual and literary elite

"This sceptered isle, this earth of majesty...this blessed plot, this earth this realm, this England..."

Nina looked down and saw inclined at an odd angle an horizon of straggling red suburb, arterial roads dotted with little cars, factories, some of them working, others empty and decaying, a disused canal, some distant hills sown with bungalows, wireless masts and overhead power cables.

"I think I am going to be sick", said Nina"

(Evelyn Waugh, Vile Bodies, 1930) (83)

In The Horrors of the Countryside (1931) the philosopher C.E.M.Joad described how, after passing through twenty miles of 'continuous London' on a journey to the coast, at Haywards Heath,

'the red rash breaks out again in a scurf of villas and bungalows, and from there to Brighton, the bungalows are with us more or less all the way, increasing in numbers and virulence as one approaches the coast.

The South Coast has now become one more or less continuous town. Brighton stretches out to meet Shoreham, Shoreham to Worthing, Worthing to Littlehampton...Large towns are girt by rows and rows of small houses, stretched out interminably into the countryside, fringed with allotments and threaded by motor roads...At Camber Beach, near Rye...before and behind the dunes, a bungaloid growth has sprung up of quite unspeakable ugliness and vulgarity. Shacks and old tramcars have appeared on the beach. A dozen shabby stalls, built apparently from sugar boxes or petrol tins, presstea, sweets and aerated waters on your unwilling attention...All around the coast the same destruction of...privacy and beauty is going on. Consider Shoreham, for instance, or 'Peacehaven'. (84)

For an intellectual minority, this democratisation of the environment

had become a burning issue, presenting the guardians of culture with the crisis of their lives. At one of the major centres of high culture, two passionate crusaders, increasingly influential in future years, produced Culture and Environment (1933) a primer in 'the training of critical awareness' for use in schools and adult education. Drawing on the teachings of back-to-the lander, George Sturt, whose Change in the Village (1911) had looked back on a supposed 'organic community' of village life, they offered a catechetical approach for examining cultural change.

Do you know of any ugly building, furniture, tools etc. before 1820? Account as far as you can for your findings.

Compare the bungalow quarter in "Star Dust in Hollywood" with Sturt's village before it changed. Which would you rather live in?

A lengthy bibliography recommended England and the Octopus and the publications of the Council for the Preservation of Rural England. (85)

The Council for the Preservation of Rural England

'She was more than ever proud of the position of the bungalow, so almost in the country'.

Angus Wilson, A Bit off the Map, 1952.

The driving force behind the campaign was the Council for the Preservation of Rural England (CPRE). The initiative in starting it had been taken, in 1925, by leading architects, Guy Dawber, the President of the Royal Institute of British Architects, and Patrick Abercrombie. (86) The Council was an umbrella organisation for some two dozen groups representing the principal 'country' interest: professional, social, political and economic. (87) Whatever else might be said about its motives, and a membership which cut across normal political and ideological positions, the Council represented the middle and upper class viewpoint of an established and propertied class with vested interests in the land. Its regional committees were headed by the aristocracy; the membership composed of senior serving or retired officers, Justices of the Peace, prominent landowners, writers, university scholars. (88)

The late twenties saw an increasingly vigorous campaign promoting the Council's objectives. Grouped housing, planned according to architectural rules, should replace 'ribbon development'; some areas should be zoned for housing, others, for agricultural and recreational use; advertising should be further restricted and 'architectural control' exercised over building development. In short, the powers of local government to plan urban development introduced on a limited scale in the Housing and Town Planning Act of 1909, extended (and in the case of larger towns, made compulsory) in legislation of 1919 and 1925, should be broadened to encompass not just towns but the whole of 'country' areas.

As part of its campaign the Council produced a series of regional reports. Well, even lavishly, produced with expenses privately guaranteed, introduced by a socially prominent literary figure (John Buchan, G.M. Trevelyan, Sir A. Quiller Couch) and advised by the architectural profession, they illustrate the preservationists' concern. Unlike the great reports on mid nineteenth century towns highlighting poverty and problems of poor public health, these reports were not concerned with social issues, with the pressures of capitalism or with agricultural decline. Their focus was essentially aesthetic. The criticisms expressed were with the quality of contemporary building and above all, with the 'invasion' of the whole countryside.

Such issues were not regarded as problematic. It was, for example, sufficient to state, in describing new housing on the Thames (near Pangbourne)

some are of simple and charming design, the others are notorious for their architectural vulgarity...The riverside inn close by is expressive of an age when architectural manners were better understood. (89)

According to their rules of taste, new developments were 'hideous', 'outrageous', 'offensive' or 'incongruous'. Suburbs were 'desecrated by a mass of uncontrolled vulgarity'. It was assumed that 'there are some fundamentals of good taste which should be obvious to the common man' yet 'the vague inclination for meaningless ornament is a depressing attribute of the age'. Though these reports covered rural advertising, garages, bridges, roads, industry, landscape and all new

building, the bungalow, as usual, came in for special attention.

At Coln Brook, on the Thames, a 'colony of bungalows' had been erected which 'are probably the worst disfigurement to the riverside in the Region surveyed'. Near Appleton 'two bungalows of incongruous materials' had been built in a country lane. Elsewhere, 'blue slate roofs with red hip and ridge tiles is a combination which should never be permitted'. Between Staines and Pangbourne, low-lying land on the Thames, previously thought unfit for building, had been 'covered for long distances with riverside bungalows'. These 'ought not to be allowed on floodland and their architecture should be controlled'.

Economic and social changes were altering the riverside scene.

'From the Stuart period and through the Georgian, great houses were built along the banks (of the Thames) and at the end of the Georgian period, interest was divided between park-like scenery, wide stretches of low-lying land and intermittent villages and towns. The Victorian period had seen its banks dotted with villas of the wealthy, reposing amidst a richly wooded country, with cedars, acacias and weeping willows, spreading their branches over the smooth lawns.

The twentieth century has seen a great incursion of small houses; long stretches of meadowland and much of the floodland are now dotted with bungalows. Many of these are by no means unattractive, with their landing stages and little gardens brilliant with geraniums, lobelia and rose-embowered pergolas...While there are still miles and miles of pleasant park-like scenery...and many eighteenth and nineteenth century villas...the bungalow with its sham half-timber, its tinsel and more ephemeral trimmings is rapidly creeping up the banks...the fashion for building big villas has practically ceased'.

Instead, there was an 'ever present menace of smaller houses down to bungalows and shacks'.

For the compilers of the report (the Earl of Mayo, and architect-planners, Professors Abercrombie and Adshead), what was necessary was 'Architectural Control, covering siting, design and materials of new building' and 'the elimination of meretricious ornament'. (90) The opportunity to exert this had, in fact, been suggested in the planning act of 1909 and in 1927, by a 'model clause' of the Ministry which could be adopted by local authorities. This allowed the setting up of an advisory committee consisting of a local Justice of the Peace, and an architect and surveyor recommended by their respective

professional organisations. (91) However, the best safeguard against 'disfigurement' was 'possession of the land by the owners who would not allow it'. (92)

Similar views prevailed elsewhere. If Cornwall was to preserve its 'subtle beauty' 'the flimsy type of ill-designed bungalow and suburban villa that disfigures the Sussex coast should never be allowed to violate the headlands of Cornwall'. A 'debasement of taste throughout England' had taken place from the late Victorian period and 'incongruous' and 'garish' new materials had been introduced.

'One material produced in this country on a large scale since the war, namely, asbestos, has done more than any other to encourage 'jerry-building' and the disfigurement of rural England...for reasons unknown, the manufacturers have assumed the English purchaser wants a temporary roof of salmon pink colour and the speculative builder has apparently concurred with the decision...asbestos is infinitely cheaper than green slate and if of a conspicuous pink colour is more likely to catch the eye of the prospective and indiscriminating purchaser.' (93)

In an appendix to the Report on Derbyshire a lengthy list of materials was included which were 'specifically unsuitable to the Peak District'. These included red, orange and pink bricks; red, reddish, pink and purple machine-made tiles; vividly coloured concrete tiles; coloured glass, as used in ornamental windows; red, reddish brown and purple red paint; crude harsh colours of every kind; pink and red asbestos slates, and diamond shaped slates of any colour; half timber, either construcitonal or imitation; rocky faced pre-cast concrete blocks or imitation stone; in brief, most of the materials which had been marketed in the previous decade. In the Report on Ryedale, the Committee suggested that even if grey asbestos tiles were used, they should not be laid diagonally.

In these reports incontrovertible rules of colour were assumed.

Hundreds of vulgar villas complete with fussy facades, creep up out of Sheffield...and shatter the harmony of remote villages. Pink bungalows suddenly appear in the heart of a wooded dale or austere moor, ruining areas of noble scenery.

In the Cordwell Valley, in Derbyshire, a handful of bungalows had 'pink

539

asbestos roofs which shatter the peaceful loveliness of the surroundings'.

The bungalow was singled out as having 'special problems'. Apart from being 'built carelessly with the poorest materials', the square plan was generally used, giving rise to an 'ugly roof' and 'badly shaped chimneys'. The walls, being one-storey high 'are quite devoid of dignity' as they were 'overpowered' by the roof. The effect of bungalows and houses built in close proximity or placed alternatively, was 'always unfortunate', the 'broken roof line is most unpleasant'. Bungalows and houses should be kept in separate groups. It was scarcely possible, even for the skilled architect, 'to give a dignified appearance to the ordinary bungalow or block of two villas owing to their lack of size'. Instead, they should be grouped into blocks of four or six. 5-41

Discussing 'Disorder and vulgarity', these arbiters of taste deplored the fact that 'each house strives to be different from its neighbours'. Bungalows were a "doll's house type of building" which was sadly out of place on the edge of a moor. The smaller a country building, the plainer it should be (94) A new bungalow should have "the elementary decency and good manners to cover the nakedness of its red-brick walls with plaster and whitewash". (95)

The Town and Country Planning Act, 1932

The campaign succeeded. In 1928, the CPRE had drafted a Bill in which the name 'town planning' would be altered to cover 'rural planning', to simplify rural planning procedures and to give County Councils town and rural planning powers. The aim of the new Act of Parliament, passed in 1932, was to simplify existing legislation, widen the application of planning power from town to country, and 'prevent the desecration of the countryside'. (96) The preamble referred to 'the protection of rural amenities' and 'the preservation of buildings and other objects of interest and beauty'. Local authorities were given the right to regulate not only the size and height but also the 'design and external appearance of buildings'. (97) 'Thus, architectural beauty is at last officially admitted to have an existence as much as the foundations and the drains' announced Garden City and Town Planning with satisfaction. (98) The 'aesthetic lobby', it seemed, had won the day.

In the debate on the bill, the contribution of the CPRE and RIBA in forming public opinion and 'promoting interest in the subject' was fully acknowledged. As might be expected, the 'bungaloid' image was to come in useful. With historic castles increasingly being exported to California, Sir Stafford Cripps was worried about the unequal exchange. He had had the sad experience, 'living in one of the most beautiful parts of England' (the Cotswolds) of seeing people coming in 'to put up small buildings of the bungaloid type' while others 'were removing buildings entirely to be erected in other parts of the world'. (99)

In the event, the Act was to have limited effect. For various reasons, including multiple responsibility, 'ribbon development' went on. In 1935, a new measure, the Restriction of Ribbon Development Bill was introduced. Though Abercrombie's original objection to the phenomenon had been social, economic and aesthetic, creating what he assumed would be socially incohesive settlements, expensive to service (with roads, sewers and power), the burden of the criticism was on aesthetic grounds. The problem was 'not a transport problem at all. It is a sociological and aesthetic problem'. (100)

We are against ribbon development because we are against uglification - we are against bungaloid and other fungoid growths which are now stretching out from every big town into the countryside...we often find on a road, a hundred small bungalows, all of one elevation and size, which are neither useful nor beautiful. (101)

Yet the long discussion of the bill, on a phenomenon in progress for over ten years, merely encouraged developers to take advantage of the delay. The Act made it illegal, without the consent of the highway authority, to build within 220 feet of the centre of main roads and therefore pushed building lines further back. Yet agricultural buildings (including, it must be assumed, the occasional smallholder's bungalow) were to be exempt. (102) In the debate, only the lone figure of Sir Francis Freemantle spoke up on behalf of people who liked to live by the side of the road, people who enjoyed watching traffic as others enjoyed watching railways, a feeling 'not confined to the working class'. (103)

The 1932 Act was permissive rather than compulsory, It followed

that only relatively wealthy authorities whose elected representatives shared the same assumptions and values as the people responsible for bringing the Act onto the book, could take advantage of its new powers. This was particularly so as the Act had immense implications involving compensation for land prevented from being developed.(104)

Thus Surrey County Council with the highest rateable income per capita in England, had been the first county to get a private Bill through Parliament restricting building development in the country in 1931, prior to the passage of the general planning act a year later. (105) Similarly, Middlesex and Essex, with their wealthy and interested middle class constituents, had promoted legislation to preserve the by-passes according to the image of their choice.

'Architectural control' was exercised in a similar way. In the debate, the Minister (Hilton Young) had seen difficulties in legislating on matters of taste. In his view, such questions were best left to local magistrates, 'with an intimate knowledge of the district in question' or 'a committee of specialists, of architects and people of that sort with special knowledge of the subject'.(106) In effect, this meant that those with social and political power exercised the aesthetic criteria of the class to which they belonged. The amount and result of this control were to be relative to the socio-economic status of the districts where it was, or was not, applied.

Where members of the CPRE or its constituent bodies were powerful, there was now quite extensive legislation by which building development could be controlled. And it is clear from CPRE publications that where their members found self-built bungalow settlements visually offensive, according to their own aesthetic values, Public Health legislation was invoked to restrict or prohibit them. (107)

The mid 1930s saw greater expansion than ever. Each year, over 360,000 houses were built, a greater number than either before or since at a time when the population was only four fifths that of the 1970s. The impact of these developments was immense. In 1938, a government report recognised that one third of all dwellings in the country had been built in the previous twenty years, almost three quarters of them by private enterprise. By the mid thirties, the market for middle class dwellings was well-nigh saturated. Builders were having to reach to lower markets, with smaller dwellings; hence,

the bungalow persisted, continuing to figure in the environmental protests of the pre-war years and symbolising, for leading architect-planners, the nadir of environmental control. (108)

In Britain and the Beast, a collection of essays by prominent political, literary and other figures, edited by Clough Williams-Ellis (1938), the bungalow took a further rap. For H.J. Massingham, the English village was being 'swallowed up by the bungalow plantations - the newest form of enclosure'; for Sheila Kaye-Smith, the complaint was of the disappearance of 'old world charm': the thatched roofs coloured like dead bracken, the walls of ruddy golden brick of Kent and Sussex, which suggested a 'natural growth', were being replaced by 'the bungalow coloured pink that can be seen nowhere else save in boiled crustaceans'. Agricultural land was being sold off and 'in one small field of just over an acre no less than seven bungalows' were being built. Everywhere land was being sold for speculative bungalows, either for sale or for an investment; everywhere, landowners were tempted by a few shillings for an advertising site or, for a few pounds, a bungalow plot 'where no advertising or bungalow should be' according to the editor. Yet there was sympathy for the bungalow dweller. Even 'a hideous bungalow set down in the midst of the loveliest of rural landscape' was the sign of a desire for something better than a house in a town street' according to a 'professional countryman', A.G. Street.

Everywhere, rapid suburbanisation had taken place. Near Oxford, 'lorry-drivers and bus-travellers are pitchforked into the road near...a stucco bungalow with a raised tower that fulfils no other function beyond giving the cafe its name'. In the Lake District was 'Bill Brown's bungalow; the poor chap had saved for years to build the little shack for himself'. He couldn't afford an architect and 'the best we can do is to see he uses grey asbestos instead of pink for the roof and trust the thing won't look too bad...from a distance'. (109) In 1928, Patrick Abercrombie had referred to 'blasphemous bungalows'; (110) ten years later, according to another architect, 'the mere mention of the word "bungalow" makes excitable people nearly as furious as a whisper of the shameful word "drawing room" does among the Chelsea highbrows'. (111) In the building boom of the time, 'semi's might have been more numerous, but the bungalow occupied the centre of the stage.

As the thirties drew to a close, planning ideas were increasingly turning to issues other than the purely physical and visual, to questions of unemployment, social amenities, defensive strategy in face of possible air attack and notions of regionalism. Yet as the 1932 Act was not compulsory, and only partially applied, people still maintained a relative freedom to build. It was a freedom drastically removed in the new planning legislation of 1947.

Conclusion

Since enclosures and the rise of the industrial state, a ruling class had owned and controlled the rural and urban environment, and had shaped it according to taste. In the country the form of building, as well as landscape, was governed by a powerful land-owning class; in the new industrial towns, building developments were in the hands of equally powerful groups. In many conventional urban or planning histories, it is often stated that such cities 'grew in totally unplanned ways'. This is a misreading of the situation in that they grew according to the 'natural' (albeit inexplicit) plan or logic resulting from the structure of economic and political power, expressed in local cultural traditions.

When explicit 'town planning' was instituted in the form of building, health and housing legislation, the resulting environments ('by-law housing' and 'garden city' design) similarly expressed the values, social, moral and aesthetic, of a newly powerful middle and upper middle class. (112) As others have pointed out, (113) the history of town planning in Britain was the history of a middle class social and architectural movement whose ideology was accepted, by government, as a norm and institutionalised through legislation.

Throughout this time, the majority of the population - the folk, the common people, the proletariat - whichever term is appropriate, were a dependent class, not least regarding housing, let alone any question of 'taste'. They owned neither property nor land. Owner occupiers, with dwellings and territory over which they had total control, represented less than ten per cent at most of all households in the early twentieth century. In the countryside, the mass of the population were dependent tenants; in the towns, housing was owned by greater or lesser landlords. Everywhere there were explicit or implicit restrictive covenants. Taking building materials as

'given', the appearance of housing was determined according to culturally derived and socially enforced values and practices (as regionally varied as these were), of landlords operating with the informal mechanisms of economic and political power. The mass of people expressed no personal 'taste' in housing because they owned neither land nor property to display it. As Alf Doo little - of Shaw's Pygmalion - said of morals, the poor 'can't afford them'.

What happened after 1918, for the reasons discussed above, was that the ruling class lost this architectural and environmental control. Changes happened which they could not contain. They therefore organised themselves to gain access to formal mechanisms of control, to legislation and the manipulation of public opinion, to ensure that the environment should as far as possible, be preserved in the image of their choice. What this class was trying to achieve was the aesthetic control of what, in the forty years before 1914, had become a recreational preserve of the traditional aristocracy as well as the urban, upper middle class elite, as discussed in Chapter Three. It was a combination of interests which had given rise, for example, to the Country Gentleman's Association (1900), the 'weekend cottage' and the discovery, by middle class architects of the 'vernacular tradition'. The countryside was still the private territory of an educated elite, sharing similar social and aesthetic values. The majority view of the 1920s and 30s that the 'country is intrinsically a better place to live in' was a relatively new view, dating from the late nineteenth century. Prior to that time, and before industrialisation, the town had been the preferred environment, the symbol of progress, security and culture; the country was for production. Only for the minority did it have any attraction; for the majority it represented the outposts of wilderness of nature. (114) In an earlier age, the Game Laws had been passed in the interests of a landowning class, defining those who contravened them as "poachers". (115) In a more subtle way, the new planning legislation, in theory in the interests of all, was an attempt to preserve landed interests, and by defining self-built housing as 'unsightly' or 'non-conforming', effectively kept it off the land.

The initiative in setting up the preservationist lobby came from the professional environmentalists, the architects and planners. Of the latter, the larger proportion were architects, from middle and upper class origins (116) sharing the values of others grouped in the CPRE. Before 1932, and to a somewhat lesser extent through the thirties, the theory and ideas of planning were strongly influenced by architectural ideas, which, at this time, were largely dominated by visual and aesthetic concerns. (117) Only in the later thirties did planning thought shift noticeably to regional economic, social and strategic questions. It was significant, therefore, that in the all-important Act of 1932, the title was to reflect not a concern with economic activities such as 'industry and agriculture' or 'urban and rural development', or, as later, the spatial distribution of populations and opportunity and a concern, in 'urban and regional planning', with economic development and growth. Instead, it expressed the traditional social and visual categories of environment of the middle and upper class lobby who had promoted it, the 'town' and 'country' planning act of 1932. At a time when the activities of urban and rural areas were becoming increasingly interdependent, legislation was introduced which aimed to keep them apart.

Protests against change in the environment were, of course, hardly new. What was different in the inter-war period was not only the size and rate of change, and the perception of it, but the organisation of the lobby against it. Here, the major difference resulted from the rise of the professions and their increasing influence, particularly architects, surveyors and after 1914, town planners. With their annual meetings, conferences and statements reported in the press, their specialised journals and, consulted by the government, growing status, they became increasingly influential in forming public opinion. The revolution in communications was also important. Apart from causing much of 'the problem' the motor car gave members of this lobby the opportunity to see the changes which they deplored. The things of which they complained were mainly 'views from the road' (it is incidentally remarkable how few bungalows can be seen from the train). Cars enabled people to move and organise. The press also expanded

during these years and establishment views were promulgated by the increasingly influential monopoly of the BBC whose weekly paper, The Listener, was also important in promoting these views.

Why was the bungalow so deplored, the symbol of all that was bad? The reasons offered by the preservationists' lobby have been sufficiently stated above. There were, however, much more fundamental explanations.

In a word, the popular bungalow, in its design, materials and location, undermined all the basic principles on which the professional architect based his career: that there were inherently absolute rules which governed questions of design: colours or materials which 'harmonised' with the landscape, rules about 'proportion' and beliefs about 'communities' which resulted from grouped dwellings. Where the planner wanted to cluster buildings together, and keep them all in one style, the bungalow owner insisted on staying apart. Where they insisted on creating a 'community', the bungalow owner preferred to be on his own. The vast majority of bungalows presented the professional environmentalist with a blatant contradiction of every belief on which he based his professional role. They soiled a cherished cultural ideal, the image of the bucolic, romantic landscape decorated with simple cottages and cows. By pre-empting, even usurping, the architect's role as 'designer' it challenged the basis of his existence.

It is a commonplace of sociology to suggest that the established or ruling values of a society may be studied in their purest form by looking at its upper class. (118) Yet it was precisely in the values governing their residential preferences that the idea of the 'bungalow in the country' had its origin. When middle class critics complained that 'it is a rare experience to come upon a landscape in southern England that is not flawed by at least one modern bungalow, planted, as bungalows almost invariably are, so as to command, and in commanding, to ruin the maximum possible area', (119) they had only the aristocracy to blame.

In the years between the wars, the preservationist lobby won the right of 'architectural control'. For some, the argument was simply elitist and paternalist. 'There never was a time when public opinion

was so vulgar, or so ill-trained, or so powerful'. Whilst the people's claim to the countryside was paramount, they were (as with nineteenth century arguments against extending the franchise) 'not yet ready to take it up'; hence, the countryside should be 'kept in trust' until such time as education made them fit for the responsibility. For those with such views, the only solution was to give back the countryside to the large landowners. For others, 'in these democratic days' (of 1938) it was impossible to impose the cultural views of a minority on the mass of the population. Yet with the disappearance of the controlling landowners, such a minority had to take responsibility. (120) What was clearly at issue were two sets of cultural rules: those of an elite, both professional and social, and those of the mass, or folk, both builders and owners, and the latter were rapidly gaining in ascendancy. For the elite, the rules were based on principles they called 'order and simplicity'. These principles they had been able to enforce when backed by the power of the state. For them, the ideal model was the Labour Exchange or Post Office in 'neo-Georgian style' and especially, the new local authority estate. (121) Such 'Corporation estates' had 'the merit of plainness and a certain unity of style'. 'Had there been no new housing but Council housing since the war, we had been in far happier case today so far as the look of England is concerned' wrote a major pillar of the CPRE. (122) On such estates, accommodating ever growing numbers of the more affluent working class, bourgeois architects, with public money behind them, had been able to impose their ideas of taste, a taste whose origins lay in their re-constructed version of rural village life. The design of the houses reflected these ideals. The lay-out of the estates exhibited a calculated 'order' which only a local authority could impose. The location of the estate, again decided 'from above', was often in the poorer part of the town. Above all, in being denied the opportunity to modify the house facade, the tenants demonstrated their subjection to local authority rules. In short, architectural control was achieved by, as well as expressed, social control.

Making pseudo-sociological assumptions, the architect-planner believed that housing, especially in country village or town, should

be in physically 'close knit groups'. Such groups symbolised 'the socially cooperative basis of the group of people it houses'. (123) Whatever the demerits of the old terraced houses, they had, in this view, 'certain qualities of social life which was the basis of the town'. The 'new romantic villas and bungalows', however, 'with their pebble dash, their half-timbered gables, the picturesque leaded lighted windows' in the 'new squandering suburbs' displayed not only 'unsightliness, a disorder and vagueness' but apparently the greatest sin of all, 'a violent individualism'. (124)

Yet it was precisely these rules, about lay-out, location and appearance of facades, drawn up by architects and imposed with local authority power, which expressed the tenant's dependent status. The fact was not unappreciated at the time. According to the Conservative Attorney General, Counsel to the CPRE, 'it might have been expected that the high standard of design imparted by architects since 1919 to the best types of Council houses would have helped to educate public taste. Yet this was not so. On the contrary, there had been 'a psychological reaction against the Council house...a revolt against (its) artistically good simplicity and excellent design'. The reaction had manifested itself in a demand for the kind of house which, according to this observer, was 'an abomination': a house bought because its 'exterior is so different from the decent exterior of the Council house that the casual observer must see at a glance that its owner is not living in a Council house - it may even have been chosen in the belief that people will think it has cost more'. (125) No better example can be found than the illustrations in the 'Ideal Home' books of the mid 1930s. Here, all key words of the description, each invested with deep social and cultural meaning, and describing the most important symbolic elements of the facade, are capitalised. 'House in TRADITIONAL style'; 'This design FEATURES the PORCH'; 'The BEAUTY of HALF-TIMBERED work'; 'with a ROOF of THATCH'; 'in TUDOR style for the ENGLISH countryside'.

Yet whilst architects were imposing their aesthetic views on a captive working class, first in the 'villagey' estates and subsequently, in mammoth 'Modernist' flats in larger cities (such as Quarry Hill in Leeds) families slightly higher up the social scale were planning

5-42
5-43
5-44

5-45

with their feet. Leaving the 'old communities' supposedly expressed by urban streets, they were moving to 'better areas' and a territorially expressive, private personalised house, or a bungalow out in the bush.

If the 1932 Act had been relatively ineffective in establishing their objectives, the post war legislation of 1947 saw the architect-planners firmly in control. The principles won in 1932, if not always enforced, were now strongly reaffirmed. Since that date, the 'distinctive philosophical strain of planning' according to Professor Hall, has been the notion that 'the planner has the right and responsibility to try and shape the life of the community through physical arrangements'. (126) It is a right which included the two principles established in 1932: to determine the location of houses and decide on their 'aesthetic appearance' from outside. The three freedoms retained by the poor in the poor countries of the world were lost by the poor in the richer ones, the freedom 'of community self-selection, the freedom to budget one's own resources and the freedom to shape one's own environment'. (127)

The bungalows of the inter-war years are now of little interest to anyone but their owners. What Joad wrote in 1931, has, in the event, proved correct: 'our children growing up in a world of garages and bungaloids...not knowing what they have lost, will not miss what they have never known'. (128) And ironically, as botanical investigation has shown, asbestos-tiled roofs have proved to be particularly attractive to a certain species of green-gold algae, especially in smoke infected regions. (129) After fifty years, the red-roofed bungalows have faded imperceptibly into the landscape.

The issues they raised, however, have remained very much to the fore. In 1940, it was foreshadowed that 'the great danger is that the preservation of beauty may come to be regarded as a class issue'. (130) This is how it was to frequently turn out. For the rich, there was an 'architecturally-approved' house in a National Park. For the poor, the self-built bungalow, whether for permanent or holiday use, was ruled out of court. The caravan that took over its role was to be mainly confined to a compound that, for planners, was preferably kept out of sight.

Chapter Five Footnotes

1. A.Sutcliffe,ed., Multi-Storey Living. The British working class experience, Croom Helm, London, 1973.
2. A.F.Weber, The Growth of Cities in the Nineteenth Century, Cornell University Press, New York, 1967 (first published, 1899), frontispiece.
3. Department of Environment, Road Motor Vehicles. Current Licences. Motor vehicles licensed in Great Britain, 1903-73; H.J.Dyos and D.Aldcroft, British Transport. An economic survey from the seventeenth to the twentieth century, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1974, pp.357-9; G.E.Cherry, Urban Change and Planning, Foulis, Henley on Thames, 1972, p.140.
4. S.Pollard, The Development of the British Economy, 1914-1967, Edward Arnold, London, 1979, p.144; F.M.L.Thompson, English Landed Society in the Nineteenth Century, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1963, p.332.
5. J.Sheail, Rural Conservation in Inter-War Britain, Oxford University Press, London, 1981, p.29.
6. Pollard, op.cit., p.138; Sheail, op.cit., p.24.
7. P.Hall et al, The Containment of Urban England, 2 vols, Allen and Unwin, London, 1973, 1, p.69.
8. W.V.Hole and M.T.Pountney, Trends in Population, Housing and Occupancy Rates, 1861-1961, HMSO, London, 1971, pp.29-31; H.W. Richardson and D.Aldcroft, Building in the British Economy Between the Wars, Allen and Unwin, London, 1968, p.56 - from which the main statistical data in this section are drawn.
9. J.Burnett, A Social History of Housing, 1815-1970, David and Charles, London, 1978, Chapter 9; A.A.Jackson, Semi-Detached London, Allen and Unwin, London, 1973; M.Boddy, The Building Societies, Heinemann, London, 1980.
10. Jackson,op.cit.; N.Branson and M.Heinemann, Britain in the 1930s, Panther, London, pp.164-5.
11. Burnett, op.cit., p.244.
12. Hall, op.cit., p.81.
13. Sheail, op.cit., p.24.
14. W.I.Chambers, Bungalows, published by author, Gloucester, 1924, p.11.
15. D.Hebdige, 'Towards a cartography of taste 1935-62', in B.Waites et al., Popular Culture: Past and Present, Croom Helm, for Open University, London, 1981, pp.194-218, p.200.

16. C.J.H.Keeley, Bungalows and Modern Homes, Batsford, London, 1927, p.2
17. J.Glynn and J.Oxborrow, Inter-war Britain. A social and economic history, Allen & Unwin, London, 1976; see also Burnett, p.246.
18. Postcards in writer's collection
19. See W.Ashworth, The Genesis of Modern British Town Planning, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1972, chapter 7; and especially T.Sharp, Town and Countryside. Some aspects of urban and rural development, Oxford University Press, London, 1932, p.146; also Cherry, op.cit., 1972; M.Swenarton, Homes fit for Heroes, Heinemann, London, 1981.
20. As Chief Technical Officer for building and town planning, Ministry of Health, G.E.Cherry, The Evolution of British Town Planning, Leanord Hill, Leighton Buzzard, 1974; for his interest in utopian communities, see S.Rowbotham and J.Weeks, Socialism and the New Life, etc. Pluto Press, London, 1977, p.48.
21. Sharp, op.cit., p.144. For a particularly perceptive view on these ideas in the inter-war period, see chapter 7.
22. Parliamentary Debates. Official reports (Subsequently referred to as Hansard) 8 December, 1919, 960. See also Burnett, chapter 8.
23. Dr.C.Addison in the House of Commons. Hansard, ibid. See also Burnett, Richardson and Aldcroft, op.cit.
24. Hansard, debates on 24 April, 1923, 311,348; 21 July, 1923, 2481-2; 25 July, 1923.
25. R.R.Phillips, The Book of Bungalows, Country Life, London, 1920,p.1.
26. Journal of the RIBA, 27, 8 November, 1919, p.16.
27. Phillips, op.cit., p.18.
28. Burnett, op.cit., 227-9.
29. Hansard, 24 April, 1923, 311,348; 21 July, 1923, 2481-2; 24 April, 1923, 366, 517, 21 July, 1921, 2483.
30. Phillips, op.cit. 3rd edition, 1926, pp.30-2.
31. Richardson and Aldcroft, op.cit., p.56. Also chapter 8.
32. The following titles are in the British Library (edition dates given)
Before 1900
R.A.Briggs, Bungalows and Country Residences, Batsford, London, 1891, 1897.

1900 - 1918

P.T.Harrison, Bungalow Residences, Crosby Lockwood, London, 1909, 1920, 1921; G.C.Samson, Houses, Villas, Cottages and Bungalows for Britishers and Americans abroad. Crosby Lockwood, London, 1910, 1920; Country Houses, Country Houses and Bungalows, Northwestern Properties, London, 1912.

from New Zealand: G.W.Phillips, New Zealand Homes and Bungalows, 1912
 from USA: H.H.Saylor, Bungalows, McBride, New York, 1912. Fdk.T. Hodgson, Practical Bungalows for Town and Country, Chicago, 1916.

1918 - 1932

A.Lakeman, Concrete Cottages, Bungalows and Garages, Concrete Association, London, 1918, 1924, 1932, 1949; R.R.Phillips, The Book of Bungalows, Country Life, London, 1920, 1922, 1926; F.Chatterton, Small Houses and Bungalows, Architectural Press, London, 1922, 1926, 1932, Daily Mail Bungalow Book, London, 1922 (this has, with intervals continued up to the present); W.I.Chambers, Bungalows, Crypt House Press, Gloucester, 1924; The Builder, Bungalows, London, 1923; South Coast Land & Resort Company, Economic Homes, containing 75 designs of Bungalow type houses, SCLR, London, 1924. Economist, The Ideal Bungalow, 1927; C.Keeley, Bungalows and Modern Homes, Country Life, London, 1928; S.Vant, Bungalows, Pavilions and Cottages, London, 1929; H.B.Philpott, Modern Houses and Bungalows. Illustrated Carpenter & Builder, London, 1930; S.D.Meadows, Modern Eastern Bungalows, Thackers Press, Calcutta, 1931; W.J.Brise, Architectural Plans for Bungalows, Dartford, 1930.
 from USA: C.E.White, The Bungalow Book, New York, 1923.

1932 - 1939

L.H.James, Modern Bungalows. Practical Building Co., London, 1935; E.Carter, Seaside Houses and Bungalows, Country Life, London, 1937; A.Hastings, Weekend Houses, Cottages and Bungalows, Architectural Press, London, 1939.

1939 - 1960

Aluminium Development Association, The First Factory Made Aluminium Bungalow, London, 1948. F.W.Julian, Bungalows and House Designs for Everyone. Illustrated Carpenter and Builder, London, 1957; All-Englander Homefinder and Small property guide. The Homefinder Bungalow Plan Book, London, 1957; Ibid. Twenty New Bungalow Plans, London, 1958; F.Walter, Fifty Modern Bungalows, Architectural Press, London, 1959; J.Park, Houses and Bungalows, Batsford, London, 1958; Clarke Brothers, Gold Star Houses and Bungalows, Home Publishing Company, Croydon, 1959.
 The Daily Mail book of Bungalow Plans comes out annually.

33. Private communication, A.A.Jackson, 22 April, 1978.
34. L.H.Hornsby, Home Owner's Handbook, Shaw Pubg.Co., London, 1938, p.24.
35. Jackson, op.cit., pp. 112 -4.

36. P.Abercrombie, The Preservation of Rural England, University of Liverpool Press and Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1926, p.11.
37. Daily Mail Bungalow Book, Associated Newspapers, London, 1922, Advts.
38. Daily Mail Bungalow Book, Advts; W.I.Chambers, Bungalows, published by the architect, Gloucester, 1924, advertisements.
39. Richardson and Aldcroft, op.cit., p.145 who underate the use of cement and ignore design developments in this informal sector of housing.
40. Ibid., pp. 33-5.
41. See 'How to Build a Bungalow' in W.H.Robinson, Inventions, Hamilton, 1930.
42. A.H.Halsey, ed., Trends in British Society since 1900, Macmillan, London, 1972, p.31, 56-57, also Burnett, op.cit., p.257.
43. Statistical Abstract for the UK for each of fifteen years, 1924-38, Cmd. 6232 1940 Table 24 (E), quoted in H.Myles Wright, ed., The Planner's Notebook. A compendium of information on town and country planning and related subjects. Architectural Press, London, 1948, p.6.
44. Burnett, op.cit., p.257.
45. Columbia recording. I am grateful to Dr.D.Page and the BBC Record Library for this information.
46. Halsey, op.cit., p.35.
47. Phillips, op.cit. preface.
48. Daily Mail Bungalow Book, p.2; Chambers, op.cit., p.6; Economist, op.cit., p.1.
49. Burnett, op.cit., p.258.
50. Phillips, Country Life, London, 1920.
51. G.Allen, The Cheap Cottage and Small House, Batsford, London, 1919, p.12.
52. Daily Mail Bungalow Book; Phillips, Book of Bungalows, 1920; Chambers, advts; The Builder, Bungalows. A series of illustrations, plans, etc., The Builder, 1923.
53. See Keeley, op.cit., 1927.
54. Ibid.
55. Phillips, op.cit., p.29.
56. Prices from Keeley, op.cit.,; Jackson, op.cit.

57. Jackson, op.cit., Burnett, op.cit., p.248. Typical was the Clerical Officer, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Whitehall Place, earning £250 p.a. who bought a new bungalow in Northolt in 1926 for £500 (less £75 subsidy), paid for from post office savings and a county council mortgage of £400 at 5%. The buyer 'preferred a bungalow as we were escaping from a London mews flat reached by a flight of stairs up and down which bicycles had to be acrobatically shouldered each day'. Some years later, the couple moved to a semi-detached house where their first (and only) child was born. My thanks to Dr.R.O.Iredale for this personal reminiscence of his father.

