

an architectural dynasty in Manchester and Salford on the back of the Co-op, Smith going on to become Mayor of Eccles.

Ultimately, however, the professional growth of its in-house architectural expertise — with a head office in Manchester and branches in Newcastle, London and Cardiff — won the day. A Co-op magazine in the 1930s sought to shame reluctant societies into employing them by triumphantly asserting that the majority ‘no longer entrust their professional work to folks with capitalistic association and individualistic notions. We have our own architects.’

Published by Historic England (now an imprint of Liverpool University Press), the book covers the often labyrinthine history of the Co-operative movement from its origins to the present day, supported by a wealth of archival and contemporary illustrations, three useful appendices and a selective bibliography. The buildings are meticulously woven into this sometimes dense narrative, clearly based on considerable original research. Pearson has produced an expansive, chronologically arranged historical survey, broken down by broad building types (retail and industrial), then further subdivided, and as a general survey it is unlikely ever to be bettered. Methodologically it is an uneasy mixture of historical geography, architectural history and industrial archaeology, but the subject probably necessitates such a broad-brush approach. It is disappointing that the author does not go further into the politics of the Co-operative movement and its affinities with the labour and trade union movements, given their crucial importance; and that avenues such as the design of Co-op housing, or the suggestion that expressionist architecture flourished best where direct labour was available, are not pursued with more vigour.

However, this is a vast subject, and the Co-op was so all-encompassing in its ‘cradle to grave’ provision that the only way to cover everything would be through a comprehensive online catalogue such as Julian Osley’s on British Post Office architecture. Given the ubiquity of the Co-op, it is probably post offices that are its closest relative of ‘everyday architecture’, both in terms of numbers, complexity and technical ambition. Other comparators must lie in other branches of the Office of Works, perhaps the private railway companies, and local authority architects’ departments.

Whether pursuing individual societies, buildings or architects, Pearson’s book must be welcomed as the starting point for all future researchers. To unravel such a complex subject is almost as heroic an undertaking as the Co-operative movement itself.

Juliet Dunmur, *Edward Maufe: Architect and Cathedral Builder* (Bury, Greater Manchester: Moyhill, 2019), 353 pp. incl. 28 colour and 54 b&w ills, ISBN 9781905597925, £20
doi:10.1017/arh.2021.26

Reviewed by DAVID FRAZER LEWIS

Edward Maufe is presented as a somewhat flat character in most existing histories of British architecture. Although he appears from time to time as the capable designer of

Guildford Cathedral, with a stylish artistic vision and a predilection for blue ceilings, his gentlemanly reticence makes his place in the broader picture unclear. His wife Prudence, a pioneering interior decorator and one of the creative powerhouses behind the interwar revival of Heal's, is seldom mentioned at all. Juliet Dunmur's new biography rectifies this. Husband and wife emerge from the book as round characters.

Dunmur's writing is engaging and straightforward, with much reference to family letters, to which she has access as the architect's granddaughter. The book is organised chronologically. If much of the content is biographical and personal, in a sense the influence of the Maufes on British design was largely personal: Dunmur shows how they were tightly woven into a colourful network of British artists and architects between 1910 and 1950. Like Jane Brown in *Lutyens and the Edwardians*, Dunmur takes the position that the personalities and friendships of architects give insight into the nature of their work.

Edward Maufe (pronounced Morf) admired and emulated Edwin Lutyens, but lacked his budgets; he was friends with Oliver Hill and Clough Williams-Ellis, but was less playful and more serious in his pursuit of the avant-garde. The Maufes thought of themselves as aesthetic modernists. They were on good terms with Maxwell Fry and Serge Chermayeff, and artist friends included William Nicholson and Hannah Gluckstein. Even the elusive Foreign Architectural Books Society — an exclusive book club made up of leading architects — appears in Dunmur's narrative, illustrated by a snapshot from one of their meetings in the Maufe family garden.