Another representative case at the other end of the country was Mr.X, the first to build in a small, out of town bungalow development at Adel some five miles from the centre of Leeds in 1933. At the time, the site, with the odd railway carriage and pre-fab, was a 'weekend place', a twopenny tram ride from the city. Mr. X moved from a rented Victorian terraced house in Delph Lane, Headingley: 'my friends thought I was crazy'. Land was 2/6 per square yard (cheaper land at 6p was turned down). A salesman with the main motor car dealers in the city, he earned £3 a week (£156 a year) and paid £3 a month mortgage which, despite only 4 per cent interest rate, was as much as his wages could support. Married, though with no children, his reasons for buying a bungalow were 'I wanted my own place . . . you can always be turned out from a rented house' and he 'didn't have any money to buy a house' rather than a bungalow. (Informal interview, January 1982)

Other evidence suggests that aspiring property-owners who moved into bungalows managed financially only by the strictest budgeting. The carefully kept domestic accounts of one such owner, getting married and moving into a Kent bungalow in June 1931 show estimates for every item considered essential for suburban life. These include

	£	s	d		£	s	d
Suite	21	0	0	Sideboard	5	10	0
Piano stool	not	given		Bookcase	4	0	0
Oxidised silver curb				Pictures(each room)	2	0	0
ditto Companion set	1	5	0	Table mangle	4	4	0
Cauldron	1	10	0	Cork mat (bathroom)		5	0
Clock	1	10	0				
Ornaments		10	0				

along with curtains, lino, beds, mattresses, chairs etc. and wedding suit (6 guineas) 4 shirts, 6 collars, 6 prs socks, 2 pairs of shoes, 2 prs spats, 1 hat, 1 pair grey flannels, etc.

My thanks are due to Randall Smith of the School of Advanced Urban Studies, University of Bristol, for these extracts from his father's accounts.

58. Personal communication. A.A.Jackson, 22 April 1978. Home Owner's Handbook, 1938, advts; Burnett, op.cit., p.247.
59. Economist, An Ideal Bungalow, How to build it well and at lowest cost and pay for it in a few years as rent. Eligible for the Government subsidy. Simpkin, Marshall, etc., London, 1927.

60. Richardson and Aldcroft, op.cit., p.87.
61. A.H.Halsey, ed., op.cit.
62. V.A.Karn, Retiring to the Seaside, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1977.
63. Census of England and Wales, 1931. County of Sussex, Part I.
64. P.Dickens, 'A disgusting blot on the landscape', New Society, 17 July, 1975, pp. 127-9, which provides a good though conventional 'architect-planner's' account of developments. For an alternative view see letter by John Henderson, New Society, 7 August, 1975, p.323.
65. Ibid.
66. Ibid.
67. Peacehaven. The land of sunshine and health. Peacehaven Estates Ltd., London, n.d. but about 1927 from which the following data are taken.
68. Ibid.
69. Dickens, op.cit., p.129.
70. J.Gloag, 'The suburban scene', in C.Williams-Ellis, ed., Britain and the Beast. Readers' Union, London, 1938, pp. 187-99, p.196.
71. S.D.Adshead, Town Planning and Town Development, Methuen, London, 1923, p.33.
72. S.Vant, Bungalows, Pavilions and Cottages. How to build and adapt them, Frdk Warne and Co., London, 1929.
73. For details of informal settlements, see various CPRE reports listed below. Also P.Abercrombie, op.cit., p.23; private communication, A.A.Jackson, 22 April, 1978: plus sporadic field work, and information from Colin Ward and Dennis Hardy, 1980.
74. C.Ward, Housing: an anarchist approach, Freedom Press, London, 1976, Section 3; ibid., Lost freedoms in housing, New Society, 12 May, 1977, pp. 271-4; Ibid, 'The Essex plotlands', 14th Burrows Lecture, University of Essex, 12 February 1980 (typescript); T.Street-Porter, A chalet by the sea, Observer Magazine, 15 June, 1975; also R. Banham, P.Barker, P.Hall, C.Price, 'Non-plan. An experiment in freedom'. New Society, 20 March 1969 suggests a period of 'non-plan' though in many areas such a period took place in the 1920s.
75. See particularly, the writings of Colin Ward above but also, D.F.Roy, Hooverville. A community of homeless men, in J.Abu-Lughod and R. Hay, Jr., Third World Urbanisation, Maroufa Press, Chicago, 1977, pp. 300-06 on similar developments in the USA in the 1930s.
76. L.Weaver, Cottages. Their planning, design and materials. Country Life, London, 1926, p.2.

77. Phillips, op.cit., 1920, p.2.
78. Abercrombie, op.cit.
79. Garden Cities and Town Planning, 16,8, 1926, p.188.
80. Ibid., 17,2, February 1927, p.56.
81. Peggy Pollard. I am grateful to the late Mr. Clough Williams-Ellis for a copy of this poem, date c. 1927-9.
82. Published by G.Bles, London, 1928, pp. 140-2.
83. Quoted in G.E.Cherry, Urban Change and Planning, Foulis, Henley on Thames, 1972, p. 151.
84. C.E.M.Joad, The Horrors of the Countryside, Hogarth Press, 1931, p. 9,11.
85. F.R.Leavis and D.Thompson, Culture and Environment. The training of critical awareness, Chatto and Windus, London, 1933, pp. 130,136.
86. Journal of the RIBA, vol. 34, 18 December, 1926,138, 276.
87. Ibid., p.276.
88. L.Allison, Environmental Planning. A political and philosophical analysis, Allen and Unwin, London, 1975. Chapter 10 provides a useful and informed discussion of the CPRE. See also Journal of the RIBA, vol. 34, 18 December, 1926, p.276.
89. CPRE, The Thames Valley from Cricklade to Staines. A survey etc., University of London Press, London, 1929, p.50.
90. Ibid., p.3.
91. Ibid., p.65.
92. Ibid., p.64.
93. W.Harding Thompson, Cornwall. Survey of its coast, moors, rivers, etc., for CPRE, University of London Press, London, 1930, chapter 9.
94. CPRE. The Threat to the Peak. The Peak District. Its scenery, disfigurement and preservation, CPRE, Sheffield, 1932; other reports: Ryedale, A report, 1934; The Penn Country of Buckinghamshire, Evans Brothers, London, 1933; Wirral Countryside. A cautionary tale, University of Liverpool Press, London, 1933; H.H.P.and N.L.C. The Face of the Land. The year book of the design and industries Association, Allen and Unwin, 1930.
95. C.Williams-Ellis, op.cit., 1928, p.162.
96. Hansard, 1931-2. 2 February, 1932, p.81.

97. Town and Country Planning Act, 1932, 22 and 23. Geo. 5.
98. August 1930, 20, 7, p.222.
99. Hansard, 2 February, 1932, pp.53-4, 81. See also the debate on 3, 7, 25 June, 1932.
100. Ibid., 25 June, 1935, p.966.
101. Ibid. 967,
102. Restriction of Ribbon Development Act, 2 August, 1935. See also G.E.Cherry, op.cit., 1974, p.103.
103. Hansard, 25 June, 1935, 1042.
104. G.E.Cherry, op.cit., 1971, pp. 150-1; ibid, 1974, p.108.
105. Hansard, 25 June, 1935, p.971; also Sheail, op.cit., p.14.
106. Ibid., 3 June, 1932, 1550.
107. For example, see legislation listed in W.Dougill, The English Coast. Its development and preservation, CPRE, 1936.
108. See for exmaple, P.Abercrombie, Town and Country Planning, Oxford University Press, London, 1933 with its reference to 'a flaring upstart bungalow which destroys a scene of immemorial beauty', p. 232. Even in more recent times, the term 'bungalow' seems to raise literary hackles. See for example 'the bungalow has a delightful vulgarity unexampled in Shaw's own buildings', A Saint, Richard Norman Shaw, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1976, p.170.
109. K.Spence, The Lakes, in C.Williams-Ellis, ed., Britain and the Beast, Reader's Union, London, 1938, p.243.
110. Epilogue, to C.Williams-Ellis, 1928, p. 181.
111. M.Briggs, How to Plan Your House, English University Press, London, 1937, p.68.
112. Swenarton, op.cit.
113. W.Ashworth, op.cit.
114. G.M.Boumphrey, Shall the towns kill or save the country?, in C.Williams-Ellis, 1938, p.109.
115. B.Kaye, The Development of the Architectural Profession in Britain, Allen and Unwin, London, 1960, pp. 45-7, 51-2; M.Bowley, The British Building Industry, Cambridge University Press, 1966 whom Cherry (1974, p.43) quotes: 'The architects were members of a profession concerned with a major art, they were the confidants of gentlemen, and to a considerable extent, arbiters of taste. Successful architects at least were members of the upper middle class elite.'

They were gentlemen, or regarded as such. Engineers, on the other hand, were closely associated with trade and industry; their training had no cultural significance; they were not artists; they might be industrialists. In the nineteenth century social stratification they were not regarded quite as gentlemen, although some aristocrats had made notable contributions to engineering. Certainly, they seem to have been regarded by architects as their social inferiors... Surveyors of all sorts were even more inferior'. In its early years, the profession of town planning was dominated by architects, Cherry, p. 57.

116. R.Williams, The Country and the City, Oxford University Press, 1973.
117. See, for example, Sharp, op.cit., also Ashworth, Hall, Cherry, 1972.
118. R.Dahrendorf, 'On the origin and inequality among men', in A. Beteille, ed., Social Inequality, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1970, pp. 16-44, p.39.
119. Joad, op.cit., p. 124.
120. See articles by Joad and Boumphrey in C.Williams-Ellis, 1938.
121. DIA, op.cit.; C.Williams-Ellis, 1928.
122. Ibid., p. 121.
123. Sharp, op.cit. especially chapter 7.
124. Ibid.
125. L.Scott, 'Preservation of the countryside', in E.Betham, ed., House Building, 1934-6, Federated Employers Press Ltd., London, 1936, pp. 32-3.
126. Hall, et.al. op.cit.
127. J.F.C.Turner, Housing By People, Marion Boyars, London, 1976.
128. Joad, op.cit., p.44.
129. P.M.Earland-Bennet, Lichens, Bankfield Museum, Halifax, 1977.
130. G.Boumphrey, Town and Country Tomorrow, Nelson, London, 1940, p.30.

CHAPTER SIX

THE BUNGALOW IN AFRICA 1880 - 1980

Introduction

The significance of the bungalow in Africa

I European interest in Africa

Early urban enclaves

The bungalow as tropical house-type

African dwelling and settlement forms

II The impact of colonialism

Colonial settlement: the dwelling

Colonial settlement: social space

The transition to capitalist urbanisation

III The bungalow as model

From hut to bungalow: the transition to European house

The urban transformation

IV Conclusion: urbanisation and 'Westernisation'

The role of house form

CHAPTER SIX

The Bungalow in Africa 1880 - 1980

'The Indian bungalow is the one perfect house for all
tropical countries'

Dr.J.Murray, How to Live in Tropical Africa
Philip & Son, London, 1895, p.314.

Introduction

According to one of Africa's leading authorities on urbanisation and development, one of the most pressing problems of African countries in the second half of this century is the provision of shelter for the rapidly growing urban and rural population. In the urban areas of most of these countries, this problem has been compounded, 'by the imposition of official housing standards, usually of colonial origin and often not wholly appropriate . . . by the adoption of foreign housing designs, and by the dependence on imported construction technologies that place the costs of house building well beyond the means of a vast majority of the population of the country'. (1)

This comment states succinctly what part at least of this chapter is about. Yet as Professor Mabogunje has discussed elsewhere, (2) these problems are only part of a much larger issue. The design of dwellings, the materials and manner of their construction, their size and contents, and their arrangement in settlements are perhaps the most visible signs of any civilisation and culture. In discussing housing standards we are talking about levels of civilisation, about the extent of economic development, expectations, ways of life, social priorities and the distribution of wealth between rich and poor. And in mentioning colonial origins, foreign design and imported technology, Mabogunje recognises that these matters depend not simply on a local but a global or international situation. What, in fact, we are considering is a topic far larger than 'housing': it is the impact of colonialism and Westernisation on the life and material culture of Africa.

For the present, however, we can limit the discussion to the question of standards. In many developing countries, whether Asian, African or Latin American, official standards exist which regulate housing and urban development. Even though they cannot always be enforced, norms are set down, controlling everything from the size of rooms to the width of roads. According to recent reports(3), most of these standards are still based on both Western technology and social philosophy and can be criticised on a number of grounds.

For example, they are said to take little note of local experience, resources or culture; construction practices are insensitive to local resources and in most countries, 'traditional' forms of shelter built in local materials rather than concrete are often considered 'sub-standard': 'modern' is taken to mean 'Western', and modern housing means Western housing. In most tropical African and Asian countries, living and sleeping often takes place outdoors for most of the year; in the traditional houses of the ordinary people, rooms serving specialised and exclusive uses are rarely found. Yet in 'modern' housing, this is what is usually supplied. As most of the standards were either inherited from the colonial past, or subsequently imported from developed countries, the technology used is invariably Western: mass production and pre-fabrication are often advocated to achieve housing targets. Human resources - the major asset of developing countries - are often overlooked.

These reports also stress the disjunction between 'official' housing and the local economy. The result is that huge differences arise between the economic rent for government-built housing and the rent-paying capacity of the people. The Western orientation of standards - in size, design or facilities - increases disparities between different groups of people. Dwellings become associated with social and economic status. The old colonial pattern is replaced by a new, indigenously evolved yet equally alien housing style and lay-out. In Nigeria, for example, though Europeans have left the 'European Reservations' new 'Government Reservations' are developed, still using similar designs and building technology.

Two sets of standards exist, the 'official' and the 'cultural'. When rural people move into urban area, they bring their cultural standards with them. Yet once settled, they are either obliged to comply with the 'official' or else they tend simply to aspire towards and copy them. 'For the huge majority of people who have migrated to cities, the set of standards operated by local authorities constitutes the single most

important obstacle to their settled existence in the urban areas to which they have migrated'. (4)

How did this situation come about? How, in less than a hundred years (and half that time for most), did vast numbers of Africans, previously living as members of extended families, farming on family-held rural land, and living in grass or mud-built dwellings in compounds, come to move into towns and cities, living in nuclear families, working for wages, and inhabiting concrete houses and bungalows, situated in residential suburbs? One aim of this chapter is to throw some light on these questions; they are ones which form part of a much larger and complex theme. In a brief chapter such as this, only a few impressionistic ideas can be explored and these relate mainly, though not entirely, to West Africa even though some of the generalisations apply more specifically elsewhere. The investigation of the development of the bungalow provides a useful place to begin.

The significance of the bungalow in Africa

Though single storey 'house and verandah' dwellings were known in South Africa at least in the early years of the nineteenth century (5), the bungalow designed and named as such reached Africa in that century's last few years. Why it arrived at this time, how it was introduced, and the role it played in incorporating sub-Saharan Africa into a global economy are the other themes of this chapter. As elsewhere, its importance was considerable.

It was, in the first place, a technological device - a form of shelter for British colonial officials providing protection against malaria and reducing the effects of tropical heat. In its construction and design, it drew on over two and a half centuries of tropical experience from India, South East Asia and the Caribbean, incorporating ideas from other Europeans and the people over whom they ruled. And at the turn of the century, it used the new materials, science and technology developed in industrialised Britain. Like quinine, the railway or Enfield rifle, it was what Donald Headrick has called a 'tool of Empire', (6) an instrument which helped a handful of colonial officials exercise control over an expanding territorial domain.

Secondly, as a distinctive form of housing, the bungalow was an important element in the vast process of urbanisation which, during the

course of the twentieth century, was instrumental in transforming the economic, social, cultural and political life of Africa. To oversimplify the complex issues discussed below, it was part of a change which, in many parts of Africa, transformed a peasant economy to a capitalist one, a society based on lineage and kinship to one increasingly structured by class, a rural family system based on the extended kin-group or descent group to an urban one where nuclear forms became increasingly common. In short, the bungalow was part of a physical and spatial process of urbanisation which incorporated modern Africa into a capitalist world economy.

Finally, as part of this same process, the bungalow was also a model, a European form of housing designed for one person or a nuclear family which, in its form, materials and construction, was to play a significant role in the social and cultural transformation of West Africa's urban elite.

If these seem ambitious, even outlandish, claims, it might be as well to clarify just what is meant, in this context, by the term 'bungalow': for this, no better authority exists than the Governor of Lagos, W. Egerton, writing to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Lord Elgin, in 1906: 'the term "bungalow" . . . is strictly only applicable to a house with no floor above the ground floor but I gather it is used in your Lordship's despatch to include any house built for European occupation'. (7) Though these might have two storeys rather than one, they invariably had other common features: they were 'detached', contained a number of specialised rooms, and were built according to European(English) standards and technology. Most importantly, they provided for one person or for a nuclear family where the children were, generally, living elsewhere.

European interest in Africa

Though trading links between Europe and Africa go back to the fifteenth century, for much of the first half of the nineteenth, sub-Saharan Africa remained largely unknown and of little interest to Europe, including Britain. (8) The formal ending of the slave trade had suppressed much of the economic activity in West Africa and European, African and other merchants were gradually developing more legitimate commerce. A few intrepid explorers had penetrated the interior and Sierra Leone was established as a Crown Colony for freed slaves in the early years of the nineteenth century. For the most part, however, European contact, in the

form of merchants, and from the 1840s, missionaries, was strictly confined to the coast.

Increasing British interest in West Africa from mid century, and somewhat later, direct involvement in the form of colonial rule, was the outcome of economic and political developments both in Britain and Europe. (9) From the late eighteenth to the mid nineteenth century, Britain, as the 'first industrial nation', had been practically unchallenged in producing and selling goods both to her own domestic as well as overseas markets. From then, however, and especially after the 1870s, as Germany, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and the United States industrialised, British exports increasingly felt the winds of competition. The growing interest in finding markets in the 'undeveloped' parts of the world, whether the formal empire of India and white colonies of Australasia, or the 'informal empire' of South America and Africa, was less an attempt to conquer new markets than an easy way out of her failure to dominate her competitors. (10) As British interest in her informal empire shrank, she was obliged to expand at a formal level. (11)

The cotton trade provides a good example. In 1820, the industry had exported over 70 per cent of its product yet thirty years later, this had fallen by 30 per cent. (12) African peasants were needed as customers for Lancashire textiles just as African groundnuts and palm oil were needed to make lubricants for the machines, and soap to wash the hands of the machinists. (13) By the mid 1880s, the importance of colonies was recognised by the major industrial powers of Europe, as markets, as suppliers of raw materials, for staging posts, as well as for political prestige and as sources on the spot for cheap colonial labour. Whilst these developments were to take the British, and the bungalow, into Sudan, Egypt, further into Malaya and elsewhere, the process and its urban consequences are best examined in West Africa.

The Act of Emancipation freeing slaves on British soil had been passed in 1807. (14) Its logical extension was the attempt to stop the slave trade as a whole. Lagos, one of the most important slaving ports, was bombarded and occupied as a British colony in 1851 and annexed ten years later, with the hope that a less nefarious commerce would develop. The move proved successful. Five European merchants set up business in 1852, soon to be joined by others. Exploration up the Niger established trading relations and missionaries extended their influence to the east and west.

With the discovery of quinine as an antidote to malaria and its development as part of a 'science for colonial expansion', (15) factories and trading posts were gradually established up the river.

Yet trade required political stability. On one hand, inter-tribal warfare threatened British traders; on the other, increasing competition came from French merchants. The Niger region, along with the rest of Africa, became the area for the rivalry of European powers. At the Treaty of Berlin in 1884, the Lagos region and Niger delta were conceded to the British, the other powers accepting the extent of her sphere of influence to an indeterminate distance inland. In January 1900, the British government took control of the whole of Nigeria from the Royal Niger Company, previously in charge of its administration and commerce.

Early urban enclaves

This rapid expansion in the last decades of the nineteenth century posed the colonisers with a new set of problems. In the earlier years, British consuls, officials, merchants and missionaries had, by and large, lived in the relatively small urban enclaves on the coast except, of course, when travelling inland. Yet these places were notoriously unhealthy - the traditional 'white man's grave' - with malaria as the ever-present danger. As the settlements grew, and as Europeans stayed longer, they became increasingly critical of their conditions. Though senior officials seem to have been fairly well provided for, many Europeans lived in congested and unhealthy surroundings. At Accra in the Gold Coast Protectorate (established in 1868), there were, according to the explorer Henry Stanley writing in 1873

'many pretentious houses, whitewashed attracting attention from their prominence above the clay-brown huts among them. Almost to the extreme left was the Commandant's house, aloof and exclusive, its wide veranda denoted luxurious coolness, its wide space around it informed you that at one time or another some occupant had been assiduous to procure unpolluted air . . . to the extreme right was another large house with wide verandas and abundant grounds around it . . . (this was the Basel Missionary House). . . between these houses, the body of the town of native and European buildings jammed itself. . . the huts of the natives have been established everywhere, without regard to order. . . the streets are uniformly narrow, crooked and oppressive from the filthy habits of the natives. . . a hundred thatched roofs in all stages of decay and native improvidence'.

Some ten years later, conditions were even worse.

'Pigs rooted among the garbage that covered the streets. . . the sea, the wells, the ponds and the very air were polluted. The houses were scenes of abomination where the dead were buried below the floor. . . There were no asylums, no real hospitals and no trained nurses either native or European. Fever-stricken Europeans were usually attended to at home by their native boys and lay amid all the stench of the native quarters. . . Gutters were uncut and drainage non-existent, so that the anopheles and other deadly insects swarmed in the pools lying under the windows and at the doors of the houses and proceeded to infect their victims'. (16)

Equally unhealthy conditions were seen to exist at Freetown, Sierra Leone though Lagos seems to have been somewhat better. (17)

In the last decades of the nineteenth century, conditions in the port cities seem to have combined with the massive extension of British rule into the interior (and no doubt with increasing awareness of urban questions in the metropolis), to focus attention on accommodation and health. To ensure that economic activities flourished, orderly government and peaceful conditions were essential. Though colonial officials were few - three or four officers might be in charge of a division of nearly a million people, assisted by a handful of Nigerian clerks, and police, (18) they needed adequate shelter. Though some of the early officials in rural areas seem to have lived in temporary shacks and native huts (19) colonial administrators such as Lugard realised that to operate effectively, adequate shelter was essential to give protection from malaria, the extremes of heat and humidity, tropical rainstorms, insects and animals, as well as provide for a minimum of social activities.

The bungalow as tropical house type

The history of tropical building - or more accurately, building and architecture for Europeans in the tropics - is, despite its importance, greatly under-researched. Since the fifteenth century, Portuguese, Spanish, Dutch, British, French, Danes, and later, Belgians, Germans and Americans have moved from temperate areas of the world to colonise and settle in the tropics. In the process they have made, though often slowly and with reluctance, adaptations in dress, diet, behaviour, dwelling and settlement forms though rarely have the newcomers adopted the dwellings of the

indigenous peoples, even if they have used their materials and techniques. Even from much earlier times, different colonising powers have borrowed from each other: the Romans from the Greeks, the Turks from the Arabs.

Yet apart from some studies of individual cases, little has been written in a systematic sense on the amalgam of cultural, political, social, economic, technological and material factors which explain why particular forms of shelter and settlement took on the forms they did.

Whatever the forms of shelter developed since the sixteenth century by British colonists in the West Indies, North America, India, Australia and South Africa, by the second half of the nineteenth, if not before, knowledge was being systematically assembled both in Britain and her overseas possessions concerning the most appropriate forms of housing for Europeans in the tropics. The particular problems of health and 'tropical medicine' had been discussed since the seventeenth century, (20) and interest in the design of housing was to gradually increase among medical and military officials, engineers and travellers; later, manufacturers of 'portable buildings' exported to the colonies were also to take an interest. (21)

Apart from the odd exception, (22) the design of portable houses sent to Africa, Australia or California in the early nineteenth century seem to have made little concession to the different climate, let alone lifestyle, or social conditions of their inhabitants. After the 1850s, however, they became increasingly adapted to tropical requirements, incorporating a verandah, roof ventilation, raised plinth and eventually, piers, quick assembly methods and specialised materials. (23) Expertise developed by military engineers in India became available in Britain; by the end of the 1860s there was sufficient interest for the problem of providing domestic accommodation for Europeans overseas to be discussed at the Royal Institute of British Architects. With growing numbers of merchants, missionaries, doctors, engineers and government officials in West Africa, and at the end of the century, settlers in East Africa, it was perhaps logical that in the late 1880s or early 90s, both the generic form of dwelling used by Europeans in India as well as the term used to describe it, were seen as appropriate for Africa. Typical was Dr John Murray's manual on How to Live in Tropical Africa, published in 1895.

After considering a number of alternative s, the author described the Indian bungalow as

6.1
6.2
6.3
6.4
6.5

'built on a masonry platform $2\frac{1}{2}$ feet above the ground. The platform is beautifully level and smooth on top, where it forms the floor of rooms, passages and verandah, being covered here and there with native mats. Its many advantages will be apparent to anyone who has lived in the tropics The verandah is 9 or 10 feet wide, and has a tiled roof, which is supported on pillars; it extends almost or quite round the house. The doors and windows open directly on the verandah, which is shaded in parts by shrubs, and generally bamboo sun-screens or 'chics'. The windows seen above the verandah are for ventilation merely, as there is no upper storey in bungalows. The house is thatched with reeds and grass, the roof being about $2\frac{1}{2}$ feet thick, and rising to a ridge 15 feet above top of the walls, which is overhangs some $3\frac{1}{2}$ feet at eaves. For Africa, the platform should be raised, say 15 feet above the ground in malarial districts; and a space of 3 or more yards wide outside of this should be cemented. Then would come flower pots and a low hedge, on outside of which should be a snake fence, made of broken stones and glass in infested districts'. (24)

The final sentence of the book reads 'the best form of tropical housing is the Indian bungalow'. By then, the term 'bungalow' had become synonymous with tropical housing for Europeans; this, by definition, was in the colonies. Hence, before the French adopted the term 'bungalow' some decades later for a rather different use in their own country (see below, p.371) 'bungalow' meant 'maison coloniale'. For the eminent German Professor of Hygiene at Heidelberg, Dr Ernst Rodenwaldt, whose Tropenhygiene of 1938 reached two later editions 'diese Bungalow-Hauser immer noch als die idealste Form des Tropenhauses anzusehen'. (25) For the first decades of German colonial experience before the first World War, the Germans adopted the bungalow from the British. 6-6

The idea of the bungalow, then, seems to have reached West Africa about the early 1890s, whether pre-fabricated and exported from Liverpool, (26) or through being used as a model for new residential developments.

Urban improvements began in the 80s. In Lagos, for example, some of the huge surpluses being generated by the export of palm products, rubber, timber, cotton and other crops were invested in urban development and expansion of the European residential area of Okoyi. (27) From 1885 a vigorous sanitation policy was set on foot on clean up Accra. A public reservoir was constructed, large areas of the bush cleared, roads were widened and drains built. Between then and 1900, the Government erected secretariat buildings in the vicinity of Victoriaborg, a new spacious 6-7

development on the outskirts of the town. Here, bungalows were erected for European officials, changing the previous practice whereby they had lived in hired houses or rooms in James Town. A few wives had joined their husbands in these houses and had found them uncongenial; the authorities too had found such accommodation unhealthy and therefore voted money for the new developments. 'The bungalows were wooden structures, erected on concrete pillars; they had much window and floor space and proved a great improvement on town dwellings. A place of recreation for Europeans was also erected. From then on, Europeans in Government service worked in offices mainly situated away from the town centre and for the most part, spent their leisure in the residential area. Later, European firms provided similar accommodation for some of their European staff and hence, increasing residential segregation of Europeans and Africans resulted. (28)

6.8

At Freetown, Sierra Leone, similar developments took place. Here, however, it was not just the Indian idea of the bungalow which was introduced but that of the hill station itself. According to a contemporary visitor, Freetown had become 'overgrown and over-crowded' in the last years of the nineteenth century. The site for the hill station, Wilberforce Hill, was 800 feet above the Atlantic and five miles out of town. The mountain railway opened in 1904. 'Hill Station' as it was simply known, was 'a perfect health resort'; the Government was to be congratulated 'for having provided so great a boon as these (twenty four) bungalows where comfort, rest, change and sea breezes' were to be enjoyed, 'an incalculable improvement upon the unhealthy town quarters of former times'.

6.9

The 'very spacious bungalows' were so conveniently arranged and healthy that several of the officials had their wives with them. Each stood in its own grounds 'a liberal space being allotted for the garden'. In addition, there were 'an excellent tennis ground, croquet lawn and golf course. . . wherever there were more than one or two British officials, there was always a tennis court'. In another suburb (Cline Town), more bungalows were provided for the European heads of the railway workshop, maintenance engineers, traffic managers and others. That of the locomotive superintendant was stone built and marked 'a new departure on the construction of bungalows out here'; each of the three main rooms were 20 by 20 feet and 11 feet high. From the 'very spacious verandah' one could 'inhale fresh air and breathe freely and you look with calm pleasure on to a quite English landscape with herds of cattle grazing lazily on the

grass fields'. With 'an absence of tom toms and unsavoury odours, it was a place in which a European and his wife should be perfectly happy, and enjoy good health for. . . their twelve month tour'. (29)

By the early years of the century, the rapid introduction of the railway had opened up the rural area for exploitation of agricultural products. Almost 140 miles inland was Bo where the railway station had recently been completed. Behind it was a large compound, 'though more like a park, carefully laid out with trees, through which run well-kept private roads'. Here were nine bungalows 'several being of spacious dimensions, forming three sides of a large quadrangle'. Originally built for the railway construction staff, they had been taken over by the colonial government for official residences with tanks for storing water gathered from corrugated iron roofs. 'Though the mention of such roofs is shocking to English taste' few people in England appreciated their value as waterproof coverings.

The bungalows were occupied by the District Commissioner, medical officer, school principal and the largest, by the circuit judge and his wife. At the time of the visit, the judge's wife was the only European woman living in the bungalows and, 'though feeling the want of female society' there were advantages: if anything was wanted 'you only had to wire for it and it arrived by the next train'. As Bo was one of the healthiest locations in the colony, the Government had chosen it for the site of a school for the sons and nominees of native chiefs. (30) In future years, the lifestyles of the local European community were not to go unnoticed.

African dwelling and settlement forms

These developing European settlement and housing forms were typical of other colonial enclaves at this time. Their significance is best understood in comparison with African forms and their relation to the pre-colonial economy and society. And despite an immense variety of peoples and forms of economic and social organisation in Africa, certain generalisations can be made. (31)

Though there is a long urban tradition in Western Africa, predominant forms of settlement in pre-colonial Africa were rural, with an economy of peasant agriculture. (32) The basic functional unit of society was the

extended family. Fundamental to an understanding of the economy is its relationship to land: the extended family is the unit that generally owns land and whose members relate to this land on the basis of values and rules sanctioned by the society. In West Africa, much land is also controlled communally with effective control vested in local chiefs. Land belonged not only to its present cultivators but to their ancestors and their descendants. As an African chief is reputed to have said, 'land belongs to a vast family of which many are dead, few are living and countless members are still unborn'. (33) No African society recognised the right of the sale of land.

The kinship relation also determined the organisation of labour and residence. Usually, such organisation was based on the allocation of tasks to different age grades who worked on family land, or on other community tasks. Crops and animals were raised with the aid of a variety of tools. Surplus crops are stored in containers which ranged in size from simple pots to large granaries or barns. In most rural communities, land is divided into two categories, one near the homestead, intensely and permanently cultivated, the other further away which is allowed to lie fallow in alternate seasons.

The residential forms to which this system of economy, technology and social organisation give rise take the form of a compound comprising a number of individual huts or a continuous building of many rooms. Such compounds may be isolated or grouped into hamlets or villages. The different types of dwelling, construction materials and techniques, and the spatial organisation of the compound, have been discussed and illustrated at length. (34) Among different peoples and regions, an immense variety of dwelling-forms and layouts exist: yet what they have in common is that they are all related to the form of economic activity and its associated social organisation.

Amongst only a few people was a single building the norm, and this was found mostly where buildings were square or rectangular rather than circular. The more usual arrangement is for compounds to have many separate buildings, each one, in effect, a 'room' of the homestead, with one special purpose - a kitchen, men's bedroom, wife's bedroom, grain store. (35)

In the pre-colonial towns and cities, the design of buildings was likewise the product of family and tribal structures as well as religious, political and economic institutions. In such towns and cities, compounds

usually looked inward on an open courtyard. This inner space provided a communal area for washing, cooking, craft work, relaxation and perhaps prayer. At the centre of the Hausa compound were the dwellings of the compound head, his wives, children and immediate relatives, and separate units for storage and cooking. The most common organisation of a compound was that each wife had a cluster of units reserved for her own use. (36)

The Yoruba compound, unlike that of the Hausa or Nupe, was an enclosed space, generally a square, bounded by a mud wall about seven feet high. Inside, the compound was divided into numerous rooms housing a number of related families. Until the early twentieth century, most of the compounds were roofed with thatch; the smallest might cover half an acre, those of the chiefs, several acres. A compound houses an extended family comprising a man's immediate, though polygamous family, the families of his grown male children and sometimes the families of his brothers as well as slaves belonging to each family.

The basic unit of residential organisation in Nigerian towns, however, was the 'quarter' or 'ward', consisting of groups of compounds. Depending on the city or state, ward identity might be based on one or more considerations: ethnic, military, occupational, social or religious. Wards were further combined into political quarters in the larger African communities. Pre-colonial Kano, in northern Nigeria, had 127 such wards, *6-14* each associated with particular ethnic or religious groups; Benin city, on the other hand, was largely of one ethnic group, though the city was divided according to craft organisation and ritual priesthoods connected to ancestor worship. Long before Europeans arrived, there was in many cities, extensive segregation based on race, ethnicity and culture. *6-15*

Differences in social and political status was often reflected in house style, building materials and the proximity of the dwelling to the royal compound, as in Benin city. In Kumasi, Benin and Abomey, two-storey houses were the exclusive right of the monarchs. The afins or palace compounds of the Obas of Yoruba towns had a distinctive kobi, resembling a porch; these were architectural marks of rank and only houses of the Obas and a few other high-ranking officials could possess them.

In many African communities, dwellings were arranged according to the occupants' social or political status. In Yoruba towns, the Oba's afin was situated in the centre of the town, next to the market place. In Southern Africa, Zulu kraals were organised in such a way as to demonstrate which parts were occupied by the major and which, the lesser wives.

'The layout articulated a design intended to minimise social friction and to assign every family member his or her rightful place. . . the kraal layout was a physical expression of the institution of polygamy'.(37)

The impact of colonialism

The impact of colonialism on house and settlement forms was part of its overall drastic impact on the economy. Traditional structures were undermined and gradually destroyed by the penetration of the capitalist mode of production. Specifically, this meant the monetization of the economy with the basic factors of production, land and labour, turned into commodities to be bought and sold. This is the starting point for understanding the development of a market in land, the construction of property as well as the ability to buy and rent it from the profits of wage labour. (38)

The ownership of land was individualised, in the process eliminating all claims on it originating in kinship or neighbourhood organisations. Overall, this meant the rise of landless peasants, many of whom moved into cities, even though, in West Africa, many retained rights over land which could be exercised if they returned home. In addition, land was subordinated to the needs of the rapidly-expanding urban population, created by the market economy. The agricultural surplus, previously supplying the neighbourhood and local town, was now shipped abroad to feed the inhabitants of the expanding metropole of Britain. 'Farmers in the tropical and sub-tropical zones were drawn into the vortex of an industrialising, urbanising Europe, based on capitalist production'. (39) Land was taken over for cash crops - groundnuts, palm oil, cotton, or newly-introduced coffee, cocoa or tea for export.

The replacement of the peasant economy by the capitalist mode of production required, to use Mabogunje's phrase, 'a more appropriate spatial order'. Fundamental to this was the establishment of law and order to ensure the conditions for colonial economic production. The two main elements in re-structuring the peasant economy and re-orienting it to the metropole was a new transport network, based on the railway, and a new system of towns. These concentrated the rural surplus and organised the available labour force.

To ease the transition of land from collective to individual and commercial ownership, legal, administrative and commercial rules developed

in European countries came increasingly to be applied to land in African countries. In East Africa especially, where there were large settler populations, extensive tracts of land were set aside for European occupation. And for land under indigenous proprietorship, individual holdings were introduced. As the land tenure system became more complex, farmers, driven off the land, became labourers in the towns, contributing to a new class structure. And with the distintegration of rural settlements, this often meant the collapse of control exercised by the extended family.

Colonial settlement: the dwelling

The new colonial settlements were part of this 'more appropriate' spatial and administrative order: on these, the basic dwelling unit was the colonial bungalow. An insight into the nature of this, is provided by a unique report, printed in 1909. (40)

In 1897, Sir Ronald Ross had established that malaria was caused, not by infected 'emanations from the ground' but from the bite of the anopheles mosquito, a discovery which had important implications both for the siting and design of European living accommodation in Africa. Moreover, the rapid penetration of the Nigerian interior, over two hundred miles from the coast, meant that at least some minimum, even temporary accommodation, was now an urgent necessity for both military and civilian personnel. Previously, some housing had been provided for government officials in the coastal area in the form of timber and iron bungalows sent out from England by the Crown Agents. Yet there were many complaints about these. It was to gather their collective experience that the Colonial Secretary, Lord Elgin, wrote to the Governors of Sierra Leone, Gambia, the Gold Coast, Lagos, and the High Commissioner of Northern Nigeria in 1906. Their replies, together with other appendices, drawings and photographs were published in 1909. They provide a valuable insight into both the design of government bungalows and the assumptions on which they were based.

Perhaps the first point to notice is the extent of Indian influence, either implicit or explicit. Elgin himself had spent five years as Viceroy of India in the 1890s; F.D. Lugard, High Commissioner for Northern Nigeria and subsequently largely responsible for developing the administrative and urban structure of Nigeria, had been born of missionary parents in Madras and had served in the Indian army. Lugard's Director of Public Works was also an old 'India hand'. W. Egerton, the Governor at

Lagos, had, in his own words 'the advantage of 23 years service in one of His Majesty's tropical possessions (Malaya) and one in which the designers of houses enjoy the experience of generations of Indian officials and of the native races in designing houses most suitable for occupation in countries adjacent to the Equator'. The correspondence was summed up on behalf of the Crown Agents by a Royal Engineers Colonel, R.D.Lloyd, with over twenty-nine years of service there who believed that 'we cannot do better than follow the experience of India. . . It is well known that West Africans (i.e. European colonial officials in W.Africa), until military and civil officers of Indian experience began to arrive, knew or cared little of the usual precautions required to make life in the tropics bearable'. (41) The correspondence represented the collective experience of British officials as it had evolved over two and a half centuries, specifically mentioning the West Indies, India, Ceylon, Malaya, Burma and West Africa, as well as recent American experience in the construction of the Panama Canal.

The criticism concerned both the materials and the design; rooms were too small and too low-pitched to hang a punkah (another import from India); windows were too small for ventilation and the anti-mosquito wire gauze covering led to 'impossible heat and stuffiness'. Yet whilst most writers expressed dissatisfaction with the portable bungalows, their merits were also appreciated. With the rapid territorial expansion, buildings were needed which were light, transportable and quickly erected with unskilled labour. For Lugard, opening up some 300,000 square miles of 'unexplored' territory in Northern Nigeria, pre-fabricated housing had been essential. In cantonments (another concept from India), necessarily on a river or railway, he had adopted wooden bungalows as the cheapest and best form of shelter, despite the fire hazard. Yet at outstations such as Sokoto, Kano and Kuka, over 250 miles from a river or railway, the cost of transport had made them impracticable; bungalows were therefore built of local stone or brick with perhaps doors, window frames, rafters and light iron roofing sent up from the coast. (42)

Portable bungalows also provided flexibility in location; the first site selected was often not the best. Moreover, the advantages of the light, portable bungalow were also seen in the swampy, unstable ground of the Niger delta where a more substantial stone or brick house would have required the expensive sinking of piers.

While this historical evidence sheds light on some of the explicit assumptions behind the introduction of the bungalow, it says little or

nothing about the implicit ones.

A better understanding is gained by referring to the two societies with which it was associated, the 'pre-industrial' African and the metropolitan British, with its capitalist industrial economy.

Most obviously, the reason for its existence in Africa was political: it housed the representative of the colonial power in the same sense as, in the indigenous African village, the most prominent dwelling housed the tribal chief. Yet from an economic and technological viewpoint, the imported bungalow had no or little connection to the indigenous economy. Its materials and manufacture were undertaken in Britain, the product of power-driven machinery using inanimate sources of energy- steam or electricity. Few, if any, local materials were used. However, local labour, under colonial supervision, seems likely to have been used for putting it up, and if paid for, came from the surplus appropriated from the local African economy. If built of local materials, the overall design meant that construction techniques were imported.

From a social and cultural viewpoint, the bungalow was a form of shelter designed for a single person, or nuclear family, often with servants, but socially (though not administratively) unconnected with the surrounding population. By the nature of his task, the official was on his own, or resided with a handful of colleagues, in an alien environment. Unlike the local population who built their dwellings collectively, as members of a kin or community group, the official was isolated; the community to which he belonged was thousands of miles away. Thus, where the Yoruba chief lived collectively in a compound, and the compound was part of a quarter, the resultant dwelling was part of a collective unit. And while this had an economic, social, cultural or religious rationale, it also made sense in climatic terms. The thick-walled mud housing, each house unit fused to the next, allowed little heat to penetrate.

In comparison, the colonial official was a social isolate. This fact, together with a commitment to long-established cultural preferences and the nature of his political office, meant that the colonial dwelling was equally isolated and 'detached'. As such, it presented its inhabitants with problems of coping with an unaccustomed 'tropical' climate which the occupants of indigenous dwellings did not face. The most obvious of these was that of keeping the sun off the external walls; hence, the development of and concern with the verandah.

Such a 'social' explanation for the form of the bungalow, however, is clearly only partial. There were also historical, economic and cultural reasons why colonial officials lived in single, 'detached' dwellings, the same reasons which had led British emigrants to build detached, single-storey cottages in other parts of the tropical world where they were not in a comparable colonial situation, i.e. the Southern states of North America, the West Indies or Australia.

In the late nineteenth century, the colonial administrator came from a society where, among the bourgeois class to which he belonged, one separate dwelling increasingly housed, and was the property of, one (nuclear) family; where, after almost two centuries of capitalist industrial development, house space had, for this class, been constantly enlarged and divided into separate and distinct specialised rooms to accommodate both different domestic activities and functions (cooking, eating, sleeping, bathing, relaxation), differences of social rank, age and gender (with spaces for servants, children and different sexes), but more especially to accommodate the accumulation of consumer goods made available through the mass market which industrial capitalism had created: soft furnishings, specialised equipment, a variety of clothes, cooking utensils and the general accoutrements of living.

These material developments had led, as we shall see below, to the development of certain attitudes and expectations about standards: social expectations of comfort, of states of health, of privacy, of aesthetic satisfaction in terms of internal and external appearances of dwellings, of 'outlooks', and 'views'. and of houses as symbols of social position and status. Culturally, they also had particular expectations about the use of space, about explanations of disease and especially, about the tolerance of temperatures and climatic extremes. In comparison, native Africans had quite different attitudes, expectations and explanations for them. A further social assumption, partly resulting from the perception of climatic differences though more from social ideas about privacy - and one that contrasted especially with African practice - was that all domestic activities, eating, sleeping, bathing, should, in general, be undertaken inside the house, out of sight of the indigenous inhabitants.

These considerations, however, were all implicit; the two most explicit requirements were, according to the report, the need to preserve the health and the comfort of the inhabitants.

A major fault of existing bungalows was the problem of over-heating caused by corrugated iron roofs. The complaints of the eminent African

traveller, Mary Kingsley, were typical

'corrugated iron is my abomination. I quite understand it has its points and I do not attack it from an aesthetic viewpoint . . . There is, close to Christianborg Castle at Accra, Gold Coast, a patch of bungalows and offices for officialdom and wife that . . . in the hard bright sunshine look like an encampment of snow white tents among the cocoa palms, and pretty enough withal . . . But the heat inside these iron houses is far greater than inside mud-walled, brick or wooden ones, and the alterations of temperature more sudden; mornings and evenings they were cold and clammy; and draughty they are always, thereby giving you chill, which means fever, and fever in West Africa means more than it does in most places'. (1897) (43)

The main remedy was to provide space or insulation between the metal roof and the ceiling below. In Australia, double corrugated steel, with an air space between, was used. Other methods included fixing a layer of felt on the lower side of the rafters to give a six inch gap to the roof, though this required leaving the gutterboarding open and the space was then invaded by bats, birds and lizards. Another method, brought from India, was a three inch layer of charcoal placed over the ceiling, the effect of which was to lower internal temperatures on average by some two degrees Fahrenheit. Roof ventilators, enthusiastically developed by engineers in England, had proved disastrous in the Nigerian climate. During tornadoes, high winds swept rain into the ventilators and thence, through the ceiling. In one case, a Director of Public Works had found the occupants of a bungalow sitting round the dining table wearing their solar topis to keep the rain from dripping on their dinner. (44)

Many of the new roofing materials developed in Britain at the end of the nineteenth century had been imported and tried out by Lugard. For the rest house at Burutu, Southern Nigeria, glazed tiles had been shipped in, only to be found broken on arrival; the felt sent out for house roofs in Wushishi had perished before it was used. The earlier houses built at Lokoja had been roofed with Willesden canvas; yet this had first rotted and then been torn to shreds by the tornadoes. 'Asbestile' had proved 'little better than cardboard' and 'uralite' had too high a degree of conductivity. 'Eternit' slates had also been imported. The patented wire-wove bungalows (concrete slabs reinforced with wire mesh netting) had cracked and let in the rain. In the end, Lugard - like the others - had reverted to corrugated iron. (45)

This had been in use in Africa since its invention in the 1830s.

The problem of housing colonial officials in West Africa was very different from India: there, labour was cheap and skilful, materials plentiful and inexpensive, and much more money, as we shall see below, spent on housing by the Government, private concerns and native owners. Tiles were burnt on the spot or flat terraced roofs used. These had not yet developed for colonial use in Africa.

What all correspondents agreed was that the bungalow, whether wood, brick or stone, should be raised on wood or concrete piers off the ground. For some, this should be four, for others, eight feet. The rationale for this (46) had changed over the years. 'It dated back to the time, comparative recent, when the cause of malarial fever was generally attributed to exhalations from the ground'. (47) Yet despite Ross's discovery about the real causes of malaria, earlier practices were not abandoned. Raising the bungalow off the ground ensured greater dryness, ventilation, freedom from dust 'in all countries a potent carrier of disease' and invasion from insects. 'Undoubtedly, mosquitos will be fewer in a high than a low bungalow'; the greater the superficial area covered, the higher the bungalow. (48) Moreover, the added height of the white man's house no doubt gave psychological, even moral advantages. Whatever the origins of the bungalow on piers, the British were credited with having adopted the principle from indigenous tropical peoples in contrast to the practice of Dutch, Spanish and Portuguese colonisers whose more solid, stone or brick-built houses had been placed firmly on the ground. Unlike the lightly-constructed bungalow, these were also much more susceptible/^{to} earthquake damage. (49)

6.19
6.20
6.21

The alternative to bungalows on piers was one of two storeys with living accommodation upstairs and the ground floor, to a greater or lesser extent built as an 'arcade', kept for storage or office space. This had occasionally been the pattern in The Gambia but, according to the Governor, it was not to be encouraged. 'With the office so near, one is always liable to calls, and this becomes very trying in a climate that has such an effect on the nerves as does that of the West Coast of Africa'. (50)

Unaccustomed to what was perceived as 'the hot, steamy and oppressive climate of West Africa', the paramount need was to keep cool. For this, generous dimensions and the 'perflation of breezes' were seen as pre-requisites. 'The ideal bungalow should be spacious and lofty' wrote the Governor of Sierra Leone. Verandas should go all

round the house and be 'as wide as money will allow'- one twelve feet wide was 'a great additional comfort in a house'. (51)

Colonial settlement : social space

The scale of accommodation varied according to social rank and region. Fairly typical were the four types of two-storey bungalows provided in the Gold Coast for Senior officers (married or single), junior officers (married), junior bachelors, and those for up-country quarters. For the higher ranks, the ground floor contained dining room, store room, pantry and box room; the first floor, a sitting room, 2 bedrooms, 2 mosquito rooms, 2 bathrooms, 1 or 2 earth closets, 1 kiosk (or porch) and an 8' foot verandah; outbuildings included a kitchen, lamp room, boys' room, forage room, stables for two or three horses and a drying closet. Bungalows for junior bachelors were smaller, with only one bed and bathroom and without store rooms, mosquito rooms, kiosk and lamp room, and with stabling for only one horse.

Room sizes were determined both by cultural and psychological factors: 'larger rooms are, of course, more comfortable, as the feeling of roominess in a tropical house produces a feeling of coolness'. (52) On these grounds, the typical bedroom size for a junior officer was about 16' by 16', 20' or 24' by 16' for a dining room, and 8' by 8' for a bath or store room. For senior officials, the dining room might be increased to 38' by 16', and other rooms, to 10' by 8'. Room heights were to be a minimum 11 feet, giving ample room for a punkah.

The Indian experience of the Crown Agent's representative, Colonel Lloyd, led him to conclude that these dimensions were too small. There was, after all, the question of proportion to consider: for large rooms, 'double cubes, such as 40' by 20', are handsome and useful'. A 'nice size' for a bedroom was 14' by 18'; a drawing room of 17' by 24' would accommodate eight people and a dining room of that size, twelve guests. (53)

The rationale for the large size and also number of rooms was the concern for coolness: 'for the sake of airiness, the sleeping room should contain little furniture but the bed and wardrobe; this necessitates a dressing and bathroom and also a store room to keep his belongings'. These included a wardrobe, chest of drawers, washstand, bootrack, writing table and 'articles of a private nature'. The bed, according to

the West African pocket book, should be kept away from the wall on both sides, incurring a loss of 24 square feet from the room area. Moreover, 'every young officer should have a second room for the sake of health so that in the event of his not being well enough to go out he might not have to spend the whole of the day in one room'. (54)

Other social considerations governed the number of bungalows on a station. Even where a number of officers were stationed together, it was thought that each should have his own bungalow. Lugard's view, that officers should dine and relax in a central 'mess house', using their bungalows primarily for sleeping was generally not shared by others. More typical was the Gold Coast practice: 'In order to ensure comfort and privacy, each bungalow should stand in its own compound and be allotted to one officer only, and in no cases should offices be contained in, or form part of the bungalow'. In the view of the Medical Officer, it was often the case that a three-roomed bungalow was shared by two officers 'who cannot hit it off'; one wanted his lunch at 11.30 and the other, at 12.00 and there was only one kitchen. The other officer's 'boys' were always about the place and if anything was missing 'it was only natural to the native to accuse the other servants'. Moreover, the choice of a young officer's companions was not always discreet: 'there is a tendency to keep late hours, to introduce third parties, and for contentions to arise among the servants . . . Losses of property are frequent when servants of two masters are in one bungalow'. The objection to incorporating offices likewise stemmed from a distrust of the native Africans. Even if the office was only used by the bungalow's occupant, there was still 'the traffice of natives to and from the bungalow and through the compound'. (55)

The size of the bungalow was an important indicator of status. In Ceylon, for example, quarters were provided not exceeding twice the annual salary of the occupant: the maintenance of these differentials was crucial; 'any officer compelled to live in quarters that did not come up to the standard of accommodation due to his provision and salary should receive compensation in lieu'. (56)

The most essential part of the bungalow was the verandah, an element which - though significantly absent from the large majority of traditional African and Asian dwellings - had long been a feature of European colonial houses in the tropics. Ostensibly, its function was to keep the sun's heat off the walls; but the verandah had for long been one of the

main eating, living and sleeping areas of the colonial bungalow. (57) The verandah, of a minimum 8 feet wide, or 10 and 12 feet for more expensive houses, and preferably all round the house, combined with the need for all rooms to go through from front to back, to ensure the 'perflation of the breezes', to result in large, and hence, expensive houses, to say nothing of the effects on land use. As the Governor of Lagos pointed out, with front and back verandahs 12 feet wide, and a room of 15 feet, it meant a roof span of 39 feet for the sake of one room. Yet verandahs were deemed essential and 'those less than 6 feet pertain to stinginess and badly-proportioned design'. (58)

Increased awareness of the danger of mosquitos favoured the enclosed verandah, which might then be used, according to some, as an office, sitting or dining room; an enclosed verandah also reduced the extent to which roof eaves needed to be brought down. Most agreed that bungalows were best only one room deep; to fill verandahs with bath and store rooms defeated their purpose. This was where one and a half centuries of Indian experience was put to good use: bathrooms in the corners of verandahs did not interfere with through air circulation for the rooms. Alternatively, bathrooms could be located in the rear annex, connected to the bungalow by a mosquito-proof bridge.

With the discovery of the mosquito origins of malaria, attention moved from raising the bungalow off the ground to keeping mosquitos out of the house. Apart from changes in design, this meant importing huge quantities of closed mesh zinc gauze. There were a number of ways of combatting mosquitos: to proof the whole house, one room only, all - or part - of the verandah, provide movable mosquito proof cages or simply, put mosquito nets round the bed. Yet fitting wire gauze on the windows or verandahs prevented 'the perflation of the prevailing breeze' and hence, defeated the basic rationale for the bungalow - to keep cool. There was a need for an entirely mosquito proof house: one cage or proofed room was insufficient: 'one cannot spend the early morning and evening after sundown in a small room'. (59)

Keeping the compound clear of undergrowth and stagnant water was equally important. It was 'absolutely imperative that the site of a bungalow for non-native officers should be removed from the propinquity to native dwellings as it is not the bite of a mosquito per se which mattered but the bite of an infected mosquito. It is not segregation

from natives as such but segregation from them as infective sources which is here emphasized'. (60)

Despite the much-emphasised sensitivity to economy, the cost of different types of bungalow varied between £1,000 and £2,000, more usually at the higher level. At Lagos, that of the general manager of railways cost £1,500; the principal medical officer, £1,775. The provision of punkas, mosquito cages, water tanks and other fittings brought the total to over £2,000. In Gambia, the steel and timber variety cost £1,800 and those of brick, £2,000. (61)

Though different forms of bungalow developed in the ensuing decades, and Governor's houses exhibited varying degrees of splendour, (62) the basic concerns with ventilation, comfort, and social and cultural needs such as privacy, status, servants' quarters, specialised room space and family needs, were to govern colonial housing design until, and indeed, long after, the end of colonial rule.

6.22
6.23
6.24

The transition to capitalist urbanisation

The system of towns and cities was, with the introduction of the railway, the pre-requisite for the transformation of the rural economy. This urban transformation was broadly in three kinds of area : the established enclaves on the coast, the traditional towns and cities of West Africa, and in the new administrative towns or, in East Africa, settler towns, set up in previously rural areas. Whether for colonial official, missionary, merchant or teacher, the bungalow, variously modified but still a single family, Western house-type designed for European use in the tropics, and located in its compound, was the standard residential unit on all colonial settlements. These were based on a strict system of segregation.

For example, in the East African Protectorate in 1910, the Governor, E.P.C.Girouard issued a memorandum to his Provincial and District Commissioners in the Kenya Province.

'In native areas, the District Commissioner is responsible for the condition of the station and all matters connected with it Every DC should take a pride in keeping his station as clean and healthy as possible. . Gardens should be made. . . roads constructed . . . and the police and porter lines and other native locations should be laid out symmetrically.

Regarding townships, when the Provincial Commissioner considered that the outlying township was likely to become permanent, he should communicate with the Land Office. . . and ask that the town be laid out on more permanent lines suitable for future development. In doing this, he should a) specify land required for government purposes b) nominate sites required for public buildings (markets, churches, hospitals, water-works, etc) and c) indicate the position of the following quarters

European business quarters
 Indian business quarters
 European residential quarters
 Native location
 Market garden site

(63)

In Nigeria, the foundations of the modern urban system were laid out by Lugard in his Townships Ordinance of 1917. As part of the system of 'indirect rule' - by which native institutions were preserved under the overall authority of the colonial power - the government provided for the creation, constitution and administration of all towns in Nigeria, categorised into first, second and third class townships. These townships were areas outside centres of African population, set aside for colonial administration and commerce. 'The essential feature of a township is that it is an enclave outside the jurisdiction of the native authority and native courts which are relieved of the difficult task . . . of controlling alien natives, employees of government and Europeans'. (64) The Non-European Reservation was for those African and Syrian migrant traders, labourers, police and others who were associated with the colonial regime but were not native to the local area.

The influence of Lugard on Nigeria urban development was so great, and his views so clearly spelt out in his Instructions to Political Officers and elsewhere, that it is worth examining these in some detail. When laying out Townships, each compound in the European Reservation was to be 100 yards in depth, 70 to 100 yards wide (viz, from 1½ to 2 acres), and be enclosed by a live hedge, mud wall or substantial fence. Within this area, ornamental and shade trees and dhub grass were to be planted, though compounds were to be kept fairly clear; 'prisoners may be hired to clean up a compound from time to time'. Servants' quarters and stables would be at least 50 yards to the rear and near a backline, along which a sanitary lane was provided.

The European Reservation was surrounded by a non-residential area 440 yards broad separating it from a non-European or Native Reservation. Apart from bona fide domestic servants, no Native might reside in the European Reservation and no European in the Native Reservation. In the latter, the area covered by building was not to exceed a third of the total area and the eaves of all buildings should not be less than six feet from the boundary fence. Overcrowding should, for reasons of health, be prevented and not more than ten occupants should be on any plot. Houses were to be of burnt brick or mud walls and with non-inflammable roofing; angle iron for ridge poles, and rafters was to be encouraged both to prevent fire hazards and decrease the cutting of trees which 'would soon denude the surrounding country of its timber and beauty'. (65)

The object of the non-residential area was to segregate Europeans so that they were not exposed to attacks of mosquitoes infected with the germs of malaria or yellow fever 'by preying on Natives and especially Native children'. It was also seen as a safeguard against bush fires and those common in Native quarters. Finally, it also removed the inconvenience felt by Europeans 'whose rest was disturbed by drumming and other noises dear to the Native'.

On the other side of the European Reservation which did not face the Native Reservation, non-residential buildings such as a church or courthouse could be erected. The area could also be devoted to golf links, polo grounds, race course and other recreation purposes as well as railway shunting grounds and parade grounds of the army and police.

If not as avid an amateur architect-planner as his French contemporary in colonial North Africa, Marechal Lyautey, (66), Lugard nonetheless had very developed views both on housing and planning. His ideas on housing were expounded at some length. On the whole, he was in favour of two storey houses with the upper floor kept for living and sleeping rooms. He had also, as has been suggested earlier, given considerable thought to temporary housing, materials, design, and water supply etc. (67)

The policy of segregation which he discussed on numerous occasions seems to have been the basic principle for his planning practice, despite the bitter controversy to which it gave rise both from British Indians and Africans that it was simply 'a manifestation of racial arrogance and prejudice'. Though he always justified it in terms of health reasons,

he also quoted Lord Milner who thought it desirable. 'no less in the interests of social comfort and convenience'. Lugard believed that 'it should be made abundantly clear that what is aimed at is a segregation of social standards and not a segregation of races. The Indian or African gentleman who adopts the higher standard of civilisation and desires to partake in such immunity from infection as segregation may convey, should be as free and welcome to live in the civilised reservation as the European, provided, of course, that he does not bring with him a concourse of followers. The native peasant often shares his hut with his goat or sheep or fowls. He loves to drum . . he is sceptical of mosquito theories'. (68)

When Lugard amalgamated Northern and Southern Nigeria, moving the Northern capital from Zungeru to Kaduna in 1916 these principles were implemented on a wide scale. 'The strictest economy was practised in the move'. The 'temporary wooden houses' and old buildings at Zungeru were dismantled and 'every sound plank used for outhouses in the new capital'. The barracks, European and native hospitals and remaining bungalows became a training centre for troops. The only permanent brick structure of any value at Zungeru was the prison 'and this I propose to convert into a lunatic asylum for the whole of Nigeria which is most urgently required'. (69)

Given their political origins and rationale, the new European Reservations were to be greatly influenced by the bungalow idea and the assumptions on which it was based. Though the models described earlier were modified, both in scale and form, the model dwelling developed for Europeans retained its basic characteristics: generous dimensions, accommodation for single nuclear family but with separate provision for servants, imported 'tropical' design and materials (especially cement) and invariably in a large walled or fenced compound. A cluster of these, whether ten or two hundred, produced the characteristic lay-out of very low densities. To permit such a lay-out, extensive land area was required. Where this was near an existing native town or village, for political, social, and cultural reasons the European area was distanced from the native - as laid down by Lugard.

To ensure the transfer of land from collective to individual ownership, legal, administrative and commercial rules were imported from England. Likewise, to enforce and maintain the particular residential and commercial areas constructed, by-laws, environmental and building

standards, and municipal legislation governing, for example, road widths, densities and construction standards were introduced, increasingly influenced by town planning and 'Garden City' ideas from Britain. (70) In the traditional Yoruba city of Ibadan, the non-European Reservation or 'Sabon Gari' ('Strangers' Town') characteristically bore the name 'Gbagi', a Yoruba term for 'pegged out', reflecting the colonial surveyors' activities in 1904. (71) Much of the modern form of West African towns, therefore, can be seen to derive from the bungalow-and-compound idea.

The bungalow as model

So far, this account has largely been concerned with the bungalow as housing for Europeans. The change by Africans to Western house forms seems to have taken place in a number of contexts. One was by the adoption of European life styles and housing models by African elites, in many cases, facilitated by the introduction of imported materials; *6.25* the second, was by the enforcement of colonial and European building standards in the new townships; the third, though this was a late development, was in the provision of housing for African government employees by the Public Works Department, or for African labour by some European firms. As, in many cases, Africans had no right to the permanent ownership of land or to buy property in urban areas, 'sanitary' housing was both required for labour and useful as an instrument of social control. All these contexts were part of much larger and complex economic, social and cultural changes. Though not the most important explanation, the easiest with which to begin is the introduction of imported materials and technology.

These, first evident in the coastal ports, with the introduction of the railway, were rapidly diffused inland. At different rates and in different areas they came to compete with the mud, grass, thatch, wattle and daub or baked brick traditionally used in various regions. An early change in Nigeria was the replacement of mud walls by baked brick. Two brick kilns were set up in Lagos in the 1860s, one of them by missionaries, a group to become increasingly influential in the introduction of European models and lifestyles, especially in relation to ideas of health. Later, cement was introduced, both for blocks and for plastering brick and mud houses. (72) In the early twentieth century,

Lugard had used reinforced concrete for European dwellings, (73) and in French Senegal about the same time, the architect, August Perret, had constructed concrete ware-houses- a first priority for colonial nations exporting raw materials to the metropole. (74) Cement became a major import, rivalled only perhaps by corrugated iron for roofs.

European missionaries had put up the first iron roofs in Ibadan in 1854; in the next fifty years it was to steadily replace thatch. (75) In Lagos in 1862, European merchants requested the British Governor that native houses be covered with a less combustible material than that in use; in 1877, a more specific proposal was made to cover, at the cost of the inhabitants, the houses of the poor with corrugated iron as a precaution against fire hazard. Though this was turned down, here too, by the end of the century, corrugated iron had become a popular roofing material. (76)

Importing new materials had many and far-reaching consequences. For Africans to buy them meant accumulating capital and hence, further involvement in wage labour and the urban economy. In the larger cities, traditional building skills began to be lost and, in different places and to different degrees, traditional housing models and materials downgraded in social esteem as foreign, imported models were adopted. Building became a specialised activity and metropolitan firms which came in later in the twentieth century, brought in with them imported technology and new materials for housing construction. The import of housing models and materials was increasingly stimulated by the growing numbers of Europeans in African towns; by 1960, the Congo, Kenya, Mozambique and Angola each had a population of over 50,000 Europeans.

Other glimpses can be gained into a process which remains largely uninvestigated. As Marx foretold about India, the railway system would become the forerunner of modern industry. Likewise in Africa, railway workshops and repair shops initiated, in many places, the onset of industrialisation. As far as imported technology is concerned, some illustrative data can be given. An early saw-milling plant was set up in Rhodesia in 1897 and a cement factory by the British South Africa Company in 1915. In Kenya, Portland Cement established the cement grinding of imported clinker in the early 1930s. With the Second World War cutting off imported supplies, domestic production was stimulated,

again helped by increased European immigration once the war had ended, causing increased production of cement, asbestos tiles, pipes, metal doors and windows. A plywood factory was set up in 1948. As growing numbers of Africans entered wage labour, domestic consumption went up, with imported materials rising significantly from £20 million in 1946 to eight times this amount ten years later. (77)

The last decades of colonial rule gave British construction companies the opportunity to develop their multinational connections. The United Africa Company brought Taylor Woodrow to Nigeria in 1953. One of colonial Africa's largest trading concerns, John Holt, founded in 1867, formed a partnership with Costains to participate in large-scale construction begun by the Ten Year Plan in 1947. By the mid century, a mass import of asbestos cement was taking place which, by the later 1970s, was to represent 80% of all cement used in Nigeria.

The import of cement was to grow by astounding proportions. Though fairly static between 1925 and 45, it grew from 100,000 tons in 1947 to eleven times that amount twenty years later until, with the collaboration of Associated Portland Cement, West African Portland Cement was set up in 1957. Other British firms - ICI, British Paints, Parmacem, established in the early 1960s, were to supply the materials for providing the finishing touches to increasingly European house forms. Increasingly, Africans were consumers as well as producers. (78)

From hut to bungalow: the transition to the European house

A detailed historical account of the transition to European house forms has yet to be researched and, as with the comments on materials, the following provides only glimpses. Clearly, one of the pre-requisites is the change in ownership and development of a market in land; and subsequently, of a market in domestic property. This has been described for mid and later nineteenth century Lagos by Hopkins. (79)

In the Ahafo district of Southern Ghana, British colonial administrators had introduced residential reorganisation and new ideas of housing and hygiene in 1915, by which time the shape of traditional Ashanti settlements and housing had begun to change. In the Goasco area, new towns had been set up on a grid pattern, the District Commissioner responsible, 'embellishing his new bungalow with grass and rose bushes'; new sites were marked out with streets, avenues and town

plots. (80) By 1921, the census report referred to the tendency of old Ashanti houses to disappear and be replaced by square compound houses. Ten years later, the Provincial Commissioner noted that 'in the large towns and villages along the motor roads, the old Ashanti compound - a rough quadrilateral built of swish or stick and roofed with thatch or leaves is gradually being replaced by well-constructed compound houses, 60 - 80 feet square, with verandahs, corrugated iron roofs, and with plenty of air space between the houses. (81)

Similar changes were taking place among the Bantu of North Kavirondo, Kenya, in the later 1930s. After a long discussion of traditional hut building techniques of timber-framed, circular, mud-walled and grass-roofed huts, German anthropologist Dr Gunter Wagner referred to recent changes - the use of nails instead of string for fastening parts, of petrol tins for doors. Under the influence of missionaries, separate huts had been introduced for cattle. A small group of economically advanced people, traders, teachers and a few chiefs and headmen, had 'altogether abandoned the traditional type of dwelling in favour of square houses of more or less European design, built of brick and with corrugated iron roofs. These had been developed since 1935. They showed all kinds of individual designs, though some being very close copies of European bungalows with rooms furnished in semi-European fashion and surrounded by a lawn and flower garden'. Though their number was negligible in proportion to the entire population, and the various social and economic problems which they raised had not become vital issues, some were built by the paid labour of African masons and carpenters, trained by the industrial department of the Friends' African Mission or the Native Industrial Training Department at Nairobi. (82)

By the 1930s in Kampala, the typical conical hut of the Ganda was thought to be dying out, replaced by dwellings consisting of a mixture of burnt bricks and tiles, and with corrugated iron or flattened petrol tin roofs. In the 1950s, in inland East Africa, local hut-building techniques were being lost as a result of economic and cultural influences; craft skills were being lost and a shortage of traditional materials was developing as bush was cleared and swamps drained for further urban expansion. (83)

In the early 1960s, a survey of Yoruba building in rural Nigeria described the development of a specialised building labour force, the breakdown of traditional ways of building, asbestos and galvanised iron

iron replacing natural materials and a pronounced shift from local to non-local models with many new 'four cornered' buildings. (84)

By the mid twentieth century, European social life and residential patterns had made a major impact on the emerging African city. In Ibadan, for example, the first European Reservation had been begun in 1901. Fifty years later, with the city as headquarters of the Western Province, there were over 2,000 European residents for whom three new Reservations had been established.

Up to 1952, these Reservations had been exclusively European but with the political changes of that year, an influx of Nigerians of similar status resulted in a further extension of the Reservations to five, now known as 'Government Reservations'. In the later 1960s, according to Mabogunje, they still preserved their 'high class character'. The new developments, laid out for government employees by the town planning authority, set up in colonial times, maintain similar standards. In these areas, houses were set in the midst of extensive lawns, hedged with shrubs and flower gardens, the average density being two to four houses per acre and with some gardens over one acre. The campuses of Ibadan and Ife provided a similar standard. (85) In Lagos, the highest grade residential areas had similar layouts.

Writing in 1969, Mabogunje indicated that similar low density, house and garden layouts had been developed by government or government-sponsored agencies in recent post-Independence years. In these areas lived 'the most important members of the community in all spheres of activity in Lagos'. (86) In the older residential areas, houses of the colonial type 'replicated as much as possible the English country house, including the fireplace'. Elsewhere in the city, Mabogunje identified other social areas, those with houses at 12-16 to the acre catering for white collar workers; the majority of such houses being modest, small size bungalows. (87) Accounts of Lagos in the 1970s show the persistence of vast differences in housing provision between industrial workers and the managers and senior government officials living in the Government Residential Areas. (88)

Where these developments are characteristic of the expanding suburbs, other changes occurred in the traditional compounds of old-established Yoruba towns. Here, the compounds disintegrated by a process which Mabogunje describes as 'growth by fission'. This was due to

'the breakdown in the control-mechanism within the extended family system. This control mechanism resided, as it were, in the powers of the head of an extended family over the family land at a time when every member of the family depended in one way or other on agricultural land for his source of income. With modern developments, many members of a family can now turn to non-agricultural employment. . . As a result the powers of the head of the extended family have been greatly weakened and the cohesiveness of the family considerably impaired. Add to this the disruptive influence of both Islam and Christianity in their preference for the nuclear family (polygamous or monogamous) and some of the factors contributing to the disintegration of the compound and the individualisation of housing units becomes clear.

The result is that the traditional compound has been broken up into a number of separate housing units.'

According to Lloyd (1974) the traditional compound houses were being replaced by two-storeyed houses and what he calls 'bungalows', though what is referred to is unclear. (89)

Conclusion: urbanisation and 'Westernisation'

Just what role the introduction of European dwelling forms and the particular colonial urban environments played in the process of social and cultural change in African cities, and how justified one is in describing such changes as 'Europeanisation', 'Westernisation' or 'Bourgeoisification' are both highly controversial topics: the first, because it raises questions of physical or architectural determinism, the belief that particular physical forms determine or result in particular kinds of social behaviour; the second, because of its implicit cultural imperialism and the consequent failure to acknowledge the real impact, and present day results, of both colonialism and neo-colonialism. (90)

To begin with, however, it seems clear that much of the characteristic form of large parts of modern West (and other parts of) African towns resulted from the patterns and policies of colonial urbanisation and the particular built environment which this introduced. Central to this was the idea of the European, later 'Government' Reservation, the basic unit of which, for the higher ranks, was the colonial bungalow - whether of one or two storeys.

The concept of the bungalow required, as a pre-requisite, an extensive compound; the multiplication of bungalow-and-compound units

necessarily led to a spacious, low density lay-out for the neighbourhood; this lay-out - based as it also was on the political, social, cultural, 'sanitary' and racialist assumptions of the colonisers - required that it be separate from 'native' areas, both existing and future. In this context, the bungalow can be seen, if not as an independent determining factor in the nature of African urbanisation, but as a major component in the inter-related social and physical process which brought this urbanisation about.

In the second place, there is widespread agreement that the original colonial housing forms and residential areas, together with post-colonial developments, provide a physical and spatial setting for social segregation. The spatial lay-out of different housing types reflects the location of different social and economic groups within the urban area. In colonial times, residential segregation was on racial lines. Even though this was not always legally enacted, as under Lugard's regime, the laying down of high building and environmental standards and their enforcement by municipal authorities was sufficient to create racial segregation: the price mechanism did the rest. (91) With independence, African elites moved into European housing in exclusive residential areas. In the 1970s, an 'invariable feature of all major towns in East and Central Africa' was that the broad racial division into European, Asian and African residential areas is nowadays increasingly giving way to one based on status groups and classes'. (92) The continued implementation of government and professionally prescribed standards ensures the use of such areas in maintaining social segregation. (93)

Thirdly, the modern, 'detached' European house, still often referred to as a 'bungalow', provides the setting for the 'modern' nuclear family, increasingly characteristic of elite and middle class urban Africa. (94) A recent study of the 'traditional' Nigerian city of Benin by an African scholar identified various house-types and related them to social and economic groups in the city. According to Onokerhoraya, 'bungalows in the Benin setting can be defined as houses designed for a single family, generally a high income one'. (95) Because of their design, the bungalow becomes another factor in separating nuclear families from their kin. Anthropologist Peter Lloyd writes of the Yoruba, 'the children probably live in the city, parents in the rural area or provincial town; the children's house is not

designed to accommodate dependents, and cooking by gas or electricity is frightening to them'. (96) The design of the bungalow there made it more difficult for two or more families to share the dwelling. And in Benin since the mid 1960s, the bungalow was the predominant form of house being built - of cement blocks, glazed windows and asbestos roofs. The high class housing region consisted of 95 per cent bungalows, with living rooms, three or four bedrooms, kitchen, bathroom and separate servants' accommodation some yards from the main house. These were built by public authorities, and, in more recent times, by private individuals. (97) Other studies in Nigeria have related changes in family behaviour to the introduction of new house forms and 'Westernisation'. According to Caldwell, the traditional practice was for parents to sleep in the same room as their children, but to eat apart from them. The values of 'Westernisation', however, improves the status of both women and children. In modern houses, therefore, parents and children sleep in separate bedrooms, enjoying more privacy and, among the Kumasi social elite, this was more favourable to family planning methods. (98)

Finally, as the city itself becomes a centre for the accumulation of capital, so, at a smaller scale, does the house. From the early days of colonial penetration, property speculation and investment became a major new source of income for urban Africans. (99) Investment in house property, with education, both giving a substantial return and considerable security, became typical forms of investment for Nigerian business elites, (100) with many landlords investing in multi-roomed tenements let to urban workers.

Yet inside the European-type bungalow, largely the product of public sector building, the spatial division into separate rooms encouraged **6.29** the acquisition of goods to fill them. So, as housing estates mushroomed up in the post-war boom in Nigeria, the import of domestic consumer goods increased. Metropolitan firms, well established for European and African elites since the 1920s, opened up new department stores in the centre of cities: radiograms, television sets, refrigerators, clothes, imported settees and armchairs became standard equipment in Nigerian middle class homes, with local furniture manufacturers tending to copy imported styles. (101)

As part of these processes, therefore, the bungalow - as a dwelling of European origins and style - becomes a major element in what many

have seen as 'Westernisation' or 'Europeanisation' - the adoption of the language, dress, behaviour, family structure, values and tastes of Europe. In the 1950s and 1960s, Mitchell was one of a number of anthropologists who saw the adoption of a 'European way of life' - speaking English among themselves, using European furniture at home, eating European-type food - as an index of social prestige. Jahoda sought to demonstrate that the higher the education a person had received in Ghana, the more likely he or she was to be 'Westernised', i.e. living in a nuclear family household, eating three meals a day at regular times, reading newspapers regularly, belong to non-traditional voluntary organisation. Higher education gave access to government jobs and government jobs entitled their occupants to government bungalows. (102)

More recent studies have adopted a similar stance. In Blantyre City, Malawi, the typical ecological zones left behind by the colonial regime and now occupied by Africans were seen to be associated with different personality types. Higher-ranking government officials, company managers and ministers lived in the ex-European area of low density, multi-roomed, large detached houses with large gardens, servants' quarters and telephones. 'In their mode and style of life they resemble the European middle class. . . wall to wall carpeting, one car or two, with a pool of domestic workers. The nuclear family is the norm. . . Relations with kinsmen are selective and manipulative; poor relations are commonly shunned. . . accommodation is not readily given to kinsmen. . . the rural link has become relatively de-personalised'. For this group 'occupational position rather than tribal values is manifestly the chief basis of emerging social relations. . . There is a de-emphasis on ethnicity, they are less religious and have literate wives'.