Edward Maufe designed Guildford Cathedral and churches that channel the Scandinavian spirit more directly than any other British architecture of his era. His delight in Scandinavian classicism was largely thanks to the influence of Prudence, who had an enthusiasm for Scandinavian simplicity and bold colour. Prudence was eventually chosen to represent the UK at the 1930 Stockholm exhibition because of the strong Scandinavian flavour of her work. Having studied art in Paris and woodcarving at the Royal College of Art in London, she made a place for herself in the emerging field of interior design, becoming an influential tastemaker through her curation of the Mansard Gallery and Show Flat at Heal's on Tottenham Court Road. As a trusted design partner of Ambrose Heal, she helped to bring the austere barrel-vaulted gallery alive with shows of bright posters by Claude Lovat Fraser and London Transport, as well as studio pottery and hand-blown glass. She also collaborated closely in the creative endeavours of her husband. Dunmur calls them 'an early power couple'.

A surprise that emerges from the book is how often Edward Maufe ended up contributing his own money towards his projects because of budget shortfalls: he sometimes donated his services, gave sculpture and other ornament when the client could not afford it, and, in the case of Guildford Cathedral, paid the salary of a fundraiser for ten years so that there was enough money coming in for construction to continue uninterrupted. The Guildford project did not have the international attention and large budgets of Liverpool Cathedral.

Despite disappointment over limited budgets, Maufe seems seldom to have engendered friction with clients or committees. Perhaps the ease of his relationships was because Maufe was the most gentlemanly of gentleman architects. With an Oxford MA, he had the university education that Lutyens and Giles Gilbert Scott lacked. His country house was a significant part of his self-presentation. By contrast, Scott had emphatically

built his house in town, and Lutyens never owned the little white house that he dreamed of in the country.

Maufe's intense loyalty to Oxbridge and familiarity with its inner workings led to his becoming the leading voice in a school of clean-lined Scandinavian-inflected design that made up a large part of the universities' building in the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s. His works at Oxford and Cambridge include a new court at St John's College, Cambridge, a memorial room at Trinity College, Cambridge, and several works at St John's College, Oxford, including Dolphin Quad. The latter is still sought-after accommodation, largely thanks to Maufe's devotion to spacious sets.

The book is well produced with good illustrations. It is currently relatively easy to obtain, but has a limited print run; like Gavin Stamp's excellent *Architect of Promise* and Eitan Karol's *Charles Holden*, it may therefore be hard to find in future years.

Sam Wetherell, *Foundations: How the Built Environment Made Twentieth-Century Britain* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2020), 272 pp. incl. 43 b&w ills, ISBN 9780691193755, £30
doi:10.1017/arh.2021.27

Reviewed by ALISTAIR FAIR

Sam Wetherell's elegantly written new book examines the relationships between architecture, planning and politics in twentieth-century Britain. With a close focus on six case-study urban forms and building types, Wetherell explores how the built environment was implicated in the rise of a 'developmental social infrastructure' from the 1930s (especially in the 1950s and 1960s). He then explores the relationships between the reconfiguration of the built environment and neoliberal impulses from the late 1970s onwards.

The first type of urban space examined in *Foundations* is the industrial estate, not least the government-funded developments of the 1930s. These estates were intended to generate employment and to support industrial diversification and decentralisation at a time of economic crisis. For some planners, they offered a compelling vision of 'a new type of capitalism tamed by the state'. The reality was sometimes more prosaic, with disputes about such things as who was responsible for repainting and maintenance. Wetherell's discussion usefully adds to a growing literature (for example, the work of Elizabeth Darling, Jessica Kelly and Neal Shasore) which shows how the 1920s and 1930s generated a distinct set of policy concerns and architectural responses that should be seen on their own terms, rather than as the precursors of post-1945 developments.

If the 1930s industrial estate was intended to embody a new kind of economy, the post-war built environment was frequently shaped by a desire to create new, community-minded citizens. Wetherell explores shopping precincts (in particular post-war Coventry) and council housing (including Park Hill and Thamesmead). Much of this takes in relatively familiar territory, well known from the work of historians such