At the other end of the scale is the 'peri-urban area' with housing ranging from the well built, to semi-shacks, untarred roads, pit latrines and scattered water taps. Here, occupants are labourers, the semi-skilled, messengers and market sellers. Here, ethnicity is a strong factor in residents' orientations, and urban-rural ties are strong. (103) Similarly, Onokerhoraye shows a correlation between those with Western education and residence in European-style bungalows. (104) And though Lloyd rightly distinguishes between 'Western' technology, cars

and television common to all industrial societies, and family values, he concludes that 'with wealth and education the style of life within the home becomes more and more Western'. Along with dress, style of speech, including speaking English, and the car, the house and life-style is an important symbol of status. 'To some extent the Yoruba have inherited a material style of life created by the colonial administrators in moving physically into their homes'. . . There are qualitative differences among them in the styles of house furnishings which can be scaled from 'the more traditional to the more modern.' (105)

Yet 'Westernisation' and 'Europeanisation' are facile terms to describe the multiple and complex processes of change in urban Africa. One of the most radical African critics of the accounts of Western anthropologists has written

'Living in an urban setting. . . an African was unavoidably involved in a money economy. He had to buy his clothing, food, furniture, utensils; and the goods that came to be offered in the shops came from the factories that catered to an industrialised society. The acquisition of 'European' goods was not, therefore, in any sense 'imitative' or indicative of status, but a necessary consequence of being absorbed in a milieu dominated by factory-made goods. A similar compulsion dictated the acquisition of cultural values, such as Christianity. To obtain a school education Africans were obliged to embrace Christianity, since education was in the hands of the missionaries. The adoption of Christianity had many consequences, such as the acceptance of monogamous marriage, the wearing of European-style clothing and the abandonment of characteristic traditional pursuits such as beer-drinking, circumcision schools and traditional forms of worship. . . Efforts at 'imitating' what is ethnocentrically called a 'European way of life' arise from the destruction of a previous way of life and the associational ties which that way provided. (106)

Whatever the situation, it is evident that the new residential environments and housing models provide a totally different set of symbols and indicators, both of status and behaviour, than those of pre-colonial Africa. As elsewhere in the world, the bungalow in Africa is a category of dwelling and as such, has a distinct social meaning which is evidently indicative of modernisation and associated with an emerging class structure.

It is a class structure, however, where large, European-style houses form part of a system of inequality where salary differentials are as great as 50:1, and where there is 'a contrast between excellent living accommodation at nominal rents for a few and squalid accommodation at extortionate rents for the vast majority'. These are the words of an African observer who has called for a 're-examination of the historical . . . foundations of our habits of distribution . . . and condemnation of the gross inequalities between salaries, perquisites and services between a privileged class and a less privileged ones'. (107) It has been this task which this study has attempted.

As for the general question of standards, housing design and the provision of shelter with which we began, it is clear from the discussion above that this is not simply a matter of changing physical phenomena such as design criteria and measurements. It is a question of changing life-styles, consumption habits and ultimately, of the direction of the economy itself. It refers to questions of taste, standards of living and status symbols which derive ultimately not just from 'the West' but from a global system of capitalism which depends on accumulation and domestic consumption.(108) The continuing cultural dependence in architecture and planning standards in Africa depends on continuing connections between the metropole and indigenous African elites. Reorienting construction to 'appropriate standards' is not simply a question of removing environments or even changing the standards on which they are based. It is a question of changing the values of an elite, or removing the elites themselves.

Chapter Six Footnotes

I am very grateful to Dr Jeremy Eades, of the Anthropology and Urban Studies programme at the University of Kent, for his comments on an earlier version of this chapter.

1. A.L.Mabogunje, review of A.B.Anderson, African Traditional Architecture: A study of the housing and settlement patterns of rural Kenya, New York, Oxford University Press, 1977, in Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, 38,3, 1979, 291.
2. A.L.Mabogunje, J.E.Hardoy and R.P.Misra, Shelter Provision in Developing Countries, The influence of standards and criteria. John Wiley, Chichester, 1978.
3. Ibid. 8. See also, J.E.Hardoy and D.Satterthwaite, Shelter: Need and Response. Housing, land and settlement policies in seventeen third world nations, Wiley, Chichester, 1981.
4. Ibid. 10 - 15.
5. R.Lewcock, Early Nineteenth Century Architecture in South Africa. A study of the interaction of two cultures, 1795-1837. Cape Town, Balkema, 1963.
6. D.Headrick, Tools of Empire, Technology and European imperialism in the nineteenth century, Oxford University Press Oxford, 1981.
7. Colonial Office. Africa (West) No.848. Correspondence (April, 1906 to January, 1909) respecting the Design of Bungalows provided for Government Officials in West Africa. Colonial Office, London, 1909. Hereafter, Colonial Office. (Italics added)
8. A.L.Mabogunje, Urbanization in Nigeria. University of London Press, London, 1968. 296 et seq.
9. B.Porter, The Lion's Share. A short history of British imperialism 1850 - 1970. Longman, London, 1975; P.J.Cain and A.G.Hopkins, 'The political economy of British Expansion Overseas, 1750-1914', The Economic History Review, 33,4,1980, 463-90. This section draws particularly on these two sources.
10. Cain and Hopkins, op.cit., 466.
11. Porter, chapter 1, op.cit.
12. Cain and Hopkins, op.cit., 472; P.Mathias, The First Industrial Nation. An economic history of Britain, 1700-1914, Methuen, London, 1978, p.295.
13. Porter, op.cit., 7.

14. Mabogunje, op.cit., 239 et seq for the following paragraphs.
15. L.H.Brockway, Science and Colonial Expansion, Academic Press, London, 1979.
16. Quoted in I.Acquah, Accra Survey. London, 1958, pp.27,23.
17. Mabogunje, op.cit., p.118; P.H.Baker, Urbanization and Political Change. The politics of Lagos, 1917-67, University of California Press, London, 1974, pp.29-30.
18. P.C.Lloyd, Power and Independence. Urban Africans' perceptions of social inequality. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1974, 60.
19. L.H.Gann & P.Duignan, The Rulers of British Africa, 1870-1914. Croom Helm, London, 1978, p.229; F.D.Lugard, The Dual Mandate in Tropical Africa, Frank Cass, London, 1965 (first published 1922), p.143.
20. e.g. T.Trapham, A Discourse on the State of Health in the Island of Jamaica, London, 1679; R.Towne, A treatise on the Diseases of the W.Indies, London 1726; J.Lind, Essay on Diseases Incident to Europeans in Hot Climates, London, 1768; J.Johnson, The Influence of Tropical Climates on European Constitutions. London, 1813. See E.T.Renbourn, 'Seasoning fluxes and fevers of acclimatization. An introduction to the history of tropical adaptation'. The Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene, 66,8,1963, 193-203.
21. G.Herbert, Pioneers of Prefabrication. The British contribution in the nineteenth century. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1978.
22. G.Kubler, 'The machine for living in eighteenth century West Africa', Journal of the American Society of Architectural Historians, 4,1,1944, 30-3.
23. See illustrations in Herbert, op.cit.
24. J.Murray, How to Live in Tropical Africa. Murray, London, 1895.
25. 'these bungalow houses are still seen as the most ideal form of tropical house'. E.Rodenwaldt, Tropenhygiene, Enke, Stuttgart, 1938, p.25.
26. See catalogues of 'portable buildings', e.g. D.Rowley, c.1890; London Iron Building Company, 1890. Herbert, op.cit.
27. Baker, loc.cit.
28. Acquah, op.cit., 23.
29. T.A.Alldrige, A Transformed Colony, Sierra Leone, As it was, and as it is. Its progress, peoples, native customs and undeveloped wealth. Seeley and Son, London, 1910, 104-36.

30. Ibid.
31. A.L.Mabogunje, The Development Process. A spatial perspective. Hutchinson, 1980; S.Amin, 'Urbanization and dependence in Black Africa: origins and contemporary forms', in J.Abu-Lughod & R. Hay, Third World Urbanization, Maroufa Press, Chicago, 1977, pp.140-54, p.140.
32. Mabogunje, 1968, op.cit.; also, R.W.Hull, African Cities and Towns before the European Conquest. Horton, New York, 1976 Mabogunje, 1980, pp.80,173, 73. This section draws mainly from this account.
33. E.Coulson, 'The impact of the colonial period on the definition of land rights', in V.Turner, Colonialism in Africa, 1870-1960. vol 3. Cambridge University Press, 1971, pp.193-215, p.203.
34. See especially S.Denyer, African Traditional Architecture. London, Heinemann, 1978; R.W.Hull, African Cities and Towns before the European Conquest, Norton, New York, 1976; P.Oliver, ed.Shelter and Society. Barrie and Jenkins, London, 1970; P.Oliver, ed. Shelter in Africa. Barrie and Jenkins, London, 1975.
35. Denyer, op.cit., 21.
36. This section draws mainly on Hull, op.cit. See also Mabogunje, 1968.
37. Hull, op.cit., p.90.
38. Mabogunje, 1980, p.80 et seq. See also D.R.Aronson, 'Capitalism and culture in Ibadan urban development', Urban Anthropology, 7,3,1978, pp.253-70.
39. Mabogunje, 1980, loc.cit.
40. Colonial Office. African(West) No848. Correspondence (April, 1906 to January, 1909) respecting the Design of Bungalows provided for Government Officials in West Africa. Colonial Office, 1909.
41. Ibid., p.4.
42. Ibid., p.7.
43. M.Kingsley, Travels in West Africa. Macmillan, London, 1895.
44. Colonial Office, op.cit., p.28.
45. Ibid., pp.8, 25.
46. See suggestions made in The Delhi Sketch Book, 1851, (p.)
47. Colonial Office, op.cit. p.28.

48. Ibid, p.19.
49. An advantage still remarked upon by Rodenwaldt, in the 1950s edition of his book.
50. Colonial Office, op.cit., p.37.
51. Ibid, p.43.
52. Ibid, p.26.
53. Ibid, p.32.
54. Ibid, p.41.
55. Ibid, pp.18-19.
56. Ibid, p.37.
57. See A.D.King, Colonial Urban Development. Culture, social power and environment. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1976. Chapter 6.
58. Colonial Office, op.cit., p.28.
59. Ibid, p.26.
60. Ibid, p.16.
61. Ibid, p.37.
62. See Gann & Duignan, op.cit., pp.162, 189.
63. East Africa Protectorate, Kenya Province, Embu District, Memoranda for Provincial and District Commissioners. Nairobi. Government Printer, 1910. 14-15.
64. R.K.Home, 'Urban growth and urban government', in G.Williams, ed. Nigeria: Economy and Society, London, 1976. 54-75,66. See also R.K.Home, 'Town Planning and indirect rule in colonial Nigeria: A form of apartheid?', Third World Planning Review (in press).
65. F.D. Lugard, Political Memoranda. Revision of instructions to political officers on subjects chiefly political and administrative, 1913-18. Frank Cass, London, 1970, pp.416 et seq. (Earlier editions, 1906, 1919)
66. J.L. Abu Lughod, Rabat. Urban Apartheid in Morocco. Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1980.
67. Lugard, op.cit.; also ibid, The Dual Mandate in Tropical Africa. Frank Cass, London, 1965, p. 143 et seq (first edition, 1922)
68. Ibid, pp.149-50.

69. A.H.M.Kirk-Greene, Lugard and the Amalgamation of Nigeria. Frank Cass, London,, 1968, pp.94-6.
70. A.D.King, 'Exporting planning: the colonial and neo-colonial experience', in G.E.Cherry,ed., Shaping an Urban World, Mansell, London, 1980, pp.203-26.
71. Mabogunje, op.cit., 1968, p.194.
72. Mabogunje, op.cit., 1968, p.118.
73. Colonial Office, op.cit., p.8.
74. R.Betts, French colonial architecture in Senegal. University of Kentucky, unpublished paper, 1975.
75. Mabogunje, 1968, op.cit., 118-19, 173.
76. Ibid, 193.
77. P.Kilby, Manufacturing in colonial Africa, in R.Duignan and L.H.Gann, ed. Colonialism in Africa, 1870-1960. Vol.4. The economics of colonialism, Cambridge University Press, 1975, pp.470-522.
78. Hardoy and Satterthwaite, op.cit.; P.Kilby, Industrialisation in an Open Economy. Cambridge University Press, 1969, passim.
79. A.G.Hopkins, 'Property rights and empire building. Britain's annexation of Lagos, 1861', Journal of Economic History, 40, 4, 1980, pp.777-98.
80. J.Dunn and A.F.Robertson, Dependence and Opportunity. Political change in Ahafo. Cambridge University Press, 1973, pp.96-8, 114-18.
81. Ibid, p.116. For traditional Asante dwellings, see M.D.McLeod, The Asante. British Museum, London, 1981.
82. G.Wagner, The Bantu of North Kavirondo. Vol 2. Oxford University Press, London, 1956 (based on fieldwork undertaken before 1939).
83. G.A.Atkinson, 'Jobbing builders or self help for African housing', Journal of African Administration, 13, 1, 1961. 46-9.
84. P.Crook, 'Sample survey of Yoruba rural building', Odu, 2,2, 1966, pp.41-71.
85. Mabogunje, 1968, op.cit., pp.231-3.
86. Ibid, p.300.
87. Ibid, p.301.

88. A.Peace, Choice, Class and Conflict, Harvester, Brighton, 1979.
89. Mabogunje, op.cit., 1968,p.226 ; Lloyd, op.cit., 115.
90. See especially B.Mabugane, 'A critical look at indices used in the study of social change in colonial Africa', Current Anthropology, 12, 4-5, 1971, pp.419-44.
91. W.Elkan, 'How people came to live in towns', in Duignan and Gann. 1975. op.cit., p.661. See also A.Southall, 'The impact of imperialism on urban development in Africa', in Turner, ed., op.cit.; T.Hodgkin, Nationalism in Colonial Africa. Muller, London, 1956, pp.72-82.
92. D.Parkin, Introduction to D.Parkin, ed., Town and Country in East and Central Africa. Oxford University Press, London, 1975, p.41. See also Southall, op.cit.
93. Mabogunje, Hardoy and Misra, op.cit., p.14.
94. P.Marris, Family and Social Change in Africa, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1961; J.C.Caldwell, Population Growth and Family Change in Africa. Australian National Press, Canberra, 1968, p.2.
95. A.G.Onokerhoraye, 'The evolution and spatial structure of house types in the traditional Nigerian city: a Benin example', The Journal of Tropical Geography. 45, 1977, pp.34-42, p.37.
96. P.C.Lloyd, Power and Independence, op.cit., p.119.
97. Onokerhoraye, op.cit.,37.
98. Caldwell, op.cit., p.2 .
99. Hopkins, op.cit.
100. Lloyd, op.cit., p.59.
101. op.cit., p. 117.
102. See articles quoted in Mabugane, op.cit.; G.Jahoda, 'Aspects of Westernisation. A study of adult class students in Ghana', British Journal of Sociology, 12,4,1961,pp.375-86, 378-9.
103. A.B.Chilivumbo, 'The ecology of social types in Blantyre', in D.Parkin,ed. op.cit., pp.309-18.
104. Onokerhoraye, op.cit.
105. Lloyd, op.cit., p.118.
106. Mabugane, op.cit., p.425.
107. O.Nduka, 'The rationality of the rich in Nigeria', in P.C.W. Gutkind and P.Waterman,eds.African Social Studies. A radical reader. Monthly review press, NY,1977,p.347.
108. Mabuganj, 1980.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE BUNGALOW IN AUSTRALIA, 1788 - 1940

Introduction

- I The shape of Australia's urban development

- II The early Australian house
The 'tropical bungalow' in Queensland
'Bungalow' as Australian term

- III The Californian bungalow in suburban Australia

CHAPTER SEVEN

The Bungalow in Australia, 1788 - 1940

The modest bungalow, occupying its own block of land, was a tribute essentially to the typical Australian drive for individual home ownership.

N.G. Butlin, Investment in Australian Economic Development, 1861-1900. 1964. p.223.

Introduction

Earlier chapters of this thesis have pursued some definite themes: this one largely raises questions. The importance of Australia in the context of this study is that it provides us with what experimental science would call a 'control group', a population and set of circumstances with which some of the propositions advanced earlier can be tested.

All cases of overseas settlement provide a laboratory situation where the influence of different forces shaping the built environment, whether geographic (climate, topography), social and cultural (kinship forms, values, worldview) or economic and political, can be examined. The particular advantage of Australia is that, with its absence of indigenous urban development, the relative cultural homogeneity of its early settlers and the time and circumstances of its colonisation, a case study is provided which, even more so than in the cases of India and Africa discussed above, demonstrates the importance of political economy and culture in shaping the built environment. It is only by looking at Australia within the larger context of an emerging capitalist world economy on one hand, and a global colonial culture embracing Britain, India, North America, Africa and the Caribbean on the other, that an adequate understanding of her building - and other cultural - forms can be obtained.

The explanation of these forms must, obviously, be of interest and importance to the Australians themselves. Yet in many ways, such forms are of equal significance to people in Britain. For what they demonstrate, and this might also be said for parts of Anglo-Saxon culture in North America or in British colonies elsewhere, are the forms of dwelling and property which British people have chosen when given the greatest economic and political freedom. It is a kind of

experiment akin to testing peoples' values by giving them £1,000 and then watching how they spend it. Though native Australians may resent this, what their typical living patterns are - a suburban quarter acre lot with every family owning its own detached, and generally single-storey home - represent what the vast majority of British people would like to have. It is a pattern which results from a combination of factors - a free market economy, the nuclear family, the symbolic expression of private property, and a cluster of social, cultural and historical preferences.

In an important sense, therefore, the bungalow - as we have discussed it so far - never went to Australia. It did not need to as it was always there from the start. Despite the fact that today the form of the bungalow is more prominent as the modal dwelling form in Australia than perhaps anywhere else in the world, the word itself is infrequently used. As the vast majority of houses are detached, single storey and located on their own lot, what use is there for the term 'bungalow'? Such dwellings are referred to as 'houses', 'homes' or 'homesteads'. In contemporary Australian parlance, 'bungalow' seems to have an ambiguous meaning. Depending on region or perhaps the person using the term, it might refer to a separate annex of a house, often just a flimsy shed of weatherboard, and sometimes used as a sleep-out. (1) In Queensland, the Northern Territory and northern Western Australia, it might describe a distinctive form of 'tropical bungalow' (discussed below); in Sydney, to occasionally describe a particular type of luxurious suburban dwelling, or, in the special language of architectural history, to refer to the particular style of the 'Californian bungalow' of the 'twenties, of which more anon.

Yet as far as existing evidence suggests, the term itself was, with perhaps the rare exception, not used to describe any particular type of Australian dwelling before 1876 when it was apparently introduced from England. (2) The common names for dwellings in nineteenth century Australia were, with the addition perhaps of 'cottage', as they are today. In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, 'bungalow' was occasionally used until, from about 1907-8, it became increasingly common with the importation of the Californian bungalow style. The use of the term to describe Australian dwelling forms from the early nineteenth century (3) would therefore seem to be not

only anachronistic but, as we shall see below, also confusing.

What this chapter is about, therefore, is - in broad terms - the explanation of the built environment; about the role of capital in relation to urban and architectural developments, about colonialism in relation to cultural forms, and about why people explain architecture in the way they do. And where earlier chapters have discussed the development of the bungalow only if it was actually named as such, this one - for reasons which should become clear - will depart from that decision.

The chapter is in four parts. The first is concerned with the various historical forces, economic, cultural, social and political, which help to explain why the one-family, generally single-storey, detached dwelling became, as part of a particular type of urban development, the modal dwelling form of Australia. Though others have written on this theme before, (4) I hope not simply to draw on their arguments but to add something as well.

The second part examines the form of early dwellings in Australia, especially where they approximate to the Anglo-Indian bungalow, and the influences which helped to produce it. Part three considers the circumstances behind the introduction of the term in the last quarter of the nineteenth century and its relation to architectural developments. In the final section, the forces leading to the introduction of the Californian bungalow, as part of the vast proliferation of suburbs in the first half of the twentieth century, are discussed. Of particular relevance here are the assumptions behind the introduction of town planning and 'garden suburbs' introduced at this time. In some ways, therefore, the middle sections of this chapter approach closer to 'conventional' architectural history than what has gone before.

The shape of Australia's urban development

'The attempt to see Australian history in terms of the evolution of a national character (distinct from British character) and the establishment of a culturally independent nation is a misleading and impossible historical exercise. Because of the nature and timing of its settlement, and the continuing importance of overseas connections, Australia - far from being or becoming a nation apart - was really one small part of an international urban, or suburban culture, created by Western civilisation. Metropolitanisation and the brief span of Australian history before 1900 gave the majority of the inhabitants . .

insufficient time, opportunity or inclination to develop a truly distinctive way of life. In fact, the major part of Australian effort was directed towards the precise opposite - an attempt to create provincial England in the Antipodes. This process was promoted by a continuous flow of people, capital, ideas and techniques from Britain'. (5)

This comment is typical of a number of Australian scholars who, by emphasising Australia's 'British origins', give precedence to what might be termed 'cultural factors' in explaining her architectural and urban development. (6) The British and Irish who went to Australia, Glynn suggests, came from urban areas and brought their urban and domestic images with them. And though the early settlers in Australia were largely to live in towns, each brought with him an image of a rural ideal. Australian cities were established rapidly and from the beginning, they 'straggled across plentiful land, using the English country cottage as its model dwelling, creating suburbs well before other urban industrial societies'. (7) They grew, according to Butlin, 'as a sprawl of detached cottages'. (8) For architectural historian Robin Boyd, this had something to do with 'the acquired English taste for privacy'. It was this taste which, he maintains, 'remained a prime motive through subsequent generations of home-building'. Other Australians have stressed the 'agressive individuality' which characterised the culture of the early settlers, (9) a 'searching for dignity and independence that had . . . first driven many of the "bloody emmigrants" from the industrialised cities of the British Isles with dreams of a simple arcady that seemed, however mythically, to be their birthright'. (10)

Had Australia been settled, as Glynn suggests, by the Spanish or the Chinese instead of the British and Irish, the pattern of urbanisation would have been different. One could also add that, if climatic or merely geographic factors had been paramount, and had Australia been settled by Arabs from the sixteenth century Middle East, for example, then the urban and architectural forms of central Australia might have been similar to those of comparable tropical and sub-tropical climes, such as Baghdad or Tunis. And as the aboriginal inhabitants of Australia had neither towns nor permanent dwellings, there was, as we have seen happened in India, no indigenous model or manpower to

influence the immigrants' ideas.

British immigrants were as slow to adapt their housing to the climate as they were their clothes. Writing on New South Wales in 1864, John Snodgrass commented

How is it that Englishmen can be so stupid as to wear, in a climate where the glass is commonly at 90 in the shade, and sometimes even as high as 120, the black frock and dress coat of the home country, the heavy boots, the misshapen, unbecoming (sic) waistcoats and trowsers (sic). (11)

A century or so later, another immigrant, this time a professor of architecture from India, was equally struck by the way that an established cultural practice, grounded - among other things - in notions of property, prevailed over what, in his view, were more logical arrangements

In many settlements in central Australia . . . rows and rows of small houses with uninsulated roofs virtually sit in a dust bowl on plots which are far too large. Open spaces in relation to built-up areas are far too generous, and roads catering only for light traffic, far too wide. (12)

In his own native north India, and in similar hot, dry tropical climes elsewhere, compact honeycombed clusters of multi-storey, courtyard houses were the norm. Yet the Australian settlement forms he described were as they had always been, the cottage ideal of a rural nineteenth century.

Similarly, the social forms for which the dwellings were built were those which prevailed in eighteenth and nineteenth century England. Though New South Wales was founded by a predominantly male immigrant population, many of whom were transported for life, their image of a family was of a two generation unit, parents and children - and possibly grandparents - in one household, and it was this for which dwellings were generally built. It was a dwelling form where, in relation to land and property, types of tenure were relatively simple. One was either a tenant or a freeholder, without any of the complex tenure arrangements which we have seen in the peasant economies of Africa, or with the religious and social obligations characteristic of the countries of Islam.

Yet cultural and social explanations of dwelling forms are clearly not enough. Transplanting the image of a cottage-on-its-own-plot, the forms of the family, the notion of private, domestic property, are only partial explanations; the larger political economy must be discussed.

Australia was first and foremost a colony, founded in 1788. As such, it was financed, equipped and peopled from Britain, and was part of a British, European and largely Western world economic system. The early, and much of the later history of Australia was of an economy dependent on Britain, initially as a convict colony, and subsequently, during the mercantile phase of capitalism, as a supplier of raw materials and a consumer of Britain's processed goods. The first towns, Sydney (founded 1788), Newcastle (1804) and Brisbane (1824) were colonial port cities, despatching agricultural and pastoral produce and in turn importing supplies. Manufacturing was small, but warehouses, insurance and banking facilities made them rapidly into commercial cities. Because of the total absence of indigenous towns or villages, the foundation and growth of these colonial ports was a case of 'dependent urbanisation' (13) in an even more quintessential sense than was the case, for example, in Lagos or Bombay. It was dependent urbanisation in the sense that it was the economic surplus created by Britain's industrialisation which made possible the towns and cities of Australia.

Within the colonial system as a whole, therefore, the functions of these cities were commercial and administrative: 'without the demand of commerce for bases and fishing grounds, and of English industry for wool and metals, the cities would hardly have grown as they did'. (14) Neither Australia, nor, for that matter New Zealand, first settled by Europeans in the 1840s, ever had a peasant agriculture and hence, never had any peasant settlements or peasant dwellings where people lived and produced solely for themselves. From the start, agriculture in Australia was commercial, producing for the market rather than for domestic consumption. Proportionally, therefore, rural farmhouses or 'homesteads' were few, though houses for the urban 'service' population were many. Thus, unlike the British metropole, or the much later cities of Europe, Australian cities were never, by comparison, 'industrial'. They never had an inheritance of

old, pre-industrial housing or newer rented 'industrial' housing built to accommodate labour close to factories. (15) Or if they did, if we can allow the metaphor, it was left behind in Britain.

From the beginning, therefore, Australia developed as an urban nation. 'The British (convict and free) who settled the country came from a rapidly urbanising society and the majority of them came from urban areas. They introduced a technology and a set of values which, in Australian circumstances, gave rise to a high degree of urbanisation'. (16) By 1891, two thirds of the population lived in towns and cities, a proportion only matched by the United States in 1920, and by Canada, in 1950. By 1971, 85% of Australians lived in towns of over one thousand inhabitants, (17) and approaching half of all of them in the two metropolitan centres of Sydney and Melbourne.

Yet paradoxically, it was a form of urbanisation which, within the dependent context outlined above, was a sort of distant suburb of Britain. In comparison with that country, there was never any shortage of land, even though the possibility of buying it was restricted by land laws not removed till the second half of the nineteenth century. Nevertheless, many people had their own plot. In an early despatch to Britain after landing with the 'First Fleet' in 1788, Governor Arthur Phillip proposed that 'the land be granted with a clause that will ever prevent more than one house being built on the allotment which will be of 60 feet in front and 150 feet in depth'. Whether Phillip was actually responsible, this lot size, though varying some feet either way in subsequent years was, according to Boyd, to become the norm in subdivisions in the twentieth century. By this time, the population was spread 15 to the acre. (18) The cheapness, in relation to incomes, of urban and suburban land and building materials, and a commitment to the principles of the free market, permitted ever-increasing numbers of urban families to acquire their own houses on one quarter and one eighth blocks in outer urban areas.

By the end of the nineteenth century, therefore, each Australian capital had its collection of sprawling suburbs, 'sacrificing some of the economic and other advantages of high-density living in the interests of space and privacy'. (19) Though row or terraced housing did, of course, exist, and occurred to a considerable extent both in the early colonial ports and also in Sydney, (20) in comparison to British cities at the time, there were always far more detached, owner-occupied

houses. As early as 1827, for example, a visitor to Sydney wrote,

Near the harbour, where ground is very valuable, the houses are usually contiguous, like those of the towns in England, but generally speaking, the better sorts of houses in Sydney are built in the detached cottage style . . . one or two storeys high . . . with verandahs in front and enclosed by a neat wooden paling'. (21)

The shape of Australian cities was also heavily influenced by technology. Compared with most other colonial countries, Australia was settled very late, and much of its development took place after the introduction of mechanised transport, especially railways, which attracted immense investment from outside. Consequently, compared with the cities in many other countries, those of Australia were spread over large areas at very low density. (22) As their major growth occurred in an era of mechanised transport, there was no reason to live within walking distance of shops, jobs and services.

Because of its colonial economy and the early development of mechanised transport (rail and tramways), therefore, the majority of Australia's population were not just urban, but suburban. Australia in fact, was probably the first 'suburban nation'. (23) In 1865, half of the population lived in municipalities with less than 20 people per acre. After 1880, the steam railway, electric tram and a huge building boom generated by British investment made for the further suburbanisation of the capital cities. The growth in population since then has meant that about ninety per cent of the increase in capital cities has occurred between the 1880s and 1970s. Again, confirmation on the suburban developments of the late nineteenth century comes from an English visitor. According to Richard Twopeny, though the upper middle class often lived in two-storey houses, 'the most popular type of dwelling' was a single storeyed house designed 'as an oblong block divided by a three to eight foot passage'. Terraces and attached houses were 'universally disliked and almost every class of suburban house is detached and stands in its own garden'. Nearly every house that could afford the space had a verandah which sometimes stretched the whole way round. (24) This preference for separate single-storey dwellings was to make late nineteenth century Melbourne, for example, so enormous and impressed other visitors with

its sheer physical extent. (25)

Yet Australia's urban development was not only 'culturally British', colonial and, in a technological sense, 'post industrial', her cities were 'pure' products of the expansion of capitalism; Australia itself, 'one of the purest manifestations that history had to offer of capitalistic societies'. (26) Fundamental to this was the concept of land and property ownership. The colonists brought with them attitudes to land as a source of wealth, power and security, and land speculation became a national hobby. Housing has always been an important component of investment and between 1861 and 1938, dwellings accounted for not much less than half the total capital formation. (27) In this process, the connection with Britain was crucial. It was not just that the people, technology and image of the ideal dwelling came from Britain. So also did the finance. In the second half of the nineteenth century, the roots of Australia's prosperity lay in the expanding British world economy and in the three decades before 1890, the building industry absorbed one third of total Australian investment. In the second half of the 1880s, £50 million of British capital poured into Victoria, fuelling a massive land boom in which speculators, who 'bought by the acre and sold by the foot', were instrumental in helping to extend Melbourne's suburbs at a time when plot values rose ten to twenty times in five years. (28) After a struggle over land ownership in the 1860s and 70s, freehold was established as the dominant form of tenure, by which time, the land was largely settled. With labour shortages and high wages, home ownership was much more of a possibility than it had been in Britain. Thus, when the 1911 census first provided information on this question, it showed that about half of all housing in Australia was owner-occupied, a proportion not reached in Canada till 1920, the United States in 1950 and Great Britain in 1971. (29) The percentage of owner-occupiers in Australia peaked at 74 per cent in 1966, and though it had fallen to 69 per cent in 1971, this was still - apart from Iceland - the highest percentage of home ownership in the world. (30)

It was these developments which explain why, in the words of Max Neutze, 'the detached family house, instead of being exceptional, as in European cities, became the standard form of housing in Australia'. By the middle of the twentieth century, well over 70 per cent of Australians lived in what were effectively suburban areas;

in the two major cities of Sydney and Melbourne, over 92 per cent of the inhabitants lived in suburbs outside the cities' boundaries.(31)

If these factors provide some explanation for the predominance in Australia of the owner-occupied, single family dwelling standing on its own plot, they are, nonetheless, only partial. After all, the 'cultural images' of British emigrants in the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century also included notions of the typical Georgian town with its squares, crescents and terraces. A comprehensive explanation of Australia's urban and architectural forms would need to provide a far more detailed account of the system of urban land-holding, the distribution of and access to capital, as well as the social, political and administrative institutions, or lack of them, which shaped the form of the built environment. The early settlements in New South Wales and Tasmania, for example, were run as 'military dictatorships' and this affected both legislation and the developments of institutions.

The single family, generally single storey house on a quarter acre block was, therefore, a product and symbol of many things - a colonial and capitalist economy and polity, basic cultural values such as privacy and domesticity, the concept of private property, and family structure amongst others. And the multiplication of these single family dwellings in the massive suburbanisation of the twentieth century was both a demonstration of, as well as a central element in, the overall accumulation of capital in Australia. These then, seem to be the basic reasons for the characteristic dwelling type of Australia. What we may now examine is the existence of a bungalow form, in nature if not in name, in the early decades following the arrival of Captain Phillips in 1788.

The early Australian house

The early architectural history of domestic housing in Australia has been very well described by Freeland, Boyd, Cox and Lucas and others.(32) It would serve little purpose, therefore, to repeat what others have done far better before. Yet digging around in Australia's history to trace the origins of the bungalow-in-form-if-not-in-name nonetheless raises questions which have more than an antiquarian interest, for

example, about cultural diffusion on a global scale or the question of housing in colonial settlement. It also suggests some areas for further research.

As the first settlers arrived in Australia a dozen years before the end of the eighteenth century, it seems fair to take the defining features of the bungalow as those existing in India at that time. As we have seen in chapter 1, these essentially were of a single storey detached dwelling, with a pyramidal, often thatched roof, of generally square or oblong plan and, most importantly, entirely or partly surrounded by a verandah. Bedrooms could be located on the enclosed four corners of the verandah; the dwelling occupied its own, generally enclosed and spacious plot.

The earliest shelter provided at Sydney Cove consisted of tents and marquees for the officers and guards of the first convicts. A prefabricated timber and canvas structure had also been brought for the use of Captain Phillips. The first solid dwelling to be built - other than the initial construction of slab and bark huts and others of clay-smeared walls and thatched roof - was the house for Governor Phillips. This, put up in Sydney in 1788, naturally enough followed a contemporary English design. According to Freeland, it was 'an elegant brick house' and to Boyd, 'a two-storeyed, verandahless box with six rooms and the only staircase in the colony'. (33) The glazed sash windows had been brought from England. However, as the convict-made bricks were poor and crumbled, all subsequent buildings other than the Governor's House were single-storey, their roofs often covered with thatch or bark.

The dwelling forms which gradually developed in New South Wales over the next two or three decades were of various sizes, materials and forms. Whilst the model of the English cottage was often predominant, what is most relevant to our discussion is the existence of a bungalow type of dwelling with a verandah.

The first evidence of this already appeared in 1793-4 (if not earlier) at Paramatta, outside Sydney. Elizabeth Farm was (and still 7.1 is) a single-storey building, rectangular in plan, with four rooms, two on either side of a large central hall, 68 by 8 feet. A verandah with rooms at the corners ran along the east front though apparently this seemed to be used as an external passage. The kitchen, laundry,

meat house and servants' quarters were in another building at the back, a practice which, with its social, safety and sanitary advantages, was to continue for many houses well into the nineteenth century. (34)

Though this form was apparently atypical of domestic dwellings in the first three decades of Australia's settlement, it formed, according to Freeland, a 'primitive prototype of Australian country houses in New South Wales'. (35) Where the typical forms before 1815 were 'verandahless, twin-windowed, hipped-roofed cottage-type dwellings', from the 1820s, the homesteads of the new sheep stations tended to be 'large, spreading single storey houses with deep verandahs supported at their edges by thin wooden columns'. (36) In the country areas the verandah was very popular before 1800 and by 1810, practically every country house had one. In Sydney itself, however, the town houses tended to be 'shadeless boxes' with less than half a dozen equipped with verandahs'. (37)

7.2
7.3

Freeland is doubtless correct in suggesting that the verandah 'came second hand from the tropical countries of the East where it had been used from time immemorial in the tropics'. However, he also states - though provides no evidence to support it - that 'it had been taken back to the counties of Devon and Cornwall in England by the founders of empire. Thence it came to Australis'. (38)

The cultural origins of the verandah on small cottage-like dwellings, either as an extended roofline, supported by pillars, or as an added structure built against the wall of the house is, for architectural historians, an important question. (39) As far as Australia is concerned, however, it seems unlikely, or only marginally possible, that the main source was found in England. There is very little evidence of it having been used before the mid 1790s there, and considerable evidence that both the feature as well as the term used to describe it were both gradually introduced from about that time. (See Appendix A)

A more convincing account is that of Moffit who suggests that neither the term nor the feature were in use in England in the 1780s. However, there were many British army officers in Sydney in 1788 who had served in colonies where verandahs were common and who were aware of their merits as a protection against sun and rain. For example,

the earliest engravings of Sydney in 1788 show such a verandah on the house of Lieutenant Governor Ross who had served in the West Indies, Mediterranean and North America. (40)

In these developments, the key role was played by the army, and especially, by military engineers. Before 1825, all the governors of Australia were military officers, including Lachlan Macquarie, the Governor in Chief of New South Wales in 1810, who had spent part of his military service in India.

Just how influential Anglo-Indian dwelling models were on Australian domestic architecture, however, is a subject which has been little explored. It has been suggested that 'the first sources of Australian architectural design forms, the English Georgian farmhouse and the Indian bungalow as interpreted by the British, were translated into buildings by men who knew the models first hand' (41) and also that 'the bungalow was introduced into Australia at an early stage by the officers of the army who had served in India, where Macquarie's regiment, for example, had been stationed. The typical Australian vernacular expanded from this model'. (42) Yet no evidence is provided to substantiate these assertions. Moreover, no evidence has yet emerged that the term 'bungalow' was used in the first ten or fifteen years of Australia's settlement, which - because the term was not in use in Britain at that time - would provide more specific evidence of an 'Anglo-Indian' connection. On the other hand, reference to 'a varando' in the Sydney Gazette in 1805 (43) could imply familiarity with India, the Caribbean or anywhere else in the Iberian colonial empire where the term, and structure, were in use.

Yet as has been suggested above, there were certainly many connections between India and Australia, and it seems not unlikely that many East India Company officials retired there. In 1827, for example, 'A Retired Officer of the Honourable East India Company's Service', wrote The Friend of Australia in which he gave extensive advice on laying out the plans of town, including questions of architecture. Interestingly enough, the particular pyramidal type of Indian bungalow was not advocated. House roofs were better terraced (i.e. flat) in warm climates, permitting an evening lounge in hot weather. Only a slight declivity was advised to permit the rain to run off. 'All houses, whether of rich and poor, should have

a piazza, alias verandah, round at least three sides' against the torrents of rain and in summer, against the glare. This, however, was literally a 'built-on piazza' as he continues 'the roof of the verandah should serve as an open balcony for the upper rooms'. (44) A year or so later, according to Moffit, another East Indian Company officer built 'a direct copy of an Anglo-Indian bungalow' near Liverpool, New South Wales. The house, 'Horsley' (1831), had 'typical Regency features of pavilion elements and pilaster, and shutters with adjustable louvres. Inside, the dining hall had large, Indian-style punkas'. This house, and another, 'Quamby' (1830s), at Hagley, Tasmania were 'by no means the first bungalow buildings in Australia but represent accurate reproductions of the Indian model'. (45)

As we have seen in chapter one, however, the term 'bungalow' was used very loosely in India, even at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The most common use is that defined by Hodges in 1781 (see page above) and this would need to act as a reference point in establishing any Indo-Australian connection.

The 'tropical bungalow' in Queensland

Some of the most 'bungalow-looking' dwellings in Australia were built in Queensland in the later nineteenth century. Indeed, so similar are these to the Anglo-Indian variety that they deserve some special attention.

Boyd lists, as one of the five principal types of house plan in eighteenth and nineteenth century Australia, what he calls 'the bungalow'. This was 'based on the English cottage plan of the eighteenth century (and) had a central passage with two or three rooms on each side. Australia discarded England's upper floor, spread the house on the ground and added a verandah on every side. This plan survived in country districts for a full century from 1840'. (46)

In the light of the earlier discussion, the suggestion that Australia 'added the veranda' needs to be questioned. There is, however, a tendency, perhaps even a need, for historians of 'new nations' both to identify, and then develop a notion of a 'national style'. In architecture, it finds expression, for example, in a search for 'the first Australian/New Zealand architect', or more

specifically, in discovering that the 'tropical bungalow' (again, an anachronistic use of the term) was 'the closest that Australia has ever come to producing an indigenous style'. (47)

The authority on this particular Australian house-type (we shall continue to use the term 'tropical bungalow' though there is no evidence that it was actually referred to as such when introduced) is Ray Sumner, on whose research the following is based. Within the time context of this study, Queensland was established relatively late in Australia's history. European settlers, attracted first by gold and subsequently, by pastoral farming, moved into Queensland from the early 1860s. The earliest dwellings were largely built of local materials, mainly timber, and, despite the prevalent tropical heat and seasonal extremes of humidity and drought, their design drew simply from the earlier ideas and models of housing which the settlers brought with them. The first dwellings were simply huts, often with a crude 'verandah' tacked on; subsequently, as settlement became permanent, two or four-roomed cottages developed, often with a verandah at the front.

The bungalow pattern seems to have been put up from the 1870s and 80s. Sumner describes it as 'a low dwelling with an iron roof. It consisted of a square, occasionally rectangular, central core with four, sometimes six, internal rooms, ranged symmetrically along a central hallway, the whole being surrounded on three or all sides by verandahs between two and three metres wide'. (48) Early bungalows were erected on wooden piles or stumps less than one metre above the ground. After about 1890, they were elevated about two metres above the ground. The reasons given are many: to overcome the problem of termites (white ants), compensate levels in uneven sites, and protect against flood hazards are the more common. The notion that ventilation was improved by elevation only seems to have been suggested after the style was firmly established. Nonetheless, the practice continues in Queensland as the undercroft offers useful, cool, low cost space. (49)

Some of the early Queensland bungalows, all built at the earliest after 1860, adopted the common Anglo-Indian practice of enclosing the corners of the rear verandah to create additional room space, either for bathroom or kitchen. Others, for reasons of safety, privacy, or comfort had separate kitchens at the rear. Corrugated iron seems to have been introduced for roofing and walls from the 1870s.

7-4
7-5

7-6

The question therefore arises as to how valid it is to describe what Professor Freeland calls 'the Australian bungalow' as 'Australian vernacular', if by this is meant, according to the Oxford English Dictionary, indigenous, or not of foreign origin? The spacious, single storey dwelling, encircling verandah and room plan seem to have developed in Anglo-India from the mid eighteenth century, and probably also owe something to colonial practice in the Caribbean. The idea of the verandah also seems to have been well known to the French in Louisiana well before Europeans came to Australia. (50) Just when Europeans adopted the widespread habit of the native inhabitants of tropical areas in raising houses on piers or stumps, whether as protection from insects, animals or other predators, or for reasons of defence, climate, privacy or other causes, is problematic. It was, as we have seen, adopted by Danish travellers to Africa in the 1790s (p.291), suggested as a 'scientific' solution for bungalows in India in 1851 (Vol.2), promoted as recommended practice for 'sanitary houses' in Britain in 1884 (Vol.2) and was characteristic of portable bungalows and houses exported from Britain to the tropical colonies at least from the late 1880s.

Though many improvements were certainly made to this housetype by its Australian inhabitants, and the particular combination of materials - especially corrugated iron, imported in vast quantities into Australia - produced some distinctive variations, it was perhaps less unique to Australia than some of her architectural historians would claim. Before these questions can be answered, however, more knowledge is needed about colonialism and architecture in the eighteenth century, and especially, of the activities and models of military engineers as they moved around the world.

'Bungalow' as Australian term

Looking for evidence of the term 'bungalow' in Australia's history can lead one up a lot of interesting, if eventually misleading paths. For, whilst Australians may not commonly use the word to describe dwellings, no country in the world has so many 'bungalow type' place names. According to the Australia (1:250,000) Map Series Gazeteer (Canberra, 1975), there is a suburb, Bungalow, in Cairns, Queensland (founded, 1878), a Bungalow homestead and Bungalow Flat in New South

Wales, as well as two places called Bungalow Well in Western Australia. A slight alteration of the spelling, quite acceptable in the light of earlier chapters of this book, gives us Bungaloo Bay (South Australia), Bungalo Well (W.Australia), as well as a town, Bangalow, a Bangalow Creek and a Mount Bangalore, all in New South Wales. This is not to mention Bungulla, Bungadoo and Bungalally, in other places on the continent.

Non-Australians, therefore, might be forgiven for thinking, particularly in the context of its actual housing stock, that the 'bungalow craze' of the early twentieth century had made a massive impact on Australia; until, that is, they discover that 'bungulla' is a New South Wales aboriginal term for the black bream tree common in different parts of the continent (51) Whether any of these (especially suburban) places names have anything to do with the bungalow as house form is a question only local topographers could discover.

The earliest identified reference to the application of 'bungalow' to a dwelling in Australia occurs in 1876; and again, provides an insight both into housing developments as well as the interpretation of architectural history. The first dwelling to be so called was a house named 'The Grange' built at Mount Victoria, New South Wales, in 1876. The evidence, however, emerges some years later. In The Building and Engineering Journal (Australia) 9, for the 13th December 1890, appeared a picture of a house captioned the 'Piddington Bungalow' and with the following description

7.7

Bungaloo (sic) Residence

The page sketch of the bungaloo residence, Mount Victoria, represents the most substantially-built house on the Blue Mountains. It is now the residence of Mr. F.C. Jarrett, but was built for the late Hon. Mr. Piddington, at one time Colonial Treasurer of New South Wales, and was designed by Mr. Horbury Hunt, the President of the Institute of Architects of New South Wales.

According to two of Australia's leading architectural historians Hunt is seen as one of the pioneers of 'modernism' in Australia. Freeland, for example, writes 'Hunt designed "The Grange", Mount Victoria, as a long, low bungalow spreading along the side of a hill. Its unbroken

brick walls were sheltered on all sides by the extension of the roof as a wide verandah. It had a low pitched roof with terra cotta cappings, and chimneys of a prototype used in future'. Freeland describes this as 'the first of Hunt's many houses which were to be pioneeringly modern in outlook and approach'. (52)

The fact that this house was built in 1876, and given the appellation 'bungalow' was obviously not un-related to the appearance of the illustrations and descriptions of the Birchington variety in the Building News (available in Australia) between 1870 and 1874. (See pp Moreover, the architectural features selected by Freeland as being of particular interest in the establishment of 'modernism', 'the long, low bungalow' unbroken brick walls, low-pitched roof and prototype chimneys, seem to bear a close similarity to the designs illustrated in the magazine.

The significance of this data is not, however, to join a sterile debate about 'architectural origins' but rather to reinforce the earlier comments concerning a need in some areas of architectural history - particularly those dealing in architectural careers - to identify 'leading figures'. Whatever, the aesthetic or other merits of Hunt's 'bungaloo', what is perhaps of more importance is that 'The Grange' was also apparently constructed as a 'second home' in what became 'at first a sort of "hill station" after the Indian model'.(53) It was eventually to become one of the major inland areas for Sydney owners of second, or vacation homes. In the early twentieth century, what the Building magazine referred to as 'seaside week-end homes' were to evolve from 'tents and shacks to cottages and bungalows' on the shore between Mordialloc and Frankston, outside Sydney. (54) The Australian vacation home is not, therefore, as is often assumed, of recent origin. (55)

From the 1890s to the end of the century, it was, as Donald Johnson points out, the idea of the bungalow, as discussed in Chapter Two, that was more important than the number of storeys, or even style, which characterised the few bungalows which appeared in Australia. As earlier chapters have shown, there was enough literature on the Western bungalow idea and lifestyle in British and American journals from the 1880s - to say nothing of Briggs' book (1891) - for the named bungalow to reach Australia. (56) Not unimportant here were the many catalogues of 'portable buildings', a form of architecture which had a long and important history in Australia, especially at the time

of gold strikes and the opening up of new land. And as the term at this time could refer to a house of either one or two storeys, it was not surprising that the same idea took hold in Australia.

7.8
7.9

What really generated the bungalow on a large scale, however, were developments in California rather than Britain. For these, we need to return to the larger economic and social setting.

The Californian bungalow in Australian suburbs

The second, and perhaps more genuine phase of the Australian bungalow movement began in the early twentieth century. Its source was firmly in the United States.

The popular American bungalow, it will be recalled, had first emerged in California about 1904-5, gathering momentum from 1906 and then turning into a flood with dozens of books, articles - and bungalows - produced in the next decade. It was this literature, together with the activities of builders and architects, which brought the California Bungalow to Australia.

The overall context of this development has been set out earlier in this chapter. There were, however, more specific circumstances as well. In considering these, it is apparent that very similar trends were at work in both California and Australia.

By the 1890s, the prosperity of Australian cities and the building boom which had gone with it, was over. 'Gone were the golden days of easy expansion, for the British world economy was constricted by competitors who had overtaken it technologically and carved out rival empires'.(57) With the withdrawal of overseas capital and the collapse of speculative companies, profits fell, wages were forced down and severe unemployment continued for the next ten years.

Yet from about 1904, the volume of construction again began to grow until, by the first World War, it was greater than at any time since 1888. Imported materials were cheaper and new materials such as asbestos cement were lowering building costs: an average six-roomed house in 1912 cost £800 in brick, £550 in weatherboard and a little less in the new asbestos cement sheets. (58)

Just what caused this revival of building activity and where the capital originated remains to be explained but the growing provision of

public transport was clearly an important factor. As suggested earlier, a major factor of Australian cities is that they grew following the transport revolution. From the 'walking distance' cities of the 1880s, they became the public transport cities of 1900. Then, with the introduction of the car and motorbus, a further revolution occurred. In each city, there were building as well as urban land booms, with massive suburban sub-divisions taking place and enormous speculation in land. High wages and labour shortages were factors which enabled large numbers of Australians to buy their own property, however small. By 1911, one in two houses were owned by those who lived in them.(59)

From then on, the commitment to single family housing became total. After this, 'with the exception of a few pair houses, each new dwelling was now detached and isolated in its own ground. The gardenless town house . . . had gone with the new century'. (60)

There were, however, other factors which help to explain this situation; in particular, the wholesale importation of town planning ideology from Britain and with it, the notion of the 'garden suburb'.(61) The economic depression around the turn of the century had focussed Australian interest on questions of social welfare: between 1890 and 1914 it was to gain its reputation as a country of advanced social legislation. And it was in this period that the town planning movement emerged, closely allied with other movements for social reform.

As the suburbs sprawled further from the centre, there was growing concern both to improve Sydney's slums as well as to check what was seen as the disorderly and wasteful manner in which, on one hand, the sub-division of land, and on the other, the construction of houses (generally two separate processes in Australia) were taking place. The situation was made more serious by a dramatic increase in Sydney's population around 1910. The introduction of town planning measures was an attempt to bring some order into the chaos.

The measures, along with the economic, social and political assumptions on which they were based, were imported wholesale from Britain, especially after the passing of the Housing and Town Planning Act of 1909. Some of the early protagonists of planning in Australia were, like architect John Sulman, British immigrants. But in addition, between 1912 and 1915, a steady procession of politicians and administrators came to Britain to study the rapidly growing town planning

movement and especially, the notion of the garden city.

Yet as various writers have pointed out, (62) this early commitment to planning had little to do with either the elimination of poverty or changing the fundamentally capitalist economic system. On the contrary, it was seen as a way of maintaining social harmony by bringing order and a more rational approach to urban development. It was an approach which, by ensuring that all new areas were planned, would introduce zoning, and in this way, improve and maintain the value of both land and property.

As the journal Building wrote in its 'Town Planning Section' (January 12, 1914), 'Town planning is now regarded as a science'. What they did not add, was that it was also good for business. For land owners, it meant increased land values; for employers, a healthy work force; ('nothing could do more for the mental elevation of the workers and improve their stamina',) (63); for architects, surveyors and the new profession of planners, it meant both work and power; and for the state, it meant increasingly commitment to the idea of private property. For the assumptions on which planning was carried out were precisely those in keeping with Anglo-Saxon, 'garden city' traditions: very low density and, as expounded by one of the most active proponents of the movement in Australia, C.C.Reade, one house, one family. And in Australia, what town planning meant was, effectively, the setting up of garden suburbs. And as garden suburbs, by improving the 'house and garden' landscape, were a device to sell land, so 'architecture' and the idea of the 'artistic bungalow', was equally a device to sell property.

Australia's first Town Planning Association was formed in New South Wales in 1913, the prototype for others which followed in different states. Its early activists were a varied and interesting collection of people; apart from architects, engineers, reformers and politicians of varying hue, it also included real estate developer and company director, Richard Stanton, and the editors of the Building and Real Estate Magazine, (later, Building). By 1914, there was, among the many who could benefit from it, a wide interest in the aesthetic, social and political aspects of town planning, and especially the garden city and garden suburb ideas. What was largely, though not totally absent, however, was Ebenezer Howard's original notion of the municipal, collective ownership of developed land. It was within this context, as well as the overall background of suburban expansion, that the

California Bungalow (in both popular as well as 'architectural' form) arrived around 1907-8.

The same developments that we have seen elsewhere now took place in Australia. According to Freeland, in the first decade of this century, 'the idea of the bungalow was taken up and found its first popular use as a cheap, light summer camp or weekend house'; 'numbers of unlined low-pitched malthoid-roofed, wide verandahed weekenders' (in Australia, the term is actually used for a temporary dwelling), appeared on the harbourside hills of Balmoral in Sydney and Frankston in Port Phillip . (64) In 1908, the first bungalow article appeared in the Australian trade press, 'The Building of a Bungalow', sub-titled, as if with prescience, 'A style that should prove popular in Australia'. The journal was Building (Australia), June 15, 1908, issued monthly with, significantly, a 'Property Owners' Section'.

For those familiar with the earlier chapters of this study, the contents are, of course, now depressingly familiar. Accompanied by the pre-requisite picture of 'The rustic bungalow', the text, arriving in a roundabout way via Britain (1890s) and California (1904-8), trotted out the same familiar phrases: 'to those long in cities pent . . . the sensation of drawing breaths of pure, country air . . . far from crowds . . . and the restraints of the city, brings one to a state of health, happy responsibility . . . nomadic instinct . . . solitary country'. At this point, a particular Australian angle was introduced. Australians were 'pleasure-loving people, to whom any respite from the daily task is an eagerly accepted excuse to get out into the splendid sun, and revel untrammelled on yellow beaches, or in the sun-splashed shadows of the bush. On every favorite camping ground are dotted the shanties of the inveterate campers, in the bush the camp is more often a tent, testifying to the vagabond instinct . . . It is really to be wondered that more permanent huts are not erected in the bush. There is nothing more picturesque, comfortable and cheap than a log bungalow . . . (This) should always look as if it had grown from the ground, and was an integral part of the bush, equally as much as the trees and undergrowth'. From here followed the prescribed (male) bungalow ideology: wide fireplaces built of rubble, chimneys of rough, moss-stained stones, simple furniture, rugs and cushions; 'with a log fire blazing on the big hearth, and oneself stretched on a rug before it, well provided

with good books and tobacco, it matters not how the wind blows nor what the world thinks'.

The adaptation from the 'vacation bungalow' to the suburban variety was simply a matter of time. Three months later in 'How to Build a Bungalow', the magazine again drew freely on American designs, especially from the Western Architect. There was 'a suggestiveness in the word bungalow that makes it interesting. Just now it is a popular catchword - all the more so because few of us have seen a real one. There is play for the imagination'. The bungalow offered the architect or builder an escape from 'the plan book designed and rule of thumb built cottage, the "ready made" house that is being advertised'. The accompanying plans and photographs provided a useful insight into what was going on in Californian suburbs - down to the leaded glass, oriental rugs and wall covered all over with vines. (65)

The fact was that the conditions in respect of transport, land speculation, investment and social aspirations, as well as climate, in parts of Australia were indeed very similar to those in Southern California; hence, the relevance of the bungalow. Two early examples of the architect-designed variety, complete with 'Sleep out', were built by architects Oakden and Ballantyne in Brisbane and Toorak, Victoria, in 1908. (66) In 1909, Building was reproducing articles from the Western Architect and in 1910, the key word 'artistic' had crept into the propaganda. As the bungalow books and articles sailed across the Pacific (in House Beautiful, House and Garden, Architectural Record or Saylor's Bungalows) (67) other important developments took place.

Seeing the benefits, and profits, latent in the garden suburb idea, Richard Stanton, estate agent and developer, began the suburb of **T-10** Haberfield, Sydney's first 'garden suburb'; here each resident owned his own house, and the bungalow idea seems to have been introduced into the later developments. More important as a setting was Daceyville, an **T-13** early garden suburb which was the outcome of a Royal Commission on the Improvement of the City of Sydney and Suburbs in 1908. For this, an architectural competition was held and architect James Peddle, a British expatriate who had arrived in 1899 but had subsequently left for California, hurried back from Pasadena, keen to put into practice the bungalow models which by then were filling that town. (68)

Bungalows - of the Californian variety - were becoming increasingly

popular, and as Peddle wrote in a special 'Bungalow Number' of Building (December 1912), there were 'Some lessons we can learn from our American neighbours'. What impressed him was 'the new American thought of city planning', as evidenced in the comprehensively landscaped, commercial developments on the Oakley-Berkeley side of San Francisco. In particular, he admired the fenceless gardens. The problem in Australia was that 'we are too individualistic . . . we think of my piece of land, of my lot, of my garden, while our American neighbours think of their city'. His recommendation was 'to mingle a few communistic ideas with our natural individualism - remove some of our fences'. (69) There was, however, as the magazine pointed out three years later, a need for 'Evolving the Australian type' of bungalow. (70)

Yet apart from the Californian influence and ideas, estate developer Richard Stanton went further. With the interest in garden cities accelerating in 1911-12, Stanton, operating under the seductively titled 'Town Planning Company of Australia' set up the garden suburb of Rosebery, which he advertised as a 'model and industrial development' 'some fifteen minutes out of Sydney central station' even though it was never actually on a railway. Here, his company was 'opening up 300 acres of magnificent building land, nicely subdivided, with 14 miles of road frontages upon which ARTISTIC HOMES are being erected with every known modern comfort and convenience, including electric light'. Bungalows in all but name, the 'ROSEBERY COTTAGES (were) the latest word in HOME COMFORT. Charming and dainty, both internally and externally with four, five or six rooms and kitchen'. Again, the major attraction was investment. As his advertisement in the Property Owner Section of Building (April 1913) indicated in block capitals: 'FOR AN INVESTMENT Your decision should be IMMEDIATE' 'ROSEBERY PRICES MUST RISE - You can get in NOW at lowest. Compare Haberfield values today with those at its inception'. (71) 7-11

Not content with local products, however, Stanton imported a pre-fabricated timber bungalow from California. Erected in 1912 by the Redwood Export Company, of Castlereagh Street, Sydney, the local representatives of the California Redwood Association of San Francisco, the bungalow was the first and exhibition house of Rosebery, planned 7-12

as a model working class suburb. According to Freeland, 'by introducing a full-blown, genuine and undiluted example of the Californian bungalow to the Australian scene, it acted as a stimulus, catalyst and model'. The large, prefabricated wall and roof units were assembled and set on brick footings and supplemented by a roughcast brick chimney. In every way the house was typical of its kind - large-spanning, low pitched gable, roof overhanging at the eaves and gables, low spreading verandah, carried on sturdy battened pylons, natural finish cedar panelling on the inside and complete with built-in cupboards, dark oil-stained weatherboard exterior. By 1917, the type of architecture that the Redwood bungalow epitomised was being everywhere accepted and enthusiastically embraced. (72)

7.14

7.15

As we have seen in California, the significance of the bungalow in these developments was not simply that it seemed the ideal dwelling form for the suburbs but it also had three critical attributes: it was new, 'artistic' and hence, 'individual'. Its individuality was expressed in all the terms attached to it - 'pretty', 'rustic', and 'different'. Architecture, or design, had a price tag: it could be used to raise prices, bring in higher values. As one development company said of the first two (architect-designed) model cottages on a new garden suburb in 1914: they 'exercised a stimulating effect on the prices paid for adjacent land'. (73) Hence, when Town Planning Conferences were held at Adelaide (1917) and Brisbane (1918), of the designs shown at the accompanying Ideal Home Exhibition, it was the Californian Bungalow variety which was actually built. (74)

7.11

7.16

The Californian bungalow, with its central hallway replacing the old narrow passage, brought changes to the suburbs. Broad-fronted rather than long and narrow, it forced sub-dividers to broaden their plots. With increasing ownership of motorcars from about 1915, access to a garage sited in a back corner of the site was needed, with an eight to ten foot driveway down one side of the house. The result was that the Californian bungalow primarily, but also the car, increased the normal width of a building block to sixty feet and as there was no reduction in the depth of the sites, by taking twentyfive to fifty per cent more land for each house, accelerated the physical spread of the suburbs. (75)

The character of the bungalow varied with different localities:

Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide, Queensland and Tasmania all had their various types. As adopted by builders, it was a style generally suitable for a small, single-storey or three-bedroomed house and partly for this reason it was restricted to lower and lower-middle class areas though these were, in any case, in the majority as the persistent drive to home ownership continued. (76) Yet as a style developed by its American architectural practitioners, it was also adopted for larger dwellings, for middle class clients and areas.

7.17

7.18

Though there were these architect-designed bungalow, modelled perhaps on the work of Wright or the Californian designs of Greene and Greene, (77) the majority belonged to the genre of popular housing, built from builders' books and combining a mix of Californian, British and Australian elements. And in addition to the mere attraction of investment, of the notion of property-ownership, there were all the same social and economic influences at work which we have seen in Britain and the USA. As building costs increased during and after the first world war, architects became increasingly interested in the smaller house. With servants disappearing from the domestic scene, excess space became a burden. Labour-saving meant that a smaller kitchen became an asset and custom-built cupboards were fitted to every wall. The architect's task was one of making comfort and elegance but now, from cheaper materials. The dining room disappeared, to be replaced by a 'common room' combining living and dining functions.

The selling points of the California bungalow were as they had been in the USA: cosy warmth, security, and quaint, roomy natural charm is how Boyd describes it. "Even in winter this bungalow looks warm" . . . "This bungalow is sociable, agreeable - like the friend who is never cold". "The deep shadows invite one to lounge in languid disregard of passing time" - such were the captions with which the designs were sold. (78) Inside the house were ingle-nooks, exposed beams, dark-stained panelling and a varied selection of built-in bookshelves; outside, the widely overhung roofs, lumpy timbers and rubble stone-work, pebble dash and rough cast, thick 'pylon' supports for deep porches.

This 'genuine bungalow feeling' was conveyed in the newly-opened suburbs of all the major capital cities, to be the dominant style from 1918 to the early thirties. Everywhere, the bungalow brought a squarer plan, often a pergola, and frequently a new feeling of orientation to the site. (79)

As in the United States, the Australian bungalow reached its peak in the 1920s, boosted by a further boom in suburban development. In New South Wales, the new Local Government Act of 1919, again, derivative from Britain, brought with it further control of new roads, subdivisions and building, and with this, the power to control the number of houses per acre in residential divisions.

By 1921, 43 per cent of the New South Wales population were living in the metropolis, 816,000 of them in the suburbs and just over one eighth of that number in the City of Sydney itself. Since 1900, the suburbs had massively expanded while the inner city had correspondingly declined. The decades between 1911-21 and 1921-31 each added 300,000 to the suburban population of Sydney. The war had created shortages and this inspired the post-war boom within a six to thirteen mile radius of public transport routes round the city. (80) As one newspaper accurately predicted in 1920

Now that the weather is warming up a resumption of subdivision sales is imminent. Agents are already arranging for what many believe will be a record season . . . The demand is here already. Whatever may be said of the improvidence of the Australian, he nevertheless has sufficient common sense to acquire his own home or at least strive hard for it. (81)

The years to the mid thirties were to represent the final fling of the bungalow style in Australia, by which time - as elsewhere in the Anglo-Saxon world - her own literature had developed. (82) The bungalow phase had been a historical era where two key notions had come from outside: the garden suburb from Britain, the transformed bungalow from California. Both were ideologies of design, and both played an important role in reaffirming, and then enhancing, the long-established Australian tradition of private property, individually expressed. In the process, the capital market in housing and land were kept comfortably rolling along. The bungalow era was a crucial phase in the long term historical process by which the function of the Australian house was transformed from one of mere shelter to that of acting as a symbol of independence and social position.

7.19
7.20
7.21
7.22

7.23

Chapter Seven Footnotes

The writing of this chapter would have been impossible without the generosity, both in sending photocopies of key evidence, as well as providing advice and the results of their own research, of a number of Australian correspondents. My thanks are especially due to Dr. Donald Johnson (Flinders University) and Bob Freestone (Macquarie University) both of whom have read and commented on an earlier draft, Ray Sumner (National Museum of Victoria), Peter Newell (Brisbane) and Dr. Jennifer Taylor (University of Sydney).

The early part of the chapter draws on L.Sandercock, Cities for Sale. Melbourne University Press, 1975; Max Neutze, Urban Development in Australia. Allen & Unwin, 1977 and L.Kilmartin and D.C.Thorns, Cities Unlimited, Allen & Unwin, 1978; the second part, on the writings of J.M.Freeland and Robin Boyd on Australian architectural history. Regrettably, recent research (P.Cox and C.Lucas, Australian Colonial Architecture, Landsdown, 1978 and M.P.Morrison & J.White, Western Towns and Buildings, University of W.Australia Press, 1979) were not available in Britain when this chapter was typed.

1. Personal communication, David Saunders, University of Sydney, 18 June, 1976; Ray Sumner, National Museum of Victoria, 12 May 1980; also Heinemann Australian Dictionary, Heinemann, Australia, 1976, 'a small single storey dwelling, often separate from a house.
2. See below, p.
3. For example, in J.M.Freeland, Architecture in Australia.A History, F.W.Cheshire, Melbourne, Canberra & Sydney, 1968; R.Boyd, Australia's Home, Melbourne University Press, 1952, p.8.
4. Boyd, op.cit; Freeland, op.cit.; L.Sandercock, Cities for Sale, Melbourne University Press, 1975; Max Neutze, Urban Development in Australia, Allen & Unwin, Sydney & London, 1977; G.Davison, The Rise and Fall of Marvellous Melbourne, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1978; D.Horne, The Australian People, Sydney, Angus & Robertson, 1972, pp.34-5, 188-90. C.McGregor, Profile of Australia, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1966, pp.122-4; P.Mullins, 'Theoretical perspectives on Australian urbanisation. I.Material components in the reproduction of Australian labour power', Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 17,1,1981,pp.65-76.
5. S.Glynn, Urbanisation in Australia History, 1788 -1900, Nelson, Australia, 1975, p.79.

6. e.g. Boyd, op.cit.; Sandercock, op.cit.; G.H.Nadel, Australia's Colonial Culture, Melbourne, 1957; A good antidote to cultural determinism is given in D.Denoon, 'Understanding settler societies' Historical Studies, 18, 73, October, 1979, pp.511-27.
7. E.C.Fry, 'Growth of an Australian Metropolis', in R.S.Parker & P.N.Troy, eds., The Politics of Urban Growth, Australian National University Press, Canberra, 1972; also Sandercock, op.cit., p.9.
8. N.G.Butlin, Investment in Australian Economic Development, 1861-1900. Cambridge University Press, 1964, p.213.
9. See Mullins, op.cit., p.72.
10. McGregor, op.cit., p.188.
11. Quoted in Glynn, op.cit., p.57.
12. B.S.Saini, Building Environment. An Illustrated Analysis of Problems in Hot Dry Lands. Angus and Robertson, London, 1973, p.87.
13. The concept of 'dependent urbanisation', is from M.Castells, The Urban Question, Edward Arnold, London, 1977, p.43.
14. Sandercock, op.cit., p.8; also D.Ulrich Cloher, 'A perspective on Australian urbanisation', in J.M.Powell & M.Williams, Australian Space: Australian Time. Geographic Perspectives, Oxford University Press, London, 1975, pp.104-49.
15. For a neo-Marxist interpretation of these developments, see P.Mullins, op.cit.
16. Glynn, op.cit., p.57.
17. L.Kilmartin & D.C.Thorns, Cities Unlimited. Allen & Unwin, Sydney and London, 1978, p.40; Sandercock, op.cit., p.7.
18. Boyd, op.cit., p.7.
19. Glynn, op.cit., p.57.
20. Boyd, op.cit., pp. 12,39,79; M.Herman, The Architecture of Victorian Sydney, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1970; Neutze, op.cit., p.22.
21. P.Cunningham, Two Years in New South Wales, Henry Colbourn, London, 1827, p.422. I am indebted to Rod Lawrence for this reference.
22. Neutze, op.cit., p.20-30, passim, for the following paragraph.
23. G.Davison, Australian urban history: a progress report, Urban History Yearbook, Leicester University Press, 1979, pp.100-9, p.100-
24. R.Twopeny, Town Life in Australia, Elliot Stock, London, 1882, pp.34-5.

25. Davison, 1978, op.cit., p.140.
26. J.W.McCarty, 'Australian capital cities in the nineteenth century', in C.B.Schedvin & J.W.McCarthy, Urbanization in Australia. The nineteenth century. Sydney University Press, 1972; also Cloher, op.cit., p.112.
27. Neutze, op.cit., p.31.
28. Sandercock, op.cit., p.9; G.Serle, The Rush to be Rich, Melbourne University Press, 1972, p.
29. A.E.Dingle and D.T.Merret, Home Owners and Tenants in Melbourne, 1891-1911, Australian Economic History Review, 12,1, March, 1972, pp.21-35. p.21, see also Butlin, quoted in Sandercock, op.cit.,p.8.
30. Kilmartin and Thorns, op.cit., p.22.
31. Neutze, op.cit., p.31.
32. Freeland, op.cit.; Boyd, op.cit; M.E.Herman, The Early Australian Architects and their Work, Angus and Robertson, Sydney, 1970; M.Herman, The Architecture of Victorian Sydney, Angus and Robertson, Sydney & London, 1956; P.Cox & C.Lucas, Australian Colonial Architecture, Landsdowne, 1978.
33. Freeland, op.cit., p.15; Boyd, op.cit., p.17.
34. Freeland, op.cit., p.22.
35. Ibid.
36. Boyd, op.cit., p.18.
37. Ibid. The use of the verandah on early (1795-1820) cottages and military buildings is well illustrated in Moffit (note 36 below) and also Historic Buildings. Windsor & Richmond. State Planning Authority of New South Wales, 1967; also Australian Council of National Trusts, The Historic Buildings of Norfolk Islands. AC of NT, 1971. Houses in Quality Row illustrated here, possibly built by a colonial architect or engineer, bear a strong resemblance to later Anglo Indian bungalows.
38. Freeland, op.cit., p.45.
39. See H.R.Hitchcock, 'American influences abroad' in E.Kaufmann,ed. The Rise of American Architecture, Pall Mall Press, London, 1970, pp. 3-50, p.9, note 9.
40. P.Moffit, The Australian Verandah, Ure Smith, Sydney, 1976,p.6; see also E.G.Robertson, 'The Australian Verandah', Architectural Review. 1960, pp.239-44.
41. H.Tanner & P.Cox, Restoring Old Australian Houses and Buildings. Macmillan of Australia, 1975, pp.20-1.

42. P.Cox, 'The growth and decay of Australian vernacular architecture', in G.Seddon and M.Davis, ed., Man and Landscape in Australia. Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra, 1974. pp.216-30, p.220.
43. Freeland, op.cit., p.26. The importance of tracing terms is that, whilst it is quite possible for an invention (in this case, an architectural feature) to be invented quite independently by different people in linguistically different parts of the world, it is impossible for them to apply the same term to it.
44. A retired officer of the Hon. East India Company, The Friend of Australia, Hurst Chance & Co, London, 1830 (written, 1827) pp.270-2.
45. Tanner and Cox, op.cit., p.44.
46. Boyd, op.cit., p.8.
47. Freeland, op. cit., p.209.
48. Ray Sumner, 'The tropical bungalow: The search for an indigenous Australian architecture', Australian Journal of Art, 1978,1, pp.27-40; also C.R.Sumner and J.Oliver, 'Early North Queensland housing as a response to environment', Australian Geographer, 14, 1978, pp.14-21, p.17; see also A.J.Wallwork, Four early timber homes in Townsville, Architecture in Australia, February, 1968, pp. 96-100.
49. Sumner, AJA, 1978; see also Boyd, op.cit., p.196.
50. M.Whiffen, American Architecture since 1780, MIT, Mass, 1969.
51. A.W.Reed, Place Names of Australia, A.W.Reed, Sydney, London, 1973.
52. J.M.Freeland, Architect Extraordinary. The life and work of John Horbury Hunt, 1838-1904. Cassel, Australia, 1974, p.92.
53. On the Blue Mountains, see A.T.A. and A.M.Learmonth, Encyclopaedia of Australia, Frederick Warne & Co, London, 1978.
54. Building, 7, 1918, p.56.
55. P.A.Murphy, Second homes in New South Wales, Australian Geographer, 13, 1977, pp.310-17, and 'Residential resort land in New South Wales', Australian Geographical Studies,14,1976, pp.103-15.
56. On the idea of the bungalow in Australia, see D.L.Johnson, Australian Architecture, 1901-51: Sources of Modernism, Sydney University Press, 1980; on pre-fabricated or 'portable' buildings, G.Herbert, Pioneers of Prefabrication, Yale University Press, 1978.
57. Sandercock, op.cit., p.10.
58. Boyd, op.cit., p.72.
59. Dingle and Merret, op.cit., p.21.

60. Boyd, op.cit., p.70. Boyd indicates that in 1947, 74% of all dwellings in metropolitan areas were detached houses, p.98. About fifteen years earlier, some 56% of detached houses were occupied by owners or instalment buyers. p.243.
61. The following section relies heavily on Sandercock, op.cit., especially chapter one, 'The emergence of the town planning movement, 1900-1920, pp.7-27; and also, R.Freestone, 'Australian responses to the Garden City idea,' Paper presented to Section 21 (Geographical Sciences) 51st ANZAAS Congress, Brisbane, May 1981.
62. e.g. Sandercock, op.cit., p.15, et seq.
63. A.Goldie, 'The Garden suburb idea', The Lone Hand, 13, June 2, 1913, pp.162-7, p.165.
64. Freeland, op.cit., p.228.
65. Building, June 15, 1908; September 15, 1908.
66. Johnson, op.cit., p.57.
67. Ibid., p.48. Johnson's research suggests that there was a fairly bizarre selection of books on housing and architecture arriving in Australia from Britain and the USA in the early years of this century, among them, works on old and modern English cottages (by C.Holme and M.Adams) and the widely-distributed and influential Radford's Artistic Bungalows (with its' unique collection of 208 designs) of 1908 and Gustav Stickley's, More Craftsman Homes, (1912). For the significance of these, see the earlier chapter on the bungalow in America.
68. On Stanton and his developments, see Sandercock, loc.cit. Freestone, op.cit., and on Peddle, Johnson, op.cit.
69. Building, December, 1912, p.50-1.
70. Building, September 11, 1915.
71. Advertisement in The Property Owner Section, Building, April 12, 1913.
72. Freeland, op.cit., p.228. Personal communication, R.Freestone, 3 July 1981.
73. Despatch No.1081, 15 August, 1914, AA Company, Australian National University Archives. Information from R.Freestone.
74. Personal communication. R.Freestone, 3 July, 1981.
75. Freeland, op.cit., p.231.
76. Ibid, p.232.

77. The architectural significance of the bungalow in Australia and its relation to the development of modern architectural design is discussed in Johnson, op.cit.; W.B.Griffin, the architect-planner responsible for Canberra, had arrived from the USA, familiar with such architect-designed bungalow developments, in 1912. See also D.L.Johnson, The Architecture of Walter Burley Griffin, Macmillan, Melbourne, 1977.
78. Boyd, op.cit., p.76.
79. Ibid., 76-7.
80. Sandercock, op.cit., pp.82-5.
81. Quoted in Sandercock, op.cit., p.84.
82. Donald Johnson suggests that there were perhaps ten to fifteen produced during the twenties, including E.W.Cole, Australian Book of Bungalows and Villas, Melbourne, 1925 and Book of Australian Bungalows, Sydney, c.1925. The foreword to the latter begins 'The old-fashioned idea of narrow passages, the inconvenient placing of kitchen from dining room, and dark rooms, have given place to the modern compact home, full of light and air, and replete with time and labour-saving devices', further confirmation of the significance of the bungalow in the development of modern housing discussed in the chapters on Britain and the USA. Although the experience of New Zealand has not been specifically referred to here, the developments there seem to have been very similar. On New Zealand as an economic and cultural dependency of the metropole, see W.Armstrong, 'New Zealand: imperialism, class and uneven development', Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 14, October, Part 2, pp.297-303. On the introduction of the bungalow, G.W.Phillips, New Zealand Homes and Bungalows. Containing 70 plans and 58 elevations. Phillips, Christchurch, NZ, 1912; and J.Stacpoole & P.Beaven, Architecture 1820-1970, A.H. & A.W.Reed, Wellington and London, 1970.

CHAPTER EIGHT

SOME SPECULATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

- I Counterurbanisation: the bungalow as promoter and product
Tenure and dwelling type: the significance of the bungalow
The bungalow in continental Europe
The proliferation of households and dwellings
Bungalow as name

- II 'Suburban sprawl': the cause and consequences of the
British exception
The bungalow as second home
The bungalow as 'tropical house'

- III The bungalow as global phenomenon

CHAPTER EIGHT

SOME SPECULATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

'Migrants and shanty towns are part of a universal process which began only a few decades ago with the intensified penetration of the tropical world by financial capital and the rapidly advancing technology of the industrial nations. A world economy is being created in which most of the rich live in the latter, most of the poor in the former . . .

The shanty town house, built with the labour of family and friends . . . is designed to suit the whims and needs of its occupants . . . The desirable little bungalow in the suburbs may be within their means - but it will not accommodate all the children'

Peter Lloyd, Slums of Hope. Shanty towns of the third world. Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1979, pp. 15, 169.

Investigating the history of the bungalow has opened up a number of issues; this final chapter is devoted to speculating about some of them.

Counterurbanisation: the bungalow as promoter and product

The previous chapters have shown that in Britain, the United States and, with certain reservations, in Australia, the bungalow was produced by - and also helped to produce - the particular forms of suburban expansion characteristic of modern, industrial and capitalist societies with a free market in housing and land. It was an early indication of what has been called 'counterurbanisation', a process of population deconcentration, implying a movement from a state of more to a state of less concentration. (1)

One way to demonstrate this would be by statistics, showing the change over time in the size of urban populations, their distribution in different sized cities and suburbs, the move to lower densities and then to correlate these figures with what is known about the introduction and development of the bungalow. A briefer way is given in the table below. What this shows is the way in which people in these societies gradually became conscious of the changes affecting their environment and invented words to conceptualise and name them. It gives the earliest identified use of various terms referring to aspects of urbanisation as well as facts (discussed in the text) known about the bungalow. A glance shows how closely the two are related.

Earliest identified use of selected terms
referring to accelerated urbanisation,
1880 - 1930 (1)

Earliest identified reference
outside Asia to: (2)

		1869	bungalow (England: as seaside vacation house)
		1876	bungalow (Australia: as country vacation house)
		1879	'week-end'
		1880	bungalow (USA: as seaside vacation house)
		1880	country cottage 'fitted up for summer use' (USA)
		1884	evidence of early interest in 'week-end cottage' habit
1888	'urbanisation' (USA)		
1888	'suburbanism'		
		1889	bungalow (country)
1890	'town-planning' (3)	1890	bungalow: recommended as suitable for permanent country or suburban residence
1893	'suburbia'		
		1894	bungalow defined as 'a little house in the country'
		1895	discussion of bungalow as suitable for retirement in suburbs
1899	<u>(Publication of A.F. Weber, The Growth of Cities in the 19th century, USA)</u>		
		1903	'Craftsman bungalow' (USA)
1904	'urbanisation'	1904	week-end bungalow week-end country cottage
		1905	'bungalow land'
		1905	'California bungalow' (USA)
		1908	suburban bungalow (Australia)
1910	'conurbation'		
1926	'suburbanisation'	1926	'ribbon development'
		1927	'bungaloid growth'
1929	'urbanism' ('The newly-coined word 'urbanism'... denotes town-planning'. <u>The Times</u> ; 16 July)		
1930	'urbanist' ('a specialist in or advocate of, town planning')		

(1) from Oxford English Dictionary, 1978.

(2) Sources given in text. Except where otherwise stated, terms refer to UK.

(3) See L. Sandercock, Cities for Sale. Melbourne University Press, 1975, p. 16.

As Berry points out, H.G.Wells had already suggested in 1902 that 'the railway begotten giant cities' he knew were

destined to such a process of dissection and diffusion as to amount almost to obliteration . . . within a measurable space of years. These coming cities . . . will present a new and entirely different phase of human distribution.

And then, as if conscious of the contemporary rise of the bungalow

'what will be the forces acting upon the prosperous household? The passion for nature . . . and that craving for a little private imperium are the chief centrifugal inducements . . . The city will diffuse itself until it has taken upon considerable areas and many of the characteristics of what is now the country . . . We may call . . . these coming town provinces, "urban regions"' (2)

Similarly, three years before Adna Ferrin Weber had suggested that the trend in urbanisation was towards the development of suburban towns. (3)

Yet reactions to the dense, highly-concentrated, industrial cities of the nineteenth century have not been the same in all societies and cultures. Although policies of deliberate decentralisation have been adopted as a solution to city ills by all societies, they have been strongly influenced by social and political forms.

Berry suggests that three types of policy have emerged in the twentieth century as a response to industrial urbanisation around the world:

- individualistic decentralisation that has culminated in the decreasing size, decreasing density . . . and more ruralised life styles of the more liberal capitalist states;
- planned new towns as counterpoints to speculative private interest in the welfare states of Western Europe; and the
- Marxist search for a new settlement for mankind, the city of socialist man in which traditional antagonisms between city and country are no more (4)

It is in the first of these three categories that the invention of the bungalow, both as permanent suburban dwelling as well as temporary second home, is most easily understood. Moreover, if we accept Berry's

implication that this form of counterurbanisation results from 'the reassertion of fundamental predispositions of the American culture that . . . are antithetical to urban concentrations' then the history of the bungalow in America would seem to symbolise the typical reaction to urbanism in that society. For according to Berry (drawing on an earlier source), the most important cultural traits are 'a love of newness', the desire to be 'near to nature', 'freedom to move' and 'individualism', (5) the major features with which the bungalow was marketed in the United States.

Yet as was pointed out in the Introduction, such all-inclusive or 'cultural' explanations ignore other facts about economic organisation, questions of supply and demand, the ownership of land and the right to private property, and the principles behind the organisation of the state. Other factors are needed to explain why the separate, singlefamily house is characteristic of and widespread in some societies (such as Australia and the United States) whereas multi-household forms (flats and apartments) are more common in others. Is the relationship to be explained solely in political and economic terms or, in those societies with a private market in dwellings and land, by the extent of home ownership? And what are the larger economic, social and spatial implications raised by changes in the types of dwelling in a nation's housing stock and the relation of these to changes in tenure?

It is in the context of these questions that the significance of the bungalow is appreciated. Here, it is understood in its most accepted sense as a physically separate, single storey, single family (or single household) dwelling, as distinguished from separate houses of more than one storey and non-separate, multi-family accommodation: flats (apartments), terrace(row) housing, or semi-detached (duplex). In comparison to the separate or detached house containing equal accommodation, it is also clear that the bungalow takes up more land.

Tenure and dwelling type: the significance of the bungalow

The question of why certain types of housing prevail in particular societies is both interesting and complex. Fortunately for the present discussion, it is one which has recently been carefully explored, on

a cross-cultural basis in regard to various industrial capitalist societies by three different scholars. (6) Certain conclusions are worth stating.

1. Although it might be easily assumed that the higher the per capita income in a society, the higher the proportion of households owning their own dwelling (with two of the wealthiest nations, the United States and Australia, having ownership rates of almost 63 and 69 per cent respectively), Sweden and Switzerland, both with much higher per capita incomes than Australia, have only 35 and 28 per cent homeownership respectively. (7)

2. Comparing Australia, Sweden and Britain, Kemeny suggests that detached and semi-detached houses constitute 87, 43 and 49 per cent respectively of all dwellings in these societies, the remainder constituted by 'other' dwellings. Taking the three major cities of Sydney, Stockholm and London, roughly three quarters, one third and one half of dwellings respectively were 'houses', the remainder being flats or 'other dwellings'. He concludes that the percentage of 'houses' in each of these cities was 'strikingly similar' to the percentage of home ownership. (8)

Agnew also suggests that in other free market societies, there is a relationship between rates of ownership and separate single family housing. In the United States, where 66 per cent of all dwellings are detached single family houses, 83 per cent are privately owned (1980). At the other end of the scale, 28 per cent of dwellings are of multi-family design (apartments), but only 17 per cent of these are owned. In Britain, the figures are similar, if not so large. More than 54 per cent of households in terraced, detached and semi-detached housing (84 per cent in the case of the latter) owned or were buying their property. These three categories were said to make up almost 80 per cent of the total housing stock. On the other hand, only 7 per cent or less of the households living in flats or maisonettes (comprising 19 per cent of the housing stock) owned or were buying their dwelling. (9) In Britain, however, the terraced and semi-detached house are more common and it is obvious that, as Agnew points out, access to a specific type of house varies according to what is available. In different countries, the availability of land, construction methods and styles, building codes and preferences of people for different types of housing differ.

Kemeny concludes that the reasons responsible for different housing stocks are 'historical, cultural and ideological'. (10) It is at all these three levels that the history of the bungalow adds to an understanding of these issues.

What evidence is there to suggest that a gradual move is taking place in Britain, not only to higher rates of owner-occupation, but for this to be expressed over time in a move to detached houses and bungalows?

Until relatively recently in Britain, the bungalow has generally been a 'private sector' dwelling, owned by its occupants. And though many inter-war bungalows were small, often low cost housing, others, especially since 1950, have been substantial, and relatively expensive. For the last few years, for example, figures suggest that, in all regions in Britain, the average price of bungalows is second only to that of detached houses among six standard types of dwelling (bungalow, detached, semi-detached, terraced, purpose-built flat, converted flat). (11)

Insufficient data exists to show the various proportions of dwelling types being constructed in Britain, but a study in 1959 concluded that there had been 'a remarkable growth in the popularity of the bungalow since the war'. In nine of sixteen towns sampled with populations between 29,000 and 250,000 (excluding London and very large cities), bungalows constituted over 50 per cent of all dwellings built in 1957. Bungalow development was seen to be equal to private house development outside large cities and though especially, and expectedly, popular in coastal resorts such as Bournemouth (where almost 88 per cent of all dwellings built were bungalows), it was also high (over 72 per cent) in typical industrial towns of Lancashire and Yorkshire. In rural districts, between two and five times as many bungalows as houses were being built. (12)

In a later study of housing on the West Lancashire coast, Cowburn found bungalows to be the most popular and preferred type of new housing. In the last few years in Britain, some 30 per cent of all new building society loans have been for detached houses of which 10 per cent have been for bungalows, mainly built since 1960. (13) However, the distribution of these loans has varied greatly according to region. Only 1 per cent of the loans on bungalows were granted in

the Greater London region compared to 32 per cent in Northern Ireland and between 10 to 15 per cent in other areas in England. (14)

Yet this data must be viewed in the light of the steady fall in the population of all large cities, and especially London, in the last three decades. This has been paralleled by a proportionate rise in suburban populations, in country areas, and in small towns and large villages.

Between 1971 and 1981, all large cities suffered substantial population losses, ranging from Glasgow (22 per cent) to Manchester (17 per cent), Liverpool (16 per cent) and Birmingham (8 per cent). In contrast, remoter districts of Cornwall, Suffolk and Humberside experienced growth rates of 10 per cent. (15) The three English regions lacking a large industrial conurbation, however, showed the biggest population gains. The largest decennial gain was in East Anglia (11.7 per cent) which, amongst all regions in England in 1980, incidentally also had the largest percentage of building society loans granted for bungalows (15 per cent) during 1980. The next largest population gains were in the South West (6 per cent) and East Midlands (under 5 per cent). With Yorkshire and Humberside, both these regions had the next highest proportion of loans granted for bungalows (11 per cent). In these cases, loans granted to all types of detached housing were greater than or equal to those given to semi-detached or terraced housing. (16)

Part of the explanation for these developments is, of course, the growing trend of retirement migration. With increasing rates of **8-1** owner-occupation, higher incomes, the reduction in multi-family households and overall increase in household numbers, and a predicted rise in the number of people of pensionable age to over ten million by 2010, it is predicted that this phenomenon will increase. (17) However, many other explanations need pursuing.

Whether this tentative evidence suggests that, over the last twenty or thirty years (or even longer), people in Britain are not only moving out of large towns and cities into suburbs, smaller towns and rural areas, but also out of (rented) flats and terraces, and 'semis', into (privately owned) detached houses and bungalows, and what the larger social, economic, political or spatial implications are, provides much scope for further speculation and research. If such a move is taking

place, the implications, as Kemeny's valuable discussion shows, are many. In energy terms, for example, studies suggest that separate houses (or bungalows) require up to 50 per cent more to heat (or cool) than flats; by the nature of their location, more energy is expended on individualised transport to reach them. In terms of land use, detached housing (in Australia at least) can take up four times the amount of land for the same population as in Sweden. With specific reference to the 'retirement bungalow', isolation, through the absence of transport and other amenities, can be a major problem. (18) None of these issues, however, touches on the much larger questions about the balance between privatisation and public provision which Kemeny discusses at length, nor indeed the deeper social and psychological symbolism which the bungalow represents.

The bungalow in continental Europe

The introduction of the term 'bungalow' into the languages of continental Europe can, with other data, be taken as sufficient evidence of its existence as permanent country and suburban dwelling, or, in smaller or pre-fabricated form, as temporary 'weekend' or summer house. In either case, it is a 'response to urbanism' and in its permanent form, may also imply a move to higher rates of owner occupation as expressed in the individual, suburban house.

In Germany, the term seems to have been in use in both senses from about the 1940s, and with the same ideological connotations. Discussing bungalows in Germany, Italy, Holland, Belgium, Denmark and England, in 1958, the authors state (in German),

'Bungalow, though a word often derided by professionals as inappropriate and merely fashionable, has come to represent for many of our contemporaries, the concept of a distinct longing. It is an expression of the need for rest, of a return to Nature, of protection from the wearing side-effects of modern technology. And finally, of the fulfilment of the desire to live, undisturbed, as an individual . . . Today, everyone understands the word to mean the one storey, detached house of modern conception which allows man, through the utilisation of modern technology, to live in comfort, protected from cold, heat, rain, storm and noise, close to nature'. (19)

In addition, however, the bungalow was being increasingly introduced for outer suburban dwellings, and modifying traditional forms of German design. In the words of an architectural critic, it was 'the pitiful and stunted form of the earlier free-standing villa: a too short and too high building draped with all the attributes of a single family house . . . the irresolvable conflict between owning a small house and wishing for a pompous country seat (Freisitz)' (20). For some German architects, however, the bungalow expressed other ideas as in 'Der Bungalow', built for the Federal Chancellor, for official functions, in Bonn in the early 1960s. It was

'an expression of a political idea . . . in an age of vanishing social differences, it is not fitting for the head of government to be exalted and glorified by a kind of rhetorically embellished classicism in concrete. Politics today needs not formality and ceremoniousness, but contacts, discussion and understanding between people . . . modern art stands for the importance of man as a free individual . . . this is reflected in the bungalow'. (21)

Perusal of advertisements in the contemporary German press reveals the existence of a wide range of bungalows: komfort winkelbungalow (comfortable, L-shaped), luxusbungalow (luxury) doppelbungalow (semi-detached), spitzenbungalow (with pyramid roof), atrium bungalow and others. What they have in common is their spacious suburban or commuter's rural setting. In France too, and elsewhere, the term and phenomenon has similarly been in use since the 1930s both for vacation use (see below) as well as for permanent living.

Whilst this is slender evidence on which to suggest that a similar move towards single-family, suburban bungalow homes is taking place on any scale in these countries, more concrete information is available on Switzerland.

Here, accommodation has traditionally been rented: in 1970 under 28 per cent of households lived in their own privately owned accommodation, and in many urban areas, the multi-family housing unit was common. In the last ten years, however, recent research has shown that there has been a rapid move to owner occupation, much of it expressed in the detached outer suburban villa. It is also in this context that the single storey bungalow, both in word and form, can now be found in Switzerland. (22)

8.2

8.3

The proliferation of households and dwellings

Some further speculations can be pursued. In some pre-industrial, pre-capitalist past, dwellings provided shelter and, with a parcel of land, as well as animals and tools, were places of work, residence and recreation. There was not in such societies, the clear distinction between work and life, or as today, between work and leisure. Also in the dwelling, sick members were nursed, children taught their adult roles and, when there was one, the surplus product was stored. Here, different members and generations of a family produced and consumed their livelihood.

The impact of industrial capitalism was not only to separate work from residence but to drain away from the dwelling all functions of production (except for the reproduction of labour) and make it principally a place of consumption. Other institutions (and buildings) developed to take on specialised tasks: the factory, bank, hospital, school, brewery and, as economy and society were transformed, more agencies were created or modified to control and classify the emerging working population - the prison, workhouse, or asylum.

With economic and technological change, and as the scale of the market increased, the size of the surplus capital grew, to be reinvested and kept in circulation in specialised places, and buildings for leisure. The most obvious expression of this was the holiday resort or, closer to the main dwelling and work place, the various places and buildings for urban recreation.

With these developments, there occurred in the basic dwelling - though varying according to divisions of class and wealth - an increase in the number and divisions of rooms, such that each had its specialised function, and could accommodate consumer goods. As population and economic growth increased, the more separate, self-contained and single family dwellings there were, the greater was the demand to fuel the growing economy.

As part of this process, where the aim of producers is to maximise profit by constantly creating and then satisfying 'needs', to commoditise requirements, kinship relations have also been fragmented. Though this is seen most clearly in India or the countries of Africa, where the impact of capitalist forms of production and urbanisation on the extended family and lineage system of peasant economies at least partly accounts for the emergence of nuclear families, it can also be

seen in the 'developed' industrialised economies of the West. Here, over time, as demographic change has taken place, individual units of accommodation have been created for different generations or for individuals at various stages of the life cycle. This is most obviously demonstrated by the emergence of the 'retirement resorts' with their tens of thousands of purpose-built bungalows, each with its individually-owned complement of consumer goods, from washing machines to lawn-mowers. But the history of the bungalow also provides further fuel to these speculations.

8-4

Some of the most perceptive insights into the social meaning of the bungalow can be derived from the lyrics of popular songs, some ten of which have been written on the bungalow between 1920 and 1980 (23). Shorter has argued that, with the rise of the market economy, material considerations were gradually replaced by romantic love in bringing couples together: the role of the family and community as socialising agents for the young was replaced by that of the market, which also required that people were more mobile. As romantic love demands seclusion, couples distanced themselves from the community, as enforcer of tradition. 'The romantic revolution which began late in the eighteenth century, sweeping across vast reaches of class and territory in the nineteenth, to become - in the twentieth - the unassailable norm of courtship behaviour, carried two components: a new relationship of the couple to each other; and a new relationship, for them, as a unit, to the surrounding social order'. (24)

The rise in romantic love which Shorter associates with the rise of the market economy has, in the twentieth century been fused with the growing commitment to the concept of ownership. The rise in marriage rates (at lower ages), coupled with the rise in home ownership, has been accompanied by the emergence of an ideology (promoted especially by building societies and construction firms) linking together romantic love, family building and home ownership: one of the most important social categories targeted by advertisements for new housing are 'the newly weds'.

In this context it is worth noting the words of popular 'bungalow songs' of the 1920s and 30s, in which four themes predominate.

- 1) The lyrics all centre round two people, a couple.
('a home just built for two', 'a bungalow for two',
'two love birds' 'love seat for two', 'where two hearts
entwine')
- 2) The association of the bungalow with romantic love
('our little love nest' 'the joy of a girl and boy'
'a bungalow, a piccolo and you')
- 3) The emphasis on the social and spatial distancing of
both the couple and the bungalow
('far from the city' 'in the country far away' 'a terrace
on the hill' 'free from care and strife')
- 4) The emphasis on domesticity and affection by use of the
diminutive
('our little love nest' 'to own a little bungalow' 'three
little things are all I desire - a bungalow, a piccolo
and you' 'to build a little bungalow' 'it does not take
much money to own a little bungalow' .

With this notion of domesticity are other 'homely' images - 'a picture window', 'a fireplace that shines' 'portrait on the wall'. This powerful combination of love, domesticity, and idyllic rustic seclusion in the bungalow prompts a very fundamental question: has there ever been, at any other conjunction in history, a purpose-built dwelling produced, not for a family of at least parents and children, but simply as 'a home just built for two'? (25)

This also seems to be the only plausible explanation for the third social category (after the 'retirement bungalow' and 'bungalow for two') for which, in its early days in Britain, the bungalow was designed - the 'bachelor's bungalow' of architect R.A. Briggs (in 1891). Though 'bachelor flats' and 'hostels for single women' have been built in different cities and settlements and clearly relate to the social and sexual organisation of work, the creation of a 'bachelor's bungalow' in the country can only be explained by reference to the workings of the market economy. The need is to keep capital in circulation by constantly creating new needs. The long term effects of this have apparently been to assist in the **8.5** fragmentation of kinship units by the creation of an ideology where **8.6** those who can afford it are housed in their separate, individual space, whether this is the specially adapted 'granny flat' in Britain or the specially-designed apartment building for the 'swinging singles' in the United States (26). The most recent American census drew attention

to the fact that more people were living alone in American cities than at any previous time in history (27). A recent study of one hundred old people's homes in Britain concluded that it was not the design of facilities to which residents objected but the fact that they did not have exclusive (property) rights over their use. (28) The individuality and privatisation characteristic of modern capitalist societies seems to be very much bound up with the private ownership of dwellings and land.

Bungalow as name

Much has been made in this study of the name 'bungalow'. It might be asked why, for example, a new name was necessary to describe a type of dwelling introduced into England in 1869 which, though new in many respects, was old in others, and part of a continuing cultural tradition. Why was the first bungalow not simply labelled 'cottage'?

Cottage, as its etymology proves*, has its original referents in feudalism, just as bungalow - as its etymology** proves - has its referents in capitalism. It was a term (and building) introduced into England during the third quarter of the nineteenth century which, according to Hobsbawm, was 'the first world wide era of urban real estate and a constructional boom for the bourgeoisie' (29) As the basic needs of families for food, clothing and shelter are met (at least for a majority of the population) so the demand for these tails off and capitalists must seek to produce other types of goods . . . In particular, the goods and services which have expanded under, if not been invented by, late capitalism, involve those especially concerned with recreation and leisure' (30)

The introduction of both the reality and name was a classic case of the creation of needs, of the emphasis on change and fashion associated with the consumer society. It is understandable that popular poets, playing on words, have described the one who lives there as the

* It was originally defined according to the economic and social status of its occupants, a cottage being the dwelling of a 'cottar', a peasant who held, under the feudal system, a given amount of land in return for labour (OED)

** As well as its origins and associations, in colonialism, second homes, suburban development and the fragmentation of households.

'bungalowner' or 'bungalonner'.

'Suburban sprawl': the cause and consequences of the British exception

The introduction and rapid spread in the popularity of the bungalow seem therefore to confirm Tabb's point that 'urban cultural forms and architectural structures manifest a consumerist orientation'. (31)

In this context, the experience of Britain, in comparison with the United States and Australia, is different. In Britain, the relative absence of the spreading suburb ('sprawl' in the terms of its critics) characteristic of these other Anglo-Saxon societies, is the major feature distinguishing British patterns of urbanisation in the twentieth century. The reason for this is that the distinctively British style of planning has, in the well-chosen phrase of Hall, resulted in 'The containment of urban England'. (32)

The particular aim of this planning policy, developing gradually from the ideas of Howard and others in the late nineteenth century, and especially embodied in the Town and Country Planning Act of 1932 and various legislation since, has been to make a clear distinction between 'town' and 'country'. In maintaining this division, it is remarkable - to say the least - how explicit the planning profession has been in defining its role as a dialectic response to both the bungalow and its lesser version, the chalet. Gilg, for example, writing on 'Countryside planning. The first three decades, 1945-75' (1978), in the context of second homes, concludes that the effect of planning 'has been to prevent the sprawl of cheap chalets and bungalows that would undoubtedly spread without planning control'. (33)

Yet this compartmentalised treatment of 'countryside planning' does not consider other implications. The fundamental distinction between 'town' and 'country' which, with the rare exception (34), is the most inherent assumption of British planning, is essentially a cultural distinction sustained by particular economic and class structures, as has been discussed in Chapters Three and Five. It is a useful example of how the distribution of power embodied in particular relations between classes, under-pins or sustains ideologies which, in turn, reinforce the way in which the environment is shaped. To complete the circle, the environment then helps to uphold and 'prove' the ideology. 'Societies reproduce themselves'.

That this distinction, economic, social, cultural and environmental, between 'town' and 'country', represents a particular distribution of power, and is a particularly 'English' distinction, is apparent especially in comparison to North America and Australia where other, initially Anglo-Saxon societies have been established. There, however, the forces of popular democracy and free market principles have operated without the constraints of either more limited land supplies, as in Britain, or especially, a strong class hierarchy, headed by a landed aristocracy, in which the interests of the most powerful have been articulated by a bourgeois intelligentsia.

That it is such an English 'cultural attitude', embodied within a particular distribution of power, is also confirmed by the way in which 'town and country' ideas, including even the unlikely concept of the 'Green Belt', were transplanted to India, Africa and other parts of the Empire, along with other institutions and ideologies of British planning. (35)

Two comments, the first by way of an 'aside', can be made in relation to the outcome of the planning system in Britain. And both grossly simplify the situations described. Firstly, history has demonstrated that many of the self- or cheaply-built dwellings (bungalows) constructed fifty, or in some cases, eighty years ago, have been transformed into substantial dwellings and also form part of established settlements. Moreover, where once such self-built aspirations were universally condemned by an intellectual establishment, today, attitudes towards housing, planning and architectural issues are, after a fifty year interval (1930-80), arguably more liberal and pluralistic.

More important is the second comment. The effect of reproducing the environment in this 'town and country' image of the upper and middle class establishment, by preventing inexpensive and often self-built housing, and by curtailing the supply of land, helped to exclude a large proportion of the population from home ownership and to create an artificial shortage of land. As working people were deprived of the opportunity of buying inexpensive houses at prices - and with standards - which they could afford (rather than, in many cases, with those satisfying the aesthetic criteria of those in power), a housing class was created dependent on the state. This class, relatively small before 1914, was subsequently to reach massive proportions and to become a captive market for municipal housing - and especially, for municipal architects and planners.

Never in the realm of public housing (to modify a famous phrase) was so much owed by so many to so few. Equally committed to 'preserving the countryside' and the cultural values of a ruling establishment, the 'environmental professions' - architects and planners - were, for some two or three decades, given free reign to experiment and build as they chose, whether in the Corbusian ideology of 'high rise' or in the collectivist pseudo-socialism of multi-family flats. In either case, it was not simply 'urban England' which was contained but also, a dependent, renting working class which was encapsulated in the segregated council estate.

The connection, therefore, between controlling 'bungaloid growth' ('suburban sprawl' in others' terms) and the emergence of the large scale, multi-unit tower block or urban 'cliff dwelling' is direct. In this way, the 'town and country' distinction and the relative absence of 'sprawl' was upheld - at the cost of one third of all households denied access to the prevailing form of tenure in the society, private property ownership. Nor is this to ignore the existence of opposing views committed to the state ownership of housing and land, or to a pluralism of tenures (36).

Where, for a variety of historical, geographical and social reasons, suburban spread was allowed, it was especially in the traditional 'working class' region (in cultural if not necessarily economic or political terms) of the Lancashire coastal plain. Here, as Cowburn has incisively shown, the bungalow was to become the most favoured form of popular housing. It was, like the car or fridge, a consumer object with which people could identify and, like these, it could be 'embraced' - unlike a unit in the block of flats. Not only was 'the Englishman's house his castle': it was also, by its location on the plot, surrounded by a moat. It rejected the standard architectural assumption that, when a number of dwelling units were to be built, there had to be 'a massive architectural expression'. 'When houses are to be built together, the designer seems unable to resist the urge to "communise" the individual houses'. Yet the interest of the bungalow owner was, not least with regard to re-sale, to have a universal standard product which nonetheless demonstrated his and her own personal possession. (37)

The bungalow as second home

A further major issue prompted by investigating the historical development of the bungalow is the phenomenon of the 'second' or 'vacation home' which, depending on how it is conceptualised, can be related to the questions of 'dual residence', 'multi dwelling ownership', 'seasonal suburbanisation' or 'counterurbanisation'.

To date, much research on second homes has been oriented to applied questions concerning recreational or countryside planning, or, in relation to the housing shortage, to those of social justice. With some exceptions(38), studies within a larger theoretical and historical context have been rare. There is, however, a need for further research on both a historical and cross-cultural basis.

One approach to this issue was undertaken at a Working Group of the International Sociological Association Conference in 1978 where, following on Berry's work (39) a framework was established in which to examine, across a variety of societies and at different times (including Britain in the nineteenth, Italy in the early twentieth and Vietnam in the late twentieth centuries) 'responses to urbanism'. Within this framework, the aim was to identify the way in which different cultural, economic, technological or political/policy variables, at different times and in different places, responded to or 'controlled' the urbanism generated by industrialisation. In the British case, the individualistic, 'non public' response represented by the 'country' or 'weekend cottage' as second home of the turn of the century (40) was seen as 'a much more important process than is usually assumed'. (41)

According to Lichtenberger, 'the future significance of this process, initiated by the metropolitan leisure society cannot be over-estimated,' it will 'undoubtedly constitute the most important process of urbanisation in the years to come'. In some parts of the Tyrol (Austria) over 50 per cent of homes were second homes in the mid 1970s and ownership of property by non-nationals was becoming a major political issue. (42)

More weight is lent to Lichtenberger's prediction, not only by the evidence presented here which indicates that the mass purpose-built vacation house has been well-established for at least a century, but also by the growth of second homes, not only in capitalist but also socialist economies. In Czechoslovakia, outside Prague, there are some 100,000 second homes, with every fifth family owning one. Many owners live in state-owned delapidated flats in the city and prefer to spend their money on a 'second home' outside.(43) Although Soviet law does not permit families to own more than one unit of housing, second homes flourish in Poland and Bulgaria.

In many cases, it is evident that socialist tower blocks in the city give rise to weekend cottages outside it. (44)

In France where, like Sweden, some 20 per cent of households own second homes, the annual movement of millions of people towards the south coast each year, is in a large part generated by the growing ownership of the 'residence secondaire'. Those not yet in a position to afford them nonetheless make the same journey, staying for two months in semi-permanent camping sites. Here, for some, accommodation is provided in 'bungalows'. 8-7

The question of second homes, represented by what are appropriately called 'rental investment bungalows' in Spain, the Canary Islands or the Caribbean (45) has, in recent years, been given accelerated impetus by the rapidly growing industry of time-sharing, or multi-ownership. Following the first developments in the French Alps in 1967, the time-sharing industry has grown immensely, especially from the mid 1970s. In the United States, it is now estimated that time-share sales, at 1.5 billion dollars, represent some 3 per cent of the total value of completed residential property. In Britain, where the first development was introduced in 1975, sales had amounted to £40 million by 1982. Although this represents only 1½ per cent of the total amount spent on holiday tourism by British residents, and about the same percentage of the total value of new private sector house construction in 1980, the introduction of time-sharing could have very considerable impact on the ownership - through the introduction of part-ownership - as well as the construction of second homes and holiday developments on a global scale. (46)

Allowing for cycles of boom and recession, it seems likely that with increasing real wages, the phenomenon of two salary households as an increasing proportion of women have paid employment, and extended transport facilities, two-home ownership (either in whole or in part) will increase. The main limits are likely to be the price and availability of fuel and policies of the state. **8-8**

In the early 1980s, in a modest British east coast resort, estate agents were advertising equally modest properties as suitable 'For first time second home buyers'. The local, national and international implications of two house ownership need considerable further research.

The bungalow as 'tropical house'

Another important research area is the history of 'tropical architecture and planning'. The introduction into tropical societies, as part of the process of colonial exploitation, of the architectural and urban forms of industrial, capitalist Europe, raises issues of fundamental empirical and theoretical importance. The built environment of colonialism, of which the bungalow is perhaps the most representative element, was first and foremost an economic and political fact; it was also part of a larger process by which goods and labour were incorporated into the metropolitan economy. It was equally a social and cultural phenomenon: the colonial settlers were socially organised and their dwellings, lay-outs and settlements, including the incorporation of indigenous peoples, were a product of this organisation.

Yet whilst all modern colonisers were from Europe, and as such, shared many cultural outlooks and beliefs, they were also markedly different, bringing to their settlements, and especially the houses in which they lived, their own cultural traditions, whether from Spain, Portugal, France, Britain, the Netherlands, Scandinavia or Germany. Moreover, such traditions changed and developed over time: theories and experience of construction, expectations and knowledge about health, notions about the organisation of labour as well as

religious and political ideas concerning the people over whom they ruled. Equally important were the vast range of cultures colonised and the particular junctures in history when the colonisation occurred.

The anodyne phrase 'tropical architecture' masks a cluster of controversial facts. Its emergence as a sphere of (European) knowledge marks the expansion of Europe into areas where Europeans had not previously lived. It elides or skims over the facts, that 'tropical architecture' was for people of alien cultures, exercising colonial power. The application of its principles - whether concerning design, construction, materials, sanitation or lay-out, first to colonial and then to 'native' populations - was inseparable from the total economic, social and political restructuring of the culture being controlled.

A detailed historical account of the emergence of consensual ideas about 'tropical architecture and planning' among the colonial powers and the way in which the domestic culture and environment as well as the larger physical and spatial environment of native peoples was transformed, would provide one of the most important insights into the penetration of this world by the capitalist world economy. It would also greatly further understanding not only of how societies produce their environments but how environments help to produce societies themselves.

The bungalow as global phenomenon

What this study has assumed, though not systematically explored, is the emergence of a global economy and culture which has been responsible, at different places and at different times, for the development of the bungalow in its various guises. What its global diffusion represents is the transfer of images, of ways and models **8-9** of living, of a particular kind of material and non-material culture which is associated with, even produced by, the modern, industrial, free market economy. Introduced as a mass phenomenon, it was based on a bourgeois image of the world - a separate, privatised environment. As part of a reaction to the city, the move to single family, often

single storey suburban homes, is what the development of the bungalow means in the rich, industrial 'North'.

Simultaneously, in the so-called developing world of the 'South', in Asia, Africa and Latin America, the introduction of the 'modern' bungalow has resulted from the penetration of those continents by 'Western', 'European' 'American' or 'bourgeois' tastes, styles and standards of living. (47) The modern housing form of which the 'European bungalow' was an early prototype, and the suburbs to which it gives rise, provides the physical and spatial setting for the consumer goods of an expanding global economy.

A pre-requisite for the understanding of these world-wide domestic lifestyles is the need to trace the historical emergence of a 'global urban culture', which has led to the situation described by Harvey (page 16) or Murphy:

With the creation of a global commercial network, the spread of industrialisation and the technological revolution in transport and transferability, cities everywhere are becoming more like one another. (48)

Evidence suggests that the main developments were well under way in the three decades preceding 1914: all round the world, western transport and other technology was gradually being introduced, capital was transferred, institutions established and increasing numbers of people were moving from place to place. Ideas about cities, sanitation, housing, planning and health were being diffused, part of the rapid extension of a growing international professionalism represented by the 'international' exhibitions and over 2,000 'international' congresses which took place in the ten or so years before the first World War. (49) Though it should be made clear in this context that 'international' refers to the system of states as it existed at the turn of the century, including imperial powers with their colonial possessions.

A world system of cities was being created which was being used, in fact, had been much earlier used, for transferring labour (including slaves and indentured labour), capital, technology and ideas around the world. Between 1870 and 1900, tourism was organised on a world scale: Thomas Cook and Sons was 'an institution of the British Empire' by the 1880s, extending the privileges of the upper class to

the bourgeoisie and petit bourgeoisie of the industrialised nations.(50) It was at this time, that the standards of the 'global urban culture' were being established. It was a culture expressed not only in economic, social, political and linguistic terms but also in physical, spatial and architectural ones. (51)

In discussing the new international division of labour which has emerged in the modern world, Cohen outlines the rise of the 'global cities'. Whilst centres of production have emerged in the developing nations, centres for the formulation of corporate strategy and international finance have not. Instead, new 'global cities' have emerged such as New York, London, Frankfurt and Zurich the centres of international finance and the headquarters of multi-national corporations operating on a world wide scale. (52) It is these whose presence is manifest in the so-called 'international style' of architecture, whether in the Western headquarters or in the subsidiary offices in the capitals of developing countries.

In a different sense, the modern bungalow is also part of this 'international style' and is equally bound up with colonialism and the international division of labour. Yet where the District Commissioner's or Planter's Bungalow overseas was symbolic of the process by which a surplus was extracted from the colonial economy, at home, as 'second home' or as spacious dwelling in the country or suburbs, it was part of the process by which the capital surplus in the domestic economy was consumed.

It is now generally accepted that the processes of 'development' and 'under-development' are one, both historically and in the contemporary world. The development of the industrial nations of the 'North' was also part and parcel of the 'under development' of the agrarian or now industrialising nations of the 'South'. (53) What is less clear are the particular implications of this process for the growth of towns, cities and suburbs in 'the North'.

The need to view the cities of a country as a unified system where growth or decline in one region has repercussions in a number of towns is now taken for granted. What is even more necessary, is to see these processes as part of a global urban system where developments in one sector of the world economy are ultimately (if not always so obviously) responsible for urban developments in another.

The introduction of the bungalow into Britain (as also in the United States and Australia), whether as vacation home in the growing resorts, or as permanent home in the expanding suburbs, occurred at a time of immense urbanisation and suburbanisation (1870 - 1930) associated with the massive accumulation of capital in these societies as a result of industrialisation, colonialism and expanding overseas trade; in the last years of the nineteenth century, when the bungalow really got under way, India (including Bengal) was experiencing the worst famine in its history.

During the course of the twentieth century, as per capita incomes in the industrialised nations have gone up, the gap between these and those of the developing nations of Asia has increased and, in a relative sense, the income of the latter has gone down. Bangla Desh, one of the poorest countries in the world, with a Gross National Product per head less than one per cent than of the United States, one of the richest, and about $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent than of the United Kingdom, (54) was the starting point for this study. What the history of the bungalow has shown is that these facts are not unrelated. The bungalow is both a product, and symbol, of a complex yet inter-dependent world.

Chapter Eight Footnotes

1. B.J.L.Berry, 'The counterurbanisation process: urban America since 1970' in ibid., ed., Urbanisation and Counterurbanisation. Sage Publications, London, 1976, pp. 17-30, p.17.
2. Ibid., p.24.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid. 'Introduction: on urbanisation and counterurbanisation' in ibid., ed., 1976, pp.7 - 14, p.10.
5. Ibid., 'The counterurbanisation process', p.25.
6. J.Kemeny, The Myth of Home Ownership, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1981, especially pp. 42-64; J.Agnew, 'Home ownership and identity in capitalist societies' and N.G.Duncan, 'Home ownership and social theory', both in J.S.Duncan, ed., Housing and Identity. Cross-cultural Perspectives, Croom Helm, London, 1981, pp.60-97, 98-134.
7. Kemeny, p.8.
8. Ibid., pp.43-4.
9. Agnew, pp.69-70.
10. Kemeny, p.44.
11. Building Societies Association, Bulletin, 28, 1981 and recent issues.
12. J.S.Cheer, 'Bungalow development', Journal of the Town Planning Institute, 45, 2 January, 1959, pp.43-6.
13. W.Cowburn, 'Popular housing', Arena, Architectural Association Journal, September-October, 1966, pp.76-81; BSA Bulletin, recent issues.
14. BSA Bulletin, 26 April, 1981.
15. Office of Population Censuses and Surveys, Census, 1981: Preliminary Report for Towns. Urban and rural population, England and Wales, HMSO, 1981, pp.5, 10.
16. BSA Bulletin, 26, 1981, Table 5.
17. C.M.Law and A.M.Warnes, 'The characteristics of retired migrants', in D.T.Herbert and R.J. Johnston, Geography and the Urban Environment, Progress in research and applications, Vol. III, Wiley, Chichester, 1980, pp. 175-222.

18. Ibid.; see also Kemeny, op.cit.
19. W.Betting and J.J.Vriend, Bungalows: Deutschland, England, Italien, Holland, Belgien, Danemark, Die Planung Verlag, Muller-Wellborn, Darmstadt, 1958 (my translation, ADK)
20. H.Nestler-Bode, Deutsche Kunst seit 1960. Architektur. Munich, 1976. p.25.
21. E.Steingraber, Der Bungalow. Gunther Neske, Bullingen, 1967, pp. 54-5.
22. A.Garnier, 'La maison individuelle en Suisse et dans le canton de Vand, Ingenieurs et Architectes Suisses, 20 August, 1981, pp.273-9.
23. A.D.King, 'Bungalow bliss: domestic imagery and the ideology of romance in the lyrics of popular songs, 1920-80', Paper given to the Seventh Annual Conference, 'Popular Culture' Social History Society, Chester, December 1981. Unpublished.
24. E.Shorter, The making of the Modern Family. Collins. London, 1976.
25. See Appendix. B; also R.J.Johnston, City and Society, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1980, p.180.
26. J.Hancock, 'The apartment house in urban America', in A.D.King, ed., Buildings and Society. Essays on the social development of the built environment, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1980, pp. 151-92.
27. The Times.
28. S.Peace, 'The balance of residential life: a study in 100 Old People's Homes'. Paper given to the British Sociological Association, Study Group (Sociology and the Physical Spatial Environment) meeting on Public and Institutional Space, February, 1982. Unpublished.
29. E.J.Hobsbawm, The Age of Capital. Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1975, p.212.
30. Johnston, op.cit., pp. 108, 118.
31. W.Tabb, Introduction, W.Tabb and L.Sawyers, eds., Marxism and the Metropolis, Oxford University Press, New York, 1978, p.4.
32. P.Hall, et al., The Containment of Urban England, Allen & Unwin, London, 1973.
33. A.Gilg, Countryside Planning. The first thirty years, 1945-75. David and Charles, 1978, p.94.
34. R.Banham, P.Barker, P.Hall, C.Price, 'Non-plan: an experiment in freedom', New Society, 20 March, 1969, pp. 435-43.

35. A.D.King, 'Exporting "planning": the colonial and neo-colonial experience', in G.E.Cherry, Shaping an Urban World. Mansell, London, 1980, pp.203-26. '"Town and country planning" has been a borrowed phrase which is still much invogue in India although it appears to be going out of use in the language of its origin in the United Kingdom'.
S.Manzoor Alam, Metropolitan Hyderabad and its Region. Asia Publishing House, London, 1972. Introduction; also D.Parkin, Town and Country in Central and Eastern Africa, Oxford University Press, London, 1972.
On the basic conceptual distinction, its incorporation into linguistic categories and the extension of 'town-country' relations globally, see R.Williams, The Country and the City, Oxford University Press, London, 1973; also ibid., Keywords. A vocabulary of culture and society. Fontana, London. It is significant that the criteria for choosing the term 'Green Belt' were clearly visual and aesthetic; had they been economic, it would presumably have been termed the 'Rural' or 'Agricultural Belt'.
36. For a valuable discussion on this, see Kemeny, op.cit.
37. Cowburn, op.cit.
38. See titles by Clout and Ragatz listed in A.D.King, 'A space for time and a time for space: the social production of the vacation house', in ibid., Buildings and Society, 1980.
39. Berry, op.cit.
40. A.D.King, 'Historical patterns of reaction to urbanism: the case of Britain, 1880 - 1939', International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 4,4, 1980, pp. 453 - 69.
41. G.Martinotti, Deurbanisation and villagisation :Introduction, International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 4,4, 1980, p.xii.
42. E.Lichtenberger, 'The changing nature of European urbanisation, in Berry, ed., op.cit. 1976, pp. 81-108, p.87.
43. R.A.French and F.E.I.Hamilton, The Socialist City, Wiley, Chichester, 1979. See pp.383,444-7, 476.
44. D.J.B.Shaw, 'Recreation and the Soviet city', in French and Hamilton, op.cit., 1979, pp. 119-44.
45. Various brochures for time-sharing arrangements.
46. S.O 'Neill, Time-sharing. Its implications for building development. Final year project. Department of Building Technology, Brunel University, 1982, pp. 10,29,37,63.

47. P.Lloyd, Slums of Hope. Shanty towns of the third world, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1979. See especially Preface.
48. R.Murphy, 'Historical and comparative urban studies' in R.G.Putman, et al., eds., A Geography of Urban Places. Selected Readings, Toronto, 1970, pp. 25-32.
49. A.Sutcliffe, Towards the Planned City. Germany, Britain, the United States and France, 1780-1914. Blackwell, London, 1981, p.166.
50. L.Turner and J.Ash, The Golden Hordes. International Tourism and the Pleasure Periphery. Constable, London, 1975, pp.58-9.
51. Some preliminary explorations were made in A.D.King, Colonial Urban Development, culture, social power and environment, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1976.
52. R.B.Cohen, 'The new international division of labour', in M.Dear and A.J.Scott, Urbanization and Urban Planning in Capitalist Society, Methuen, London, 1981. pp. 287-318.
53. See especially the writings of Amin, Frank, Wallerstein and others usefully discussed in I.Roxborough, Theories of Underdevelopment, Macmillan, London, 1979.
54. World Bank, World Development Report, 1981. Washington, DC. 1981. Table 1. p. 134.

APPENDIX A

An architectural note on the term 'veranda'

Veranda, verandah: 'an open portico or light roofed gallery extending along the front (and occasionally, other sides) of a dwelling or other building, frequently having a front of lattice work, and erected chiefly as a protection or shelter from the sun or rain'
Oxford English Dictionary, 1980.

The concept of the veranda, whether understood as a semi-enclosed space created (on a single storey house) by the extension of the roof down and outwards, and supported by pillars, or by an 'additional' structure incorporated onto the side of the building, is an essential feature of the 'colonial' bungalow for much of its history. In some respects, it could be seen as a defining one which distinguishes the bungalow from other single storey dwellings.

Both geographers as well as architectural historians have seen it as an important subject, demanding 'detailed investigation in the East, as well as in England, the West Indies and the United States'.(1) Its importance is not simply a matter of 'style' ; it is a feature which has frequently characterised the dwellings of people who have moved from their normal habitat in temperate zones to hotter climates where the houses which they constructed have been adapted to meet cultural expectations established in their countries of origin. Though features similar to the verandah, and with comparable functions, naturally exist in the vernacular architecture of many 'hot climate' countries, the verandah is not a universal 'tropical' feature. For example, many dwelling forms of traditional African cultures do not have this feature, which underlines the view that different peoples have different perceptions about climate, the 'need for shade' outdoors, and the different functions which dwellings perform.

The reasons for the existence of the verandah, therefore, are complex, and require far more discussion than space here permits. For example, consideration would need to be given to structural or geographical factors, such as the availability of materials permitting

such a feature; to cultural considerations, regarding the perception and tolerance of climatic conditions; to social factors, regarding the social organisation of communities and whether shelter was provided in terms of clustered or 'collective' units which simultaneously provided climatic protection. Other economic, political or behavioural factors govern what space is available for use in a dwelling, or what time is available to utilise this space. The questions are endless. Whatever the earlier history of the verandah, however, it often became, either in itself or as an integral part of the bungalow, particularly symbolic of 'tropical' and especially colonial life-styles (2). In comparison to the dwellings of native peoples, whether in India, Africa or Australia, it was a sign of European 'adjustment' to the climate, a feature made necessary by the social as well as spatial separation of one dwelling from another and, as a space to spend one's spare time, it was a symbol of economic and political status. Whilst geographers and others may trace evidence of the feature itself, the following notes provide some insight into the introduction of the term.

It is generally accepted that the term 'verandah', as used in England and France, and later in the British colonial world, came into the English language from India, the origins being either Persian or, more likely, Spanish or Portuguese (3). For example, the first recorded use is in 1498 in Portuguese and is in an account of the voyage of Vasco da Gama to India. Numerous other instances of its use in Portuguese and Spanish, without definition, occur in the seventeenth century. The veranda was native to the folk and medieval vernacular houses of northern Portugal and Spain (4), was introduced to Brazil and possibly, reached the West Indies (5), although so far there is no record of the term being in use there in the eighteenth century.

The first recorded use of the term in English is in 1711 when, in an Indian context, reference is made to a building having 'a paved court, and two large verandas or piazzas' (6). It is worth noting that, until about 1800, the term 'piazza' is frequently used in English not only to explain the meaning of 'veranda' but also, whether in the West Indies or in colonial and post-colonial North America, to

refer to what subsequently was often called 'veranda'. 'Piazza', like the other terms used to explain the 'new' term 'veranda' such as 'portico', 'colonnade', or 'arcade', had been imported into English from the Mediterranean (Italian). Literally meaning a square or market place in Italian, 'piazza' had in English been erroneously applied to a colonnade or covered gallery or walk surrounding a "piazza proper", and hence, to a single colonnade in front of a building. This practice 'appears to have begun with the vulgar misapplication of the name to the arcades built after the designs of Inigo Jones on the north and east side of Covent Garden instead of the open market place' and was being used in this way in England in the mid seventeenth century. (7)

From the mid eighteenth century, an increasing number of references to 'veranda' are recorded in English, all of them from an Indian context, though with a variety of spellings (e.g. feerandah, virander): 'small ranges of pillars that support a pent-house or shed, forming what is called in the Portuguese lingua franca, veranda' (8) or, in 1787, when the orientalist Sir William Jones, living in rural Krishnagar, outside Calcutta, referred to his 'pastoral mansion' as 'a thatched cottage with an upper storey and a covered verome or veranda, as they call it here, all round, well boarded and ten or twelve feet broad'. (9) In the earliest definition of the bungalow (1781), Hodges refers to 'the whole (being) covered with one general thatch, which comes low to each side, the spaces between are viranders or open porticoes'. (10)

The first recorded use of the term in English, in England, is in 1800 when architect John Plaw published a cottage design 'with a viranda, in the manner of an Indian bungalow', (11) though the feature itself had appeared at least some years earlier. (12) Evidence suggests that it is from perhaps the second or third decades of the nineteenth century that the type of veranda characteristic of the Anglo-India bungalow and hence the form (if not with the name) of the bungalow itself was introduced into Britain. In North America, however, and no doubt elsewhere, the feature had existed at least from the late seventeenth century, where it was generally termed a 'piazza' (13). French colonial architecture in Mississippi in the late eighteenth century also produced a one storey house on piers, the

A-1

whole surrounded by a 'galerie' which, though not a continuation of the roof, was nonetheless functionally similar to the verandah. (14) Similar forms were known in the West Indies (15). The term veranda, however, does not seem to have been applied to any of these features.

That the next known reference outside India to a 'varando' occurs in Sydney, in 1805 (16), suggests a positive Indian or Anglo-Indian link to Australia, via the British. Its newness in England is confirmed by Southey who, in 1807, wrote 'Here is a fashion lately introduced from better climates, of making verandas, verandas in a country where physicians recommend double doors, and double windows as a precaution against intolerable cold' (17). In the United States, the word had arrived at least by 1819 when an advertisement in the South Carolina newspaper, the Courier, referred to 'A Marine Villa. . . on Sullivan's Island . . . with two verandas'. (18) From about this time, the term seems to have been used as an alternative for 'piazza'. (19)

In England, as an 'added' rather than integral form, the veranda became increasingly common as a fashionable architectural feature from this period. Apparently referring to its recent introduction, architect J.B.Papworth wrote in 1818, 'no decoration has so successfully varied the dull sameness of modern structures in the metropolis as the verandah' (20). In this form, and often using wrought iron, it had become primarily a decorative, rather than functional feature, as is confirmed by a more detailed description of 1843: it was 'a sort of light external gallery with a sloping roof of awning-like character, supported on slender pillars and frequently partly enclosed in front with lattice work. The verandah is both of Eastern name and Eastern origin, and appears to have been first introduced into this country towards the end of the eighteenth century. As here applied, however, it is a mere excrescence in design, assimilating with no one style practised by us and so far tolerable only for small villas and cottage residences where no style is attempted and where it affords a cheap substitute for a colonnade providing shelter against rain and sun, and a dry walk or seat al fresco, attached to sitting rooms on the ground floor' (21) Though no systematic research has been undertaken on this, the 'genuine' verandah, as in the Indian bungalow, formed from the projecting roof, seems to have been adopted into country house lodges and early cricket pavilions in Britain from the second or third decades of the century.

Appendix A Footnotes

1. H.R.Hitchcock, 'American influences abroad' in E.Kaufmann, ed., The Rise of American Architecture, Pall Mall Press, London, 1970, pp. 3-50, p.9, note 9 .
J.D.Edwards, 'The evolution of vernacular architecture in the Western Caribbean', in K.Wilkerson, ed. Cultural Traditions and Caribbean Identity. The question of patrimony. University of Florida, Gainesville, 1980, pp.291-346; R.L.Lewcock, Early Nineteenth Century Architecture in South Africa. A study of the interaction of two cultures, 1795-1837. Balkema, Cape Town, 1963.
2. For example, the title of J.Pope Hennesey, Verandah. Some episodes in the Crown colonies, 1867-89. Allen and Unwin, London, 1964, and numerous similar essays, 'From my Veranda' etc.
3. Yule and Burnell, op.cit., under 'veranda'.
4. Edwards, op.cit., quoting Lewcock, p. 125.
5. Edwards, op.cit.
6. Yule and Burnell, loc. cit.
7. Oxford English Dictionary, Clarendon Press, 1980, 'piazza'.
8. Yule and Burnell, loc.cit.
9. S.N.Mukherjee, Sir William Jones. A study in eighteenth century British attitudes to India. Cambridge University Press, 1968,p.113.
10. Yule and Burnell, loc.cit.
11. J.Plaw, Sketches for Country Houses, Villas and Rural Dwellings, Taylor, London, 1800.
12. C.Middleton,Picturesque and Architectural views for cottages, farmhouses, and country villas. Published by E.Jeffrey, London, 1793.
13. H.Morrison, Early American Architecture.Oxford University Press, New York, 1952, pp. 132, 495.
14. Ibid., p.258.
15. Edwards, op.cit.
16. J.M.Freeland, Architecture in Australia. A History. Cheshire, Melbourne, Canberra & Sydney, 1968, p.26.
17. In C.A.M.Fennel, The Stanford Dictionary of Anglicized Words and Phrases. Cambridge University Press, 1892. Under 'verandah'.

B. St J. Ravenel, Architects of Charleston, Carolina Art Association Charleston, SC, 1945, p. 107. The architect of the house, arriving in the American South in 1817, came from Bath, Somerset and probably brought the term from England. I am indebted to Clay Lancaster for his information.

Morrison, p. 495; also Clay Lancaster, personal communication.

J.B. Papworth, Rural Residences, etc. J. Taylor, London, 1818. Preface.

C. Knight, ed., Penny Cyclopaedia, Knight, London, 1843, vol 26, p. 251.

APPENDIX B

The bungalow in Poetry and Song

The following help to convey the nature of imagery conveyed by the bungalow. Some reference is made to the lyrics of popular songs in Chapter Eight.

The Deserted Bungalow

There stands on the isle of Seringapatam,
 By the Cauvery, eddying fast,
 A bungalow lonely,
 And tenanted only
 By memories of the past.
 It has stood, as though under a curse or spell,
 Untouched since the year that Tippoo fell.

The garden about it is tangled and wild,
 Sad trees sigh close to its eaves,
 And the dark lithe shapes
 Of chattering apes
 Swing in and out of the leaves;
 And when night's dank vapours rise grey and foul,
 The sildence is rent by the shrill screech-owl.

The windows are shuttered, the doors ares shut,
 And the odour and stain of decay
 Is on plaster and beam,
 And the stone steps seem
 To be ooze-corroding away;
 And the air all around is as tinged with the breath
 of the felt, though invisible, presence of Death.

'T was a pleasant abode, no doubt, in its prime;
 Two storeyed, facing the tide;
 A verandah deep,
 And a broad stone sweep
 Of stpes to the riverside,
 And a boat-house, close to the water's edge,
 Flanking the stairs, on a rocky ledge.

The stream flows by in a low-banked curve,
 And higher up, to the right,
 Are the battlements grey
 That could not stay
 The rush of old England's might;
 And, higher up still, the world-famed breach--
 A lesson we to posterity teach.

Stirring the times were those times, forsooth,
 And bold the hearts of our men,
 Who plunged through water,
 And rocks and slaughter,
 And carried the tiger's den.
 Heroic the onset and crushing the blow
 That was struck near this lonely bungalow.

When the seige was over a Colonel dwelt
 With his wife and daughters here,
 In command of the fort
 Where the bloody sport
 Has cost Mysore so dear.
 I can fancy the girls with their prattle light,
 And the house all trim, and the garden bright;

And the merry party afoot on the steps,
 Looking across the stream,
 Or swinging afloat
 In their pleasure boat,
 Under the soft moonbeam,
 With the cool breeze over the water blowing,
 Making amends for the midday glowing.

I think I can see the early morn
 The horses held at the door,
 And the girls riding out
 With the Colonel stout
 To visit the breach once more,
 Or gaze at the gate where Tippoo fell,
 Stabbed to death in the fierce pell-mell.

And then the breakfast after the ride,
 Under the shadowy trees,
 Mamma in her chair,
 And the homely fare,
 And the Colonel at his ease,
 Conning the sheets of the night-brought post,
 Between attacks on the tea and toast.

And, after, the long yet happy day
 In the cuscus-tattied gloom,
 The cheery tiffin,
 And giggling griffin
 'Sconced in the drawing-room;
 And the voice of the grand piano, half
 Hushing the man's and the maiden's laugh.

And hushed they were; for one dreadful eve
 The Cholera tapped at the door;
 Nor knocked in vain,
 For mother and twain
 Answered the summons sore.
 When dawn broke over the house next day,
 The mother and daughter had passed away.

The Colonel buried his loved ones three,
 Then fled from the house of woe.
 And ne'er since then
 Have the feet of men
 Trod in that bungalow,
 Save feet of the traveller, passing near,
 Who turns to see it, and drops a tear.

The mouldering rooms are now as they stood
 Near eighty years ago:
 The piano is there,
 And table and chair,
 And the carpet, rotting slow,
 And the beds whereon the corpses lay,
 And the curtains half time-mawed away.

A type of gloom and decay and death,
 And happiness overcast,
 Is this bungalow lonely,
 And tenanted only
 By memories of the past.
 Peace to the shades of the three who died
 In that lonely house by the Cauvery's tide!

from
 Aliph Cheem, Lays of India.
 Thacker Spink, Calcutta,
 1883 (7th edition), pp. 201-4.

A TALE OF EAST AND WEST

Silent and still the bungalow
As the fire-flies gleam around;
Silent and still the bungalow,
Save for the murmuring sound
Of the night winds rustling through the gloom
Of each dark, decaying, deserted room.

The English planter was debonair
As he mounted his horse to ride
Out in the vigorous Eastern air
On the tea-clad mountain side,
As he rode he thought of a word of love,
And his heart was bright as the skies above.

The Eastern maiden was fair to see
(The story is shortly told),
The Eastern maiden was fair, and he
Was youthful, was strong, was bold.
He beguiled the Eastern heart away
On the mountain side in the Eastern day.

An English bride to the Eastward came,
To the home which the planter made;
She had taken the English planter's name--
Trustful, of nought afraid.
And the Eastern girl on the hill-side wept,--
Maiden no more, as the darkness crept.

The English planter sat in his chair,--
 Placid his evening rest;
 His blood bespattered the evening air,
 Bespattered his wife's fair breast.
 And peace fell over an Eastern mind,
 Her honour avenged before her kind.

Silent and still the bungalow
 As the fire-flies gleam around;
 Silent and still the bungalow,
 Save for the murmuring sound
 Of the night wind rustling through the gloom
 Of each dark, decaying, deserted room.

from

Philip Randell, Bungalow Ballads,
 Echoes from the East, Simpkin Marshall,
 London, 1910

'These lines were written in a bungalow
 in the Himalayas . . . in them I have
 tried to depict certain phases of life
 which have helped . . . to make our
 Empire what it is. Should they be
 read at sea, in barracks at home or
 in cantonments abroad, I trust they
 will wile away an hour'.

Preface.

Bungal-Ode

By Burgess Johnson

There's a jingle in the jungle,
 'Neath the juniper and pine,
 They are mangling the tangle
 Of the underbrush and vine,
 And my blood is all a-tingle
 At the sound of blowon blow,
 As I count each single shingle
 On my bosky bungalow.

There's a jingle in the jungle,
 I am counting every nail,
 And my mind is bungaloading,
 Bungaloping down a trail;
 And I dream of every ingle
 Where I angle at my ease,
 Naught to set my nerves a-jingle,
 I may bungle all I please.

For I oft get bungalonly
 In the mingled human drove,
 And I long for bungaloafing
 In some bungalotus grove,
 In a cooling bung'location
 Where no troubling trails intrude,
 'Neath some bungalowly rooftree
 In east bungalongitude.

Oh, I think with bungaloathing
 Of the strangling social swim,
 Where they wrangle after bangles
 Or for some new-fangled whim;
 And I know by bungalogic
 That is all my bungalown
 That a little bungalotion
 Mendeth every mortal moan!

Oh, a man that's bungalonging
 For the dingle and the loam
 Is a very bungalobster
 If he dangles on at home.
 Catch the bungalocomotive;
 If you cannot face the fee,
 Why, a bungalloan'll do it--
 You can borrow it of me!

from H.H.Saylor, Bungalows, their design, construction & furnishing
 etc. New York, 1911, pp.2-3.

A Bungalow of Dreams (1928?)
Bix Beiderbecke.

Our little love nest
Beside a stream
Where red, red roses grow
Our bungalow
Of dreams

Just like two love birds
We'll bill and coo
I'll whisper love words
For only you

Far from the city
Somehow it seems
We're sitting pretty in
Our bungalow
Of dreams

A bit of heaven
Beside a stream
I know you'll love it so
Our bungalow
Of dreams

In the Land of the Bungalow (1929)
George F. Devereux.

I just got off the sunset train
I'm from the Angel Town
The Golden West Los Angeles
Where the sun shines all year round
I left a girlie back there
She's the sweetest girl I know
She said 'Goodbye'
I'll wait for you
In the Land of the Bungalow

I just can't keep my tho'ts away
From California's shore
The Land of Flow'rs & Winter Show'
How I miss you more and more
As soon as I can get away
I know that I will go
Back to the girl
I love the best
In the Land of the Bungalow

Chorus
In the Land of the Bungalow
Away from the ice and snow
Away from the cold
To the Land of Gold
Away where the poppies grow

Away to the setting sun
To the home of the orange blossom
To the land of fruit & honey
Where it does not take much money
To own a little Bungalow

(From R. Winter. The California
Bungalow. Los Angeles. 1980)

A Bungalow, a Piccolo and You (1933)
 Lewis, Sherman & Campbell. Henry Hall
 & BBC Dance Orchestra

Underneath your window
 Every night I stand
 Pleading for your wonderful caress
 Listen at your window
 And you'll understand
 What it takes to bring me happiness

Chorus
 Three little things are all I desire, dear
 A bungalow, a piccolo and you
 Three little things set my heart on fire, dear
 A bungalow, a piccolo and you

Life will be complete
 When my songs I tweet
 On a love seat
 Built for two

Chorus

A Bungalow for Two
 Dorothy Evans. Oz Hill, with orchestra (1950s?- 1960s?)

A home just built for two
 A picture window too
 A door that opens with thanksgiving
 A fireplace that shines
 Where two hearts entwine
 In a bungalow
 For two

There'll be silvery laughter
 Sometimes purple tears
 But we'll have something
 to remember
 In our golden years

A terrace on the hill
 A nesting whippoorwill
 The music of our love resounding
 Echoing the joy
 Of a girl and boy
 In a bungalow
 For two

A portrait on a wall
 And friends will come to call
 To share with us
 Our peaceful living
 Later we will see
 Maybe there'll be three
 In a bungalow
 For two

Bungalow in Quogue

1977 (?)

(Jerome Kern. P.G.Woodhouse. from musical
'Very Good, Eddie) Lynn Crigler & orch. DRG)

recorded

O let us fly without delay
Into the country far away
Where free from all this care & strife
We'll go and live the simple life

Out here the voice of nature calls
I'll go and get some overalls
Get the last year's almanac
To read at night when things go slack

Chorus

Let's build a little bungalow in Quogue
In Jappa? or in Taxilo (?) that's all (?)

Where we can sniff the scented breeze
And pluck tomatoes from the trees
Where there is room to exercise the dog

How pleasant it will be to life, the jog (?)
To fill the bowl and feed the bran the hog
Each morn' we'll waken from our doze
When Reginald the rooster crows
Down in our little bungalow in Quogue

Let's build a little bungalow in Quogue
In Jappa?, in Taxilo (?) that's all (?)
If life should tend to be a bore
We'll call on Farmer Brown next door
And get an earful of his dialogue

When Nature comes and brings us snow and fog
We'll fortify our systems with hot grog
And listen when the lights are still
To Wilberforce the Whippoorwill
Down in our little bungalow in Quogue

Bungalow Love

(Rik Kenton, vocal with instr. accomp. ISLAND)

1974

Bungalow love
 Such slow love
 Lovely girl
 . . . Sugar
 Love to me now
 Come . . .
 Close your eyes, girl
 So you can't see

Chorus

Let me give you love
 Let me give a little love
 Let me give a little love
 To your heart (Babe) (4)

She makes the boys laugh
 She makes the girls cry
 She makes the birds sing in the wind.

Tangerine night (?)
 Should be nice
 Thank . . .
 Jumble street . . .

. . . girl's heart

Chorus (4)

Gimme, gimme, gimme, gimme,
 gimme, gimme, etc etc
 Love from your heart, babe
 gimme, gimme, etc etc
 C'mon, baby, C'mon, baby
 etc etc
 Let me lay, let me lay,
 Let me lay you down.

Select Bibliography

The bibliography is divided into two main sections, General Works of Reference (C) and Primary Sources (D) which, with (A) and (B), have provided the empirical data. However, the division is not rigid: certain works could be listed in both categories. To avoid unnecessary length, only those architectural and building books and articles on the bungalow referred to in the text are listed below. A more comprehensive list is given in the footnotes of the relevant chapters.

Items of lesser importance have been omitted.

A. Periodicals and journals (except where otherwise stated, these refer to titles published in the United Kingdom)

American Architect and Building News (USA)
 The Architect
 Architectural Review
 British Architect
 The Builder
 Building (Australia)
 Building News
 Building World
 The Bungalow
 Country Life in America (USA)
 The Craftsman (USA)
 Garden Cities and Town Planning
 Granville Illustrated News
 House and Garden (USA)
 The Illustrated Carpenter and Builder
 Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects
 Indoors and Out (USA)
 Ladies Home Journal (USA)
 The Studio
 The World's Work and Leisure

B. Catalogues (principally from manufacturers of portable buildings: these are generally undated. An approximate date has been added)

Boulton & Paul	<u>Bungalow Cottages for Small Holdings</u> , Norwich, c. 1909
Boulton & Paul	<u>Homesteads for Small Holdings</u> , Norwich, c.1908
Boulton & Paul	<u>Catalogue of Horticultural Buildings</u> , 1889
Braby, Frederick	Catalogues, various. late 19th century
Cooper, W.	<u>Illustrated Catalogue of Goods</u> . Old Kent Rd, London, c. 1903, 1910.
Morton, Francis	Catalogue, 1873 (Liverpool City Library)
Rowell, David	Catalogue, c. 1890 (RIBA Library)
Smith, Harrison	<u>Bungalows, Residences, Cottages</u> , c. 1906? 471, Lichfield Road, Birmingham

Royal Agricultural Society. Catalogues of Annual Meetings (British Library)

C. General Works of Reference ; books.

- Abu-Lughod, J. & Hay, R. eds., Third World Urbanisation, Maaroufa Press, Chicago, 1977
- Agnew, J. 'Home ownership and identity in capitalist societies', in Duncan, J.S.ed., op.cit. pp. 60-97.
- Aldcroft, D. & Richardson, H. Building in the British Economy between the Wars, Allen & Unwin, London, 1976.
- Allison, L. Environmental Planning. A political and philosophical analysis, Allen & Unwin, London, 1975.
- Amin, S. 'Urbanisation and dependence in Black Africa. Origins and contemporary forms', in Abu-Lughod & Hay, eds., 1977, op.cit., pp.140-54.
- Archer, M. & W.G. Indian Painting for the British, 1770-1880, Oxford University Press, London, 1955.
- Ashworth, A. The Genesis of Modern Town Planning, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1972.
- Ballhatchet, K. & Harrison, J. eds. The City in South Asia; pre-modern and modern, Curzon Press, London, 1980.
- Bassett, K. & Short, J. Housing and Residential Structure, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1980.
- Bayley, C.A. The Local Roots of Indian Politics, 1880 - 1920, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1975.
- Berry, B.J.L. ed. Urbanisation and Counterurbanisation, Sage, London, 1976.
- Berry, B.J.L. 'The counterurbanisation process: urban America since 1970', in Berry, 1976, op.cit., pp.17-30.
- Best, G. Mid-Victorian Britain, 1851-75, Panther, London, 1973.
- Boddy, M. The Building Societies, Longman, London, 1980.
- Bowley, M. Innovations in Building Materials, Cambridge University Press, London, 1960.
- Bowley, M. The British Building Industry, Cambridge University Press, London, 1966.
- Boyd, R. Australia's Home, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1952.
- Brockway, L. Science and Colonial Expansion, Academic Press, London, 1979.

- Brooks, H. A. The Prairie School. Frank Lloyd Wright and his Mid-West contemporaries, Toronto University Press, 1972.
- Brush, J.E. 'The morphology of Indian cities', in Turner, ed., 1962, op.cit., pp. 57-70.
- Burnett, J. Useful Toil; autobiographies of working people from the 1820s to the 1920s, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1974.
- Burnett, J. A Social History of Housing, 1815-1970, David & Charles, Newton Abbott, 1978.
- Butlin, N.G. Investment in Australian Economic Development, 1861-1900, Cambridge University Press, London, 1964.
- Castells, M. The Urban Question, Edward Arnold, London, 1977.
- Castells, M. City, Class and Power, Macmillan, London, 1978.
- Chaudhuri, K.N. The Trading World of Asia and the East India Company, 1660-1760, Cambridge University Press, London, 1978.
- Cherry, G.E. Urban Change and Planning, Foulis, Henley-on-Thames, 1972.
- Cherry, G.E. The Evolution of British Town Planning, Leonard Hill, Leighton Buzzard, 1974.
- Chilivumbo, AB. 'The ecology of social types in Blantyre', in Parkin, ed., 1975, op.cit., pp.309-18.
- Church, R.A. The Great Victorian Boom , 1850-73, Macmillan, London, 1975.
- Clark, R.J. The Arts and Crafts in America, 1876-1916, Princeton University Press, 1972.
- Clout, H.D. 'The growth of second home ownership: an example of seasonal suburbanisation', in Johnson, ed., 1974, op.cit.,
- Cohen, R.B. 'The new international division of labour', in Dear & Scott, eds., 1981, op.cit., pp. 287-318.
- Cohn, B.S. India. The Social Anthropology of a Civilisation, Prentice-Hall, New Jersey, 1971.
- Connor, P. Oriental Architecture in the West, Thames & Hudson, London, 1979.
- Coppock, J.T. 'The changing face of England, 1850-1900', in Darby, ed., 1973, op.cit.,
- Coppock, J.T. Second Homes. Curse or Blessing? Pergamon Press, London, 1977.
- Cottrell, P.L. British Overseas Investment in the Nineteenth Century, Macmillan, London, 1975.
- Coulson, E. 'The impact of the colonial period on the definition of land rights', in V.Turner, ed., 1971, op.cit., pp.193-215.

- Cox, K.R. ed. Urbanisation and Conflict in Market Societies, Maaroufa Press, Chicago, 1978.
- Current, W.R. and K. Greene and Greene, Fort Worth, Amos Carter Museum of Western Art, 1974.
- Dani, A.H. Muslim Architecture in Bengal, Asiatic Society of Pakistan, Dacca, 1961.
- Darby, H.C. A New Historical Geography of England, Cambridge University Press, London, 1973.
- Davey, P. Arts and Crafts Architecture, Architectural Press, London, 1981.
- Davidoff, L. The Best Circles. Society, Etiquette and the Season, Croom Helm, London, 1973.
- Dear, M. & Scott, A.J. eds Urbanisation and Urban Planning in Capitalist Society, Methuen, London, 1981.
- Denyer, S. African Traditional Architecture, Heineman, London, 1978
- Dodwell, H.H. ed Cambridge History of India, 5 volumes, Cambridge University Press, London, 1929.
- Douglas, M. & Isherwood B. The World of Goods. Towards an Anthropology of Consumption Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1980.
- Duncan, J.S. ed. Housing and Identity. Cross-cultural perspectives. Croom Helm, London, 1981.
- Duncan, N.G. 'Home ownership and social theory', in Duncan, ed., 1981 op.cit. pp. 98-134.
- Dyos, H.J. & Aldcroft, D. British Transport. An economic survey, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1974.
- Edwards, J. 'The evolution of vernacular architecture in the Western Caribbean', in K.Wilkerson, ed., Cultural Traditions and Caribbean Identity. The question of patrimony. University of Florida, Gainesville, 1980, pp. 291-346.
- Elkan, W. 'How people came to live in towns', in Duignan, P. & Gann, L.H. eds., Colonialism in Africa, 1870-1960, vol 4 Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- Fogelson, R.M. The Fragmented Metropolis, Los Angeles, 1850-1930. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1967.
- Frank, A.G. Dependent Accumulation and Underdevelopment, Macmillan, London, 1978.
- Fraser, W.H. The Coming of the Mass Market, 1850-1914. Macmillan, London, 1981.
- Freeland, J.M. Architecture in Australia. A History, F.W.Cheshire, Canberra and Sydney, 1968.

- French, R.A. & The Socialist City. Spatial structure and urban policy, Hamilton, F. eds. Wiley, Chichester, 1979.
- Gann, L.H. & The Rulers of British Africa, 1870-1914, Croom Helm, Duignan, P. eds. London, 1978.
- Ghosh, S.C. The Social Condition of the British Community in Bengal, 1757-1800, E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1970.
- Glaab, T.N. & A History of Urban America, Collier Macmillan, New York, Brown, A.T. 1976.
- Glynn, J. & Inter-war Britain. A social and economic history, Oxborrow, J. Allen & Unwin, London, 1976.
- Glynn, S. Urbanisation in Australian History, 1788-1900, Nelson, Australia, 1975.
- Gottdiener, M. Planned Sprawl. Private and public interests in suburbia Sage, London, 1977.
- Gutkind, P.C.W. African Social Studies. A radical reader. Monthly Review & Waterman, Peds. Press, New York, 1977.
- Hall, P. et al. The Containment of Urban England, Allen & Unwin, London, 1973, 2 vols.
- Halsey, A.H. ed. Trends in British Society since 1900, Macmillan, London, 1972.
- Hardoy, J.E. & Shelter: Need and Response. Housing, land and settlement Satterthwaite D. in seventeen third world nations, Wiley, Chichester, 1981
- Hardy, D. Alternative Communities in Nineteenth Century England, Longman, London, 1979.
- Harvey, D. Social Justice and the City, Edward Arnold, London, 1973.
- Headrick, D. Tools of Empire. Technology and European imperialism in the nineteenth century, Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Hebdige, D. 'Towards a cartography of taste, 1935-62', in Waites, B. et al. Popular Culture. Past and Present, Croom Helm, London, 1981, pp. 194-218.
- Herbert, G. Pioneers of Prefabrication, Princeton University Press, 1978.
- Hobsbawm, E.J. Industry and Empire, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1969.
- Hobsbawm, E.J. The Age of Capital, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London, 1975
- Holdsworth, D.W. 'House and home in Vancouver' in Stelter, G.A. and Artibise, A.F.J. eds., The Canadian City, McClelland & Stewart, Toronto, 1977, pp. 186-211.
- Hole, V.W. & Trends in Population, Housing and Occupancy Rates, 1861-1961, HMSO, London, 1971. Pountney, M.

- Holzman, J.M. The Nabobs in England. A study of the returned Anglo-Indian, 1760-85. Columbia University Press, New York, 1926.
- Home, R.K. 'Urban growth and urban government', in Williams, ed. 1976, op.cit., pp. 54-75.
- Howell, S. The Seaside, Studio Vista, London, 1974.
- Hull, R.W. African Cities and Towns before the European Conquest, Horton, New York, 1976.
- Hunter, W.W. A History of British India, 2 vols, London, 1899-1900.
- Illich, I. The Right to Useful Employment, Marion Boyars, London, 1978.
- Jackson, A.A. Semi-detached London, Allen & Unwin, London, 1973.
- Jensen, R.G. 'Urban environments in the United States and the Soviet Union; some contrasts and comparisons', in Berry, ed. 1976, op.cit., pp. 31-42.
- Johnson, D.L. The Architecture of Walter Burley Griffin, Macmillan, Melbourne, 1977.
- Johnson, D.L. Australian Architecture, 1901-51. Sources of Modernism, Sydney University Press, 1980.
- Johnson, J.H. Suburban Growth. Geographical processes at the edge of the western city, Wiley, London, 1974.
- Johnston, R.J. City and Society. An outline for urban geography, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1980.
- Karn, V. Retiring to the Seaside, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1977.
- Kaye, B. The Development of the Architectural Profession in Britain, Allen & Unwin, London, 1960.
- Kemery, J. The Myth of Home Ownership, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1981.
- Kemp, T. Historical Patterns of Industrialisation, Longmans, London, 1978.
- Kilby, P. 'Manufacturing in colonial Africa', in Duignan, P. and Gann, L.H., eds., Colonialism in Africa, 1870-1960, vol. 4, Cambridge University Press, 1977, pp. 470-522.
- Kilmartin, L. & Thorns, D.C. Cities Unlimited, Allen & Unwin, London, 1978.
- King, A.D. Colonial Urban Development. Culture, social power and environment, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1976.
- King, A.D., ed. Buildings and Society. Essays on the social development of the built environment, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1980.

- King, A.D. 'A space for time and a time for space: the social production of the vacation house', in King, A.D. ed., 1980, pp. 193-227.
- King, A.D. 'Exporting planning: the colonial and neo-colonial experience', in Cherry, G.E. ed., Shaping an Urban World, Mansell, London, 1980, pp. 203-26.
- King, A.D. 'Colonial cities: global pivots of change', in Ross and Telkamp, eds., op. cit.
- Kira, A. The Bathroom, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1976.
- Lancaster, C. The Japanese Influence in America, Walton H. Rawls, New York, 1963.
- Lancaster, C. The American Bungalow (forthcoming).
- Laslett, P. Household and Family in Past Time, Cambridge University Press, London, 1974.
- Lewcock, R. Early Nineteenth Century Architecture in South Africa: A Study of the Interaction of Two Cultures, 1795-1837, Balkema, Cape Town, 1963.
- Lloyd, P.C. Power and Independence. Urban Africans' perceptions of social inequality, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1974.
- Lloyd, P.C. Slums of Hope? Shanty towns of the third world, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1979.
- Mabogunje, A.L. Urbanization in Nigeria, University of London Press, London, 1968.
- Mabogunje, A.L. The Development Process. A spatial perspective, Hutchinson, London, 1980.
- Mabogunje, A.L., Hardoy, J. & Misra, R.P. Shelter Provision in Developing Countries. The influence of standards and criteria. Wiley, Chichester, 1978.
- Makinson, R.L. Greene and Greene. Architecture as a fine art, Perègrine Smith, Salt Lake City & Santa Barbara, 1977.
- Marris, P. Family and Social Change in Africa, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1961.
- Matthias, P. The First Industrial Nation. An economic history of Britain, 1700-1914, Methuen, London, 1978.
- Meller, H. Leisure and the Changing City, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1976.
- Misra, B.B. The Indian Middle Classes. Their Growth in Modern Times. Oxford University Press, London, 1961.

- Morris, A.E. Pre-cast Concrete in Architecture, George Godwin, London, 1978.
- Murie, A., Niner, P. & Watson, C. Housing Policy and the Housing System, Allen & Unwin, London, 1976.
- Nadel, G.H. Australia's Colonial Culture, Melbourne, 1957.
- Nduka, O. 'The rationality of the rich in Nigeria' in Gutkind & Waterman, eds, 1977, op .cit.
- Neutze, M. Urban Development in Australia , Allen & Unwin, London, 1977.
- Nilsson, S. European Architecture in India, 1750-1850, Faber, London, 1969.
- Oliver, P.,ed. Shelter in Africa, Barrie & Jenkins, London, 1975
- Oliver, P., Davis, I. & Bentley, I. Dunroamin. The suburban semi and its enemies, Barrie & Jenkins, London, 1981.
- O'Neill, S. Time-sharing. Its implications for building development. Final Year Project, Department of Building Technology, Brunel University, 1982.
- Parkin,D. ed. , Town and Country in East and Central Africa, Oxford University Press, London, 1975.
- Patmore, J.A. 'The spa towns of Britain', in R.P. Beckinsale, ed., Urbanisation and its Problems, Blackwell, Oxford, 1970, pp. 47-69.
- Pickvance,C.G. Urban Sociology. Critical Essays, Tavistock, London, 1976.
- Pimlott,J.A.R. The Englishman's Holiday, Faber & Faber, London, 1976.
- Pollard, S. The Development of the British Economy, 1914-1967, Edward Arnold, London, 1979.
- Porter, B. The Lion's Share. A short history of British imperialism, 1850-1970, Longman, London, 1975.
- Raghuvanshi, V.P.S. Indian Society in the Eighteenth Century, Associated Publishing House, New Delhi, 1969.
- Rao, G. Subha Indian Words in English. A study in Indo-British cultural life and linguistic relations, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1969.
- Rapoport, A. House Form and Culture, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1969.
- Rapoport, A. Human Aspects of Urban Form, Pergamon, London, 1977.
- Ravetz, A. Re-making Cities, Croom Helm, London, 1980.
- Roberts, B. Cities of Peasants, Edward Arnold, London, 1978.

- Ross, R. & Telkamp, G. eds. Colonial Cities, University of Leiden Press, 1983 (forthcoming).
- Rowbotham, S. & Weeks, J. Socialism and the New Life, Pluto Press, London, 1977.
- Roxborough, I. Theories of Underdevelopment, Macmillan, London, 1979.
- Roy, D.R. 'Hooverville. A community of homeless men', in Abu-Lughod, J. & Hay, R., eds, 1977, op. cit., pp. 300-6.
- Sandercock, L. Cities for Sale, Melbourne University Press, 1975.
- Schedvin, C.B. & McCarthy, J.W. Urbanisation in Australia. The nineteenth century, Sydney University Press, 1972.
- Schmitt, P.J. Back to Nature. The Arcadian Myth in Urban America, New York, Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Schwartz, B. ed. The Changing Face of the Suburbs, University of Chicago Press, Chicago & London, 1976.
- Shah, A.M. The Household Dimension of the Family in India, University of California Press, London, 1974.
- Shaw, D.J.B. 'Recreation and the Soviet City' in French & Hamilton, eds, 1979, op. cit., pp. 119-44.
- Shorter, E. The Making of the Modern Family, Collins, London, 1976.
- Singleton, G.H. 'The genesis of suburbia. A complex of historical trends', in Massotti, L.H. & Hadden, J.K., eds, The Urbanisation of the Suburbs, Sage, London, 1973, pp. 29-50.
- Smith, M.P. The City and Social Theory, Blackwell, Oxford, 1980.
- Southall, A. 'The impact of imperialism on urban development in Africa' in Turner, ed, 1971, op.cit.
- Spear, P. The Nabobs, Oxford University Press, 1963.
- Spear, P. A History of India, vol. 2, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1965.
- Srinivas, M.N. Social Change in Modern India, Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Sutcliffe, A. ed. Multi-Storey Living. The British working class experience, Croom Helm, London, 1973.
- Sutcliffe, A. Towards the Planned City. Germany, Britain, the United States and France, 1780-1914, Blackwell, Oxford, 1981.
- Tabb, W. & Sawyers, L., eds Marxism and the Metropolis, Oxford University Press, New York, 1978.
- Taylor, N. The Village in the City, Maurice Temple Smith, London, 1973.
- Thomas, B. Migration and Economic Growth, Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Thompson, F.M.L. English Landed Society in the Nineteenth Century, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1963.

- Thompson, P. The Edwardians, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London, 1975.
- Thorne, D.C. Suburbia, MacGibbon & Kee, London, 1972.
- Tobin, G.A. 'Suburbanisation and the development of motor transportation' in Schwartz, B., 1976, op.cit., pp. 95-111.
- Turner, J.F.C. Housing by People, Marion Boyars, London, 1976.
- Turner, L. & Ash, J. The Golden Hordes. International Tourism and the Pleasure Periphery, Constable, London, 1975.
- Turner, R.ed. India's Urban Future, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1962.
- Turner, V.ed. Colonialism in Africa, 1870-1960, vol. 3, Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- Wade, R.C. 'Introduction' to Schmitt, P.J., 1969, op.cit., pp. vii-x.
- Walker, R.A. 'The transformation of urban structure in the 19th century and the beginnings of suburbanisation' in Cox, K. ed., 1978, op.cit., pp. 165-212.
- Walker, R.A. 'A theory of suburbanisation: capitalism and the construction of urban space in the United States' in Dear, M. & Scott, A.J. eds, 1981, op.cit., pp. 383-430.
- Wallerstein, I. The Modern World System, Academic Press, London & New York, 1974.
- Wallerstein, I. 'The three stages of African involvement in the world economy' in Gutkind, P.C.W. & Wallerstein, I. eds, The Political Economy of Contemporary Africa, Sage, London, 1976, pp. 30-52.
- Wallerstein, I. The Capitalist World-Economy, Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Walton, J. The Blackpool Landlady, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1978.
- Walton, J. The English Seaside Resort. A Social History 1750-1914, Leicester University Press, 1983 (in press).
- Walvin, J. Beside the Sea, Allen Lane, London, 1977
- Ward, C. Housing. An anarchist approach, Freedom Press, London, 1976.
- Weber, A.F. The Growth of Cities in the Nineteenth Century, Cornell University Press, New York, 1967 (first published, 1899).
- Whiffen, M. American Architecture since 1780, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1969.
- Williams, E. Capitalism and Slavery, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1944.
- Williams, G.ed. Nigeria. Economy and Society, London, 1976.

- Williams, R. The Country and the City, Chatto & Windus, London, 1973.
- Winter, R. The California Bungalow, Hennessey & Ingalls, Los Angeles, 1980.
- Wright, G.W. Moralism and the Model Home. Domestic architecture and culture conflict in Chicago, 1873-1913, University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- World Bank World Development Report, 1981, World Bank, Washington, D.C., 1981.

D. General Works of Reference: articles and papers.

- Aitken, M. & Castells, M. 'New trends in urban studies', Comparative Urban Research 4: 2 & 3, 1977, pp. 7-10.
- Archer, M. 'The Daniells in India and their influence on British Architecture', RIBA Journal 67:11, 1960, pp. 439-44.
- Archer, M. 'India revealed. Sketches by the Daniells', Apollo, November 1962, pp. 689-92.
- Archer, M. 'Aspects of classicism in India; Georgian buildings in Calcutta', Country Life 132, 1966.
- Archer, M. 'Georgian splendour in South India', Country Life 130, 1964, pp. 728-31.
- Armstrong, W. 'New Zealand: imperialism, class and uneven development', Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology 14:2, 1979, pp. 297-303.
- Aronson, D.R. 'Capitalism and culture in Ibadan urban development', Urban Anthropology 7:3, 1978, pp. 253-70.
- Banham, R., Barker, P., Hall, P., Price, C. 'Non-plan. An experiment in freedom', New Society, 20th March, 1969.
- Cain, P.J. & Hopkins, A.G. 'The political economy of British expansion overseas, 1750-1914', The Economic History Review 33:4, 1980, pp. 463-90.
- Chase, L. 'Eden in the orange groves. Bungalows and court houses of Los Angeles', Landscape 25:3, 1981, pp. 29-36.
- Checkoway, B. 'Large builders, federal housing programmes and postwar suburbanisation', International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 4:1, 1980, pp. 21-45.
- Cloher, D.U. 'A perspective on Australian urbanisation' in Powell, J.M. & Williams, M., Australian Space: Australian Time. Geographic Perspectives, Oxford University Press, London, 1975, pp. 104-49.
- Cooney, E.W. 'Capital exports and investment in Britain and the USA, 1856-1914', Economica NS 16, 1949, pp. 347-56.

- Cowburn, W. 'Popular housing', Arena. Journal of the Architectural Association, Sept-Oct., 1966.
- Crook, P. 'Sample survey of Yoruba rural building', Odu 2:2, 1966, pp. 41-71.
- Davison, G. 'Australian urban history: a progress report', Urban History Yearbook, Leicester University Press, 1979, pp. 100-9.
- Denoon, D. 'Understanding settler societies', Historical Studies 18:73, 1979, pp. 511-27.
- Desmond, R. 'Photography in India during the nineteenth century' in India Office Library, Report for the Year 1974, HMSO, London, 1976.
- Dingle A.E. & Merret, D.T. 'Home owners and tenants in Melbourne, 1891-1911', Australian Economic History Review 12:1, 1972.
- Friedlander, D. 'Internal Migration in England and Wales', Population Studies 19, 1966.
- Furedy, C. 'The development of modern elite retailing in Calcutta, 1890-1920', Indian Economic and Social History Review 16:4, 1979.
- Garnier, A. 'La maison individuelle en Suisse et dans le canton de Vaud', Ingenieurs et Architectes Suisses, 20th August, 1981, pp. 273-9.
- Gubler, J. 'Architecture and colonialism: a historical safari', Lotus International 26, 1980, pp. 5-19.
- Harper, R. 'The conflict between English building regulations and architectural design', Journal of Architectural Research 6:1, 1977, pp. 24-33.
- Harvey, D. 'The urban process under capitalism: a framework for analysis', International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 2:1, 1978, pp. 101-31.
- Home, R.K. 'Town planning and indirect rule in colonial Nigeria: A form of apartheid', Third World Planning Review (in press).
- Hopkins, A.G. 'Property rights and empire building. Britain's annexation of Lagos, 1861', Journal of Economic History 40:4, 1980, pp. 777-98.
- Jahoda, G. 'Aspects of westernisation. A study of adult class students in Ghana', British Journal of Sociology 12:4, 1961, pp. 375-86.
- King, A.D. 'The Bungalow. The development and diffusion of a house-type' and 'Social process and urban form: the bungalow as an indicator of social trends', Architectural Association Quarterly 5:3 & 5:4, 1973, pp. 4-26 & pp. 4-21.
- King, A.D. 'The westernisation of domestic architecture in India: some preliminary considerations' and 'The Bengali peasant hut: some 19th century accounts', Art and Archaeology Research Papers, 11 and 12, 1977, pp. 32-41 and 70-8.

- King, A.D. 'Historical patterns of reaction to urbanism: the case of Britain, 1880-1939', International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 4:4, 1980, pp. 453-69.
- King, A.D. 'Colonial architecture and urban development: is there a future for the past', Lotus International 1982 (in press).
- Lancaster, C. 'The American Bungalow', The Art Bulletin 40:3, 1958, pp. 239-53.
- Mabugane, B. 'A critical look at indices used in the study of social change in colonial Africa', Current Anthropology 12:4-5, 1971, pp. 419-44.
- Martinotti, G. 'Deurbanisation and villagisation: Introduction', International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 4:4, 1980, p. xii.
- Mullins, P. 'Theoretical perspectives on Australian urbanisation. I. Material components in the reproduction of Australian labour power', Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology 17:1, 1981, pp. 65-76.
- Murphy, P.A. 'Second homes in New South Wales', Australian Geographer 13, 1977, pp. 310-17.
- Murphy, P.A. 'Residential resort land in New South Wales', Australian Geographical Studies 14, 1976, pp. 103-15.
- Neild, S. 'Colonial urbanism: the development of Madras City in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries', Modern Asian Studies 13:2, 1979, pp. 217-46.
- Onokerhoraya, A.G. 'The evolution and spatial structure of house types in the traditional Nigerian city: a Benin example', The Journal of Tropical Geography 45, 1977, pp. 34-42.
- Ragatz, R. 'Vacation housing. A missing component in urban and regional theory', Land Economics 46:2, 1970, pp. 118-26.
- Saul, S.B. 'House building in England, 1890-1914', Economic History Review 15:1, 1962, pp. 119-37.
- Slater, T.R. 'Family, society and the ornamental villa on the fringes of English country towns', Journal of Historical Geography 4:2, 1978, pp. 129-44.
- Summer, R. 'The tropical bungalow: the search for an indigenous Australian architecture', Australian Journal of Art 1, 1978, pp. 27-40.
- Summer, R. & Oliver, J. 'Early North Queensland housing as a response to environment', Australian Geographer 14, 1978, pp. 14-21.
- Ward, C. 'Lost freedoms in housing', New Society, 12th May, 1977, pp. 271-4.
- Ward, C. 'The Essex plotlands', Fourteenth Burrows Lecture, University of Essex, February 1980. Typescript.

- Willmott, P. 'Support for suburbia', Times Higher Education Supplement, 12 March, 1982, p.13.
- Winter, R. 'The Arts and Crafts as a Social Movement', Record of the Art Museum, Princeton University, 34:2, 1975, pp. 36-40.

Unpublished material

- Freestone, R. 'Australian responses to the Garden City idea'. Paper presented to Section 21 (Geographical Sciences), 51st ANZAAS Congress, Brisbane, 1981.
- Hambidge, H. Westgate-on-Sea, 1909-69. H.Hambidge, 39, Linksfield Road, Westgate-on-Sea. Typescript.
- Holdsworth, D.W. 'House and home in Vancouver: the evolution of a West Coast urban landscape, 1886-1929', PhD thesis, University of British Columbia, 1981.
- Tarapor, M. 'Art education in Imperial India: The Indian Schools of Art', Paper presented to the Seventh European Conference on South Asian Studies, SOAS, University of London, 1981.
- Peace, S. 'The balance of residential life: a study in 100 Old People's Homes'. Paper presented to the British Sociology Association Study Group on Sociology and the Physical-Spatial Environment meeting, February, 1982.
- Sloane, J.V.N. 'The development of the urban and social structure of Bournemouth, 1840-1940', PhD thesis, University of Surrey, 1978.
- Ward, C. 'The Essex plotlands', Fourteenth Burrows Lecture, University of Essex, February, 1980. Typescript.
- Whyman, J. 'Kentish resorts before 1900', University of Kent, Department of History, 1972. Mimeo.
- Wolfe, R. Recreational land use in Ontario, PhD thesis, University of Toronto, 1956.

D. Primary Sources

- Abercrombie, P. The Preservation of Rural England, University of Liverpool Press & Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1926.
- Abercrombie, P. Town and Country Planning, Oxford University Press, London, 1933.
- Acquah, I. Accra Survey, University of London, London, 1958.
- Adshead, S.D. Town Planning and Town Development, Methuen, London, 1923.
- Aitken, E.H. Behind the Bungalow, Thacker & Co., London, 1889 (later editions, 1897, 1904, 1907)

- Allbridge, T.A. A Transformed Colony, Sierra Leone, as it was and as it is. Seeley & Sons, London, 1910.
- Allen, G. The Cheap Cottage and Small House, Batsford, London, 1919.
- Anon. The Indian Vocabulary, John Stockdale, London, 1788.
- Atkinson, G.F. Curry and Rice (on forty plates) or The Ingredients of Social Life at 'Our' Station in India, Day, London, 1859.
- Australian Council of National Trusts
The Historic Buildings of Norfolk Islands, ACNT, 1971
- Bartell, W. Hints for Picturesque Improvements in Ornamental Cottages, etc. J. Taylor, London, 1804.
- Betting, W. & Vriend, J.J. Bungalows. Deutschland, England, Italien, Holland, Belgien, Danemark, Die Planung Verlag, Muller-Wellborn, Darmstadt, 1958.
- Binstead, A.M. Gal's Gossip. T. Werner Laurie, London, 1899.
- Blakiston, J. Twelve Years' Military Adventures in Threequarters of the Globe, 2 vols., Henry Colburn, London, 1829.
- Blanchard, S.L. Yesterday and Today in India, W.H. Allen, London, 1867.
Book of Australian Bungalows, Sydney, n.d. c1925.
- Booth, J.D. ed. The Works of A.M. Binstead, T. Werner Laurie, London, 1927.
- Boumphrey, G. Town and Country Tomorrow, Nelson, London, 1940.
- Bourne, G. Change in the Village, London, Duckworth, 1912.
- Briggs, M. How to Plan Your House, English University Press, London, 1937.
- Briggs, R.A. Bungalows and Country Residences, Batsford, London, 1891 (later editions, 1894, 1895, 1897, 1901).
- Brown, H. The Sahibs. The Life and Ways of the British in India, Hodge, London, 1948.
- Brunner, A.W. Cottages, or Hints on Economical Building, Comstock, New York, 1884.
- Buchanan, F. The History, Antiquities, Topography and Statistics of East India, 3 vols, W.H. Allen, London, 1838.
California Ready-Cut Bungalows, Los Angeles, c. 1915
- Carpenter, E. The Simplification of Life, Treherne, London, 1905.
- Carter, E. Seaside Houses and Bungalows, Country Life, London, 1937.
- Chambers, W.I. Bungalows, Crypt House Press, Gloucester, 1924.
- Colonial Office, Africa (West)
Correspondence respecting the design of Bungalows provided for Government officials in West Africa (April 1906-January 1909), Colonial Office, London, 1909.

- Comstock, W.T. Bungalows, Camps and Mountain Homes, Comstock, New York, 1908.
- Council for the Preservation of Rural England (CPRE)
The Thames Valley from Cricklade to Staines, University of London Press, 1929.
- CPRE The Peak District. Its scenery, disfigurement and preservation. CPRE, Sheffield, 1932.
- CPRE Ryedale. A Report, CPRE, London, 1934.
- CPRE The Penn Country of Buckinghamshire, CPRE, London, 1933.
- CPRE Wirral Countryside. University of Liverpool Press, London,
- The Country Gentleman The Book of the Cheap Cottages Exhibition. Country Gentleman and Land & Water Co., London, 1905.
- Country Gentleman's Association
Artistic Country Buildings, CGA, London, c1912.
- Country Houses Country Houses and Bungalows, Northwester Properties, London, 1912.
- Cunningham, P. Two Years in New South Wales, Henry Colbourn, London, 1827.
- Daily Mail Daily Mail Bungalow Book, Daily Mail, London, 1922
(continued, with intervals, up to the present)
- Design and Industries Association
The Face of the Land. Year book of the DIA, Allen & Unwin, 1930.
- Dictionary of Daily Wants, Houlston & Sons, London, 1859.
- Dougill, W. The English Coast. Its development and preservation, CPRE, London, 1936.
- East Africa Protectorate, Kenya Province
Memoranda for Provincial and District Commissioners.
Nairobi, Government Printer, 1910.
- Elsam, R. An Essay on Rural Architecture, for author, London, 1803.
- 'Economist' The Ideal Bungalow. How to build it well and at lowest cost and pay for it in a few years as rent. Eligible for the Government subsidy, Simpkin Marshall, London, 1927.
- Edwards, A.E. The Design of Suburbia. A critical study in environmental history, Pembrige Press, London, 1981.
- Fennel, C.A.M. The Stanford Dictionary of Anglicised Words & Phrases, Cambridge University Press, London, 1892.
- Foster, W. The English Factors in India, 1655-60. Clarendon Press, 1921
- Fryer, J. A New Account of East India and Persia, 1672-81. Hakluyt Society, London, 1909.

- Fuller, B. The Empire of India, Pitman, London, 1913.
- Gillion, K.L. Ahmedabad. A Study in Indian Urban History, University of California, Berkeley, 1968.
- Gissing, G. The Whirlpool. Watergate Classics, London, 1948 (first published, 1897)
- Government of India (Consulting Architect)
Annual Reports on Architectural Work in India for the Years 1909-1916. Superintendent, Government Printing, Calcutta, 1910 -
- Grant, C. Anglo-Indian Domestic Life, Thacker & Spink, Calcutta, 1849.
- Grant, C. Rural Life in Bengal, Thacker & Spink, Calcutta, 1859
- Granville, A.B. The Spas of England and Principal Sea-bathing Places, 3 vols, Henry Colbourn, London, 1841.
- Hamilton, A. A New Account of the East Indies, 2 vols, London, 1744.
- Harrison, P.T. Bungalow Residences, Crosby Lockwood, London, 1909.
- Hastings, A. Weekend Houses, Cottages and Bungalows, Architectural Press, London, 1939.
- Heber, R. Narrative of a Journey, etc. 2 vols, J Murray, London, 1828.
- Hodges, W. Travels in India during the Years 1780-3, J. Edwards, London, 1793.
- Hodson, F.T. Practical Bungalows for Town and Country, F. Drake, Chicago, 1906 (later editions 1912, 1916)
- 'Home Counties' Country Cottages. How to build, buy and fit them up, Heinemann, London, 1905. (later edition, 1910)
- Ikramulla, Begum Shaista
From Purdah to Parliament. The Cresset Press, London, 1963
- James, L.H. Modern Bungalows, Practical Building Company, London, 1935.
- Jeffreys, J. The British Army in India. Its preservation by an appropriate clothing, housing, location, recreative employment and hopeful encouragement of the troops, Longman, Brown, Green, London, 1858.
- Jennings, A.S. The House Beautiful. A practical guide to the artistic decoration and furnishing of moderate-sized homes, etc. Greening, London, 1908.
- Joad, C.E.M. The Horrors of the Countryside, Hogarth Press, London, 1931.
- Keeley, C.J.H. Bungalows and Modern Homes, Batsford, London, 1927.
- Kingsley, M. Travels in West Africa, Macmillan, London, 1895.
- Kirke-Greene, A.H.M. Lugard and the Amalgamation of Nigeria, Frank Cass, London, 1968.

- Lakeman, A. Concrete Cottages, Bungalows and Garages, Concrete Association, London, 1918 (later editions, 1924, 1932, 1949)
- Leavis, F.R. & Thompson, D. Culture and Environment. The training of critical awareness, Chatto & Windus, London, 1933.
- Lent, F.T. Summer Homes and Camps, Boston, F.T. Lent, 1899.
- Lewin, T.H. ed The Lewin Letters, 1756-1884. A selection from the correspondence and diaries of an English family, Constable, London, 1909.
- Llewellyn Jones, R. 'The city of Lucknow before 1856' in Ballhatchet & Harrison, 1980, op.cit., pp. 88-128.
- Lockyer, C. An Account of the Trade in India, S. Crouch, London, 1711.
- Lugard, F.D. Political Memoranda. Revision of instructions to political officers on subjects chiefly political and administrative, 1913-18. Frank Cass, London, 1970 (earlier editions, 1906, 1919).
- Lugard, F. The Dual Mandate in Tropical Africa, Frank Cass, London, 1965 (first edition, 1922).
- Masterman, C.F.G. The Condition of England, Methuen, London, 1908.
- Mayhew, A. Birchington and its Bungalows, Canterbury, 1881.
- Mayhew, A. The Chronicles of Westgate-on-Sea, Canterbury, 1882.
- Meadows, S.D. Modern Eastern Bungalows, Thackers Press, Calcutta, 1931.
- Miller, F. The Training of a Craftsman, Virtue, London, 1901.
- Moffit, P. The Australian Verandah, Ure Smith, Sydney, 1976.
- Morton, F.A. The Simple Life on Four Acres, Werner Laurie, London, 1906.
- Murphy, A. The Upholsterer, or What News? A Farce, in two acts. P. Vaillant, London, 1758.
- Murray, J. How to Live in Tropical Africa, Murray, London, 1895.
- Murray, J.A.H. A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1888 (subsequently, Oxford English Dictionary, all later editions and supplements).
- Padfield, J.E. The Hindu at Home, Simpkin, Marshall, London, 1896.
- Papworth, J.B. Rural Residences, etc. Ackerman, London, 1818.
- Parkes, F. Wanderings of a Pilgrim in Search of the Picturesque, Pelham Richardson, London, 1850.
- Parliamentary Debates. House of Commons, Official Reports (abbreviated as 'Hansard').
- Peacehaven Estates Peacehaven. The land of sunshine and health. London, c.1927.

- Perks, S. Residential Flats, Batsford, London, 1905.
- Phillips, G.W. New Zealand Homes and Bungalows, Christchurch, 1912.
- Phillips, R.R. The Book of Bungalows, Country Life, London, 1920 (later editions, 1922, 1926).
- Philpott, H.B. Modern Houses and Bungalows, Illustrated Carpenter and Builder, London, 1930.
- Plaw, J, Sketches for Country Houses, Villas and Rural Dwellings, Taylor, London, 1800.
- Pott, J, Old Bungalows in Bangalore, privately printed, London, 1977.
- Price, C.M. The Practical Book of Architecture, Lippincott, Philadelphia and London, 1916.
- Nanda, B.R. The Nehrus. Motilal and Jawaharlal, Allen & Unwin, London, 1965.
- Oursler, C.F. The Bungalow on the Roof, Mystery League, New York, 1931.
- Radford, W. Radford's Artistic Bungalows. The Radford Architectural Bungalow Company, Chicago & New York, 1908.
- A Retired Officer of the Hon. East India Company
The Friend of Australia. Hurst Chance, London, 1830.
- Rodenwaldt, E. Tropenhygien, Enke, Stuttgart, 1938.
- Rossetti, W.M. Dante Gabriel Rossetti. His family letters, Ellis & Elvey, London, 1895. 2 vols.
- Rossetti, W.M. Some Reminiscences, Brown Langham, London, 1906.
- Russell, W.H. My Diary in India in the Year 1859-60, 2 vols. Routledge, Warne & Routledge, London, 1860.
- Samson, G.C. Houses, Villas, Cottages and Bungalows for Britishers and Americans Abroad, Crosby Lockwood, London, 1910 (later edition, 1920).
- Saylor, H.M. Bungalows. Their design, construction and furnishing, Grant Richards, New York, 1912.
- Schemerhorn, C. 'Planning the bungalow', in Comstock, 1908, op.cit. pp.15-22.
- Scott, L. 'Preservation of the countryside', in Betham, E. ed., House Building, 1934-6, Federated Employers Press, Ltd, 1936.
- Sharp. T. Town and Countryside. Some aspects of urban and rural development, Oxford University Press, London, 1932.
- Shaw, R.Norman Sketches for Cottages and Other Buildings designed to be constructed in patent Cement Slab System. W.H.Lascelles, London, 1878.
- Sheail, J. Rural Conservation in Inter-war Britain, Oxford University Press, London, 1981.

- Social Trends, HMSO, London, 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981.
- Steingraber, E. Der Bungalow. Gunther Neske, Bullingen, 1967.
- Sullivan, E. The Bungalow and the Tent, or a visit to Ceylon, London, 1854.
- Sutcliffe, G. ed. The Principles and Practice of Modern House Construction, Blackie, London, 1898.
- 'Taffrail' The Lonely Bungalow, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1931 (reprinted 1931, 1932, 1934, 1934, 1936, 1940)
- Tandon, P. Punjabi Century, 1857-1947. Chatto & Windus, London, 1961.
- Tanner, H. & Cox, P. Restoring Old Australian Houses and Buildings, Macmillan of Australia, 1975.
- Temple, R.C. ed. The Diaries of Streynsham Master, 1675-80. 2 vols. John Murray, London, 1911.
- Tennant, W. Indian Recreations; consisting chiefly of strictures of the domestic and rural economy of the Mahomedans and Hindoos, 2 vols. C. Stewart, Edinburgh, 1803-4.
- Thompson, S. Health Resorts and How to Profit from Them, Warner, London, 1860.
- Thompson, W.H. Cornwall. Survey of its coast, etc. for CPRE. University of London Press, London, 1930.
- Trevelyan, G. Cawnpore. Macmillan, London, 1894.
- Twopeny, R. Town Life in Australia, Elliot Stock, London, 1882.
- Walter, F. Fifty Modern Bungalows, Architectural Press, London, 1959.
- Walton, H. How to Build Your Cabin or Modern Vacation House, Barnes and Noble, New York, 1964.
- Ward, W. A View of the History, Literature, and Religion of the Hindoos, including a minute description of their manners and customs, etc. 2 vols. Black, Parbury & Allen, London, 1817.
- Weale, J. Designs and Examples of Cottages, Villas and Country Houses, J. Weale, London, 1857.
- Weaver, L. Cottages. Their planning, design and materials. Country Life, London, 1926.
- Wells, H.G. In the Days of the Comet, Macmillan, London, 1906.
- West Pakistan, Government of. Design of 'A' Class Bungalows and Houses for Satellite Towns, Punjab Public Works Department, Superintendent, Government Printing, Lahore, 1956.
- White, C.E. The Bungalow Book, Macmillan, New York, 1923.
- Williams-Ellis, C. ed. England and the Octopus, G. Bles, London, 1928.

- Williams-Ellis, Britain and the Beast, Readers' Union, London, 1938.
C. ed.
- Williamson, T. The East India Vade Mecum, 2 vols. Black, Parry, London, 1810
- Wilson, E. Healthy Skin, J. Churchill, London, 1876.
- Wilson, H.L. The Bungalow Book. A short sketch of the evolution of the bungalow from its primitive crudeness to its present state of artistic beauty and cozy convenience etc. Wilson, Chicago, 1910.
- Wrightson, P.ed The English Picturesque Villa and Cottage, 1760-1860.
Indianapolis Museum of Art, Indianapolis, 1973.
- Wrightson, P. The Small English House, Catalogue 5, Weinreb, London, 1977.
- Woodruff, P. The Men who Ruled India. 2 vols. Johnathon Cape, London, 1965.
- Vansittart, J. From Minnie, with Love. The Letters of a Victorian Lady, 1849-61. Peter Davies, London, 1974.
- Vant, S. Bungalows, Pavilions and Cottages. How to build and adapt them. Frederick Warne, London, 1929.
- Yoho, J. The Craftsman Bungalow Book, Puget Sound News, Seattle, 1913.
- Yule, H. & Burnell, A.C. Hobson-Jobson. A Glossary of Colloquial Anglo-Indian Words and Phrases. John Murray, London, 1903.

Primary sources: articles

- Adams, H.L. 'Railway carriages as houses', The Harmsworth Magazine, Extract, Pamphlet Box, Brighton Public Library, c.1910-15.
- Archer, M. 'Sir Charles D'Oyly and his drawings in India', Appollo, November, 1962, pp. 173-81.
- 'Ballad of the Bungalow', Architect and Engineer (USA), 36, 1914, p. 8.
- 'Some California bungalows', Architectural Record, 18, September, 1905, pp. 217-23.
- 'The California Bungalow', Architectural Record, 19, May, 1906, pp. 394-5.
- 'The bungalow at its best', Architectural Record, 20, Oct 1906, pp. 297-305.
- 'What is a bungalow?', Arts and Decoration, 1, 12, October, 1911, p. 487.
- Atkinson, G.A. 'Jobbing builders or self help for African housing', Journal of African Administration, 3:1, 1961, pp. 46-9.
- Audsley, G.A. 'The American bungalow', Building News, May 24, 1912, pp. 725-6.

- Briggs, R.A. 'Bungalows', The Studio, 3, 1894, pp. 20-6.
- Cheer, J.S. 'Bungalow development', Journal of the Town Planning Institute, 45, 2 January, 1959, pp. 43-6.
- Darby, M. 'The first bungalows', Country Life, 3 August, 1978, pp. 306-9.
- Clark, G.A. 'Bungalow architecture from a layman's point of view', The House Beautiful, 24, 1908, pp. 16-7.
- 'How to build a Bungalow', Craftsman, 5, 1903, p. 253.
- 'A Forest Bungalow', Craftsman, 6, 1904, p. 305.
- 'A Hillside Bungalow', Craftsman, 7, 1905, p. 391.
- 'The Bungalow. Its possibilities as a permanent home', Craftsman, 8, 1906, pp. 859-63.
- 'An 800 dollar Bungalow', Craftsman, 9, 1907, p. 393.
- David, A.C. 'An architect of bungalows in California', Architectural Record, 20, 1906, pp. 307-15.
- Dickens, P. 'A disgusting blot on the landscape', New Society, 17 July, 1975, pp. 127-9.
- Fawcett, W. 'Bungalows in Southern California', Architects and Builders Magazine, 38, July, 1906, p. 419.
- Girouard, M. 'Days of Victorian Glory, Cromer', Country Life, 26 August, 1971, pp. 502-5.
- Hodson, F.T. 'The California Bungalow', Architectural Record, 19, 1906, pp. 394-5.
- Keith, H.P. 'What to put in a bungalow', Keith's Beautiful Homes Magazine, 33, 1915, p. 17.
- Kipling, J.L. 'The origin of the bungalow', Country Life in America, 19:8, 1911, pp. 308-10.
- Koch, F.J. 'In search of bungalows: what we found', House and Garden, 13, 1918, pp. 9-11.
- Kubler, G. 'The machine for living in eighteenth century West Africa', Journal of the American Society of Architectural Historians, 4:1, 1944, pp. 30-2.
- Lazear, M.H. 'The evolution of the bungalow in California', Indoors and Out, 4:1, 1907, pp. 7-12.
- Locke, S.E. 'Bungalows; what they really are, the frequent misapplication of the name', House and Garden 12:2, 1907, pp. 45-53.

- Renbourn, E.T. 'Seasoning fluxes and fevers of acclimatisation. An introduction to the history of tropical adaptation', The Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene, 66:8, 1963, pp. 193-203.
- Rice, A. 'The Heyday of Bungalow Town', Country Life, 19 April, 1973, pp. 1099-1100.
- Thompson, L.D. 'The Rampant Craze for the Bungle-Oh', Country Life in America, 22:6, 1912, pp. 20-1.
- Smith, T.R. 'On buildings for European occupation in tropical climates, especially India', Proceedings of the Royal Institute of British Architects, 1868-9, 1st series, p. 18.
- Street-Porter, T. 'A chalet by the sea', Observer Magazine, 15 June, 1975.
- Webb, W. 'Why bungalows are so popular', Keith's Beautiful Homes Magazine, 33, 1915.

Other primary sources

In addition to the above, many other building and architectural books and journals have been consulted, particularly those listed in the comprehensive catalogue on 'The Small English House' (1977) by Wrightson, which contains over 650 entries. Particular attention has been paid to titles in the 1780-1840 and 1830-1900 sections. Newspapers, exhibition catalogues and other ephemera have proved useful. Picture postcards published from 1901 onwards are a particularly valuable source of data.