1910s: The bungalow from California to Australia

The California bungalows stand for emancipation in home building. They have been designed with no previous custom in mind … A delightful cosmopolitanism prevails about them—for while traditions for the most part have been left behind by the wayfaring Californian of to-day, yet unconsciously or subconsciously, there creeps into this unconventional western home a suggestion of the elements in a home he has loved best elsewhere.

In the bush bungalow the human condition to be met is the desire of the prospective owner to secure temporary release from some of the conventionalities of our social system; to live more simply … It is the super-conventionalities, the starched collar and the shoe polish, not the tooth-brush and the bath, from which he desires relief, and the plan problem is to find the line of demarcation between that which is worthwhile and that which is not …

The climatic and social conditions of the American Far West were closely parallel to those in Australia. It followed, then, that its houses should transplant well. They did.

One year after the announcement in Australia of the California gold discovery, a mason named Timothy (or William) Bushton out of Hobart, Van Diemen’s Land, erected a frame house on the corner of Munras Avenue and Webster Street in the old Hispanic capital of California, Monterey. Bushton and his family had endured a peripatetic voyage on the Elisabeth Starbuck to come to the new American state. He had brought along all of the timber from several pre-existing Hobart buildings—later identified in Monterey tourist labels as ‘Australian ironwood’—in the hold of the ship transporting him and his family. Each piece of timber was perfectly matched and Bushton put an entire twelve-room structure together without nails, simply mortised. Shortly after finishing the house, Bushton died. His widow married Thomas Allen, a prominent American settler in Monterey, and the house became known as the Allen House. According to later aggrandising accounts, the house was ‘the center of much of the romance of our early California history, [visited by] Sherman, Fremont, General Castro, Governor Pio Pico, Sloat, Larkin and many other eminent men’. Captions on prints produced for the tourist trade in the 1920s inaccurately claimed it was ‘the most photographed house in the world’.

The house gained additional romantic cachet in those early years when Australian tenants of the house—Mrs Allen had apparently been forced to take in renters—stashed
50,000 dollars in gold robbed from the Monterey Customs House under the Allen House stairway. By the 1910s, the house was a prominent tourist destination, advertised as one of the many ‘firsts’ in California so intently sought by American settlers trying to construct an Anglo–Saxon history for the region that would validate its connection to the rest of the nation and white, Protestant culture. The ironic fact that this supposed ‘first’ wooden-frame house was built out of Australian timber brought to California by ship ready-cut to be reassembled on the other side of the Pacific was not as significant to the American image-makers as was its palpable link to the Anglo–American architectural tradition of the frame house. In the early days of the twentieth century, much was made of this architectural style, presented in California as a contrast to the aesthetic of the surviving Hispanic adobes, about which the state’s new American establishment had ambivalent feelings.8

As Australia and California entered a new century, the importance of their Anglo–Saxon kinship would manifest itself most visibly in architectural form. Their English-speaking affinity coincided with an increasingly self-conscious nurturing of a Pacific Rim lifestyle that could somehow incorporate a Mediterranean aesthetic appropriate to their climatic conditions, at the same time representing their Anglo-Protestant heritage in the design of buildings, both domestic and public.

Politically, the twentieth century began auspiciously for both of these English-speaking countries on the edge of the Pacific Ocean. After nearly a decade of economic depression and spurred on by increasingly intense nationalist sentiments, the six separate Australian
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colonies became a political federation of states proclaimed as the Commonwealth of Australia on 1 January 1901—the first day of the new century. On that day, some 60,000 people gathered in Sydney’s Centennial Park to witness the ceremonial Proclamation of the Commonwealth of Australia, an event that took place in an ornate Victorian-style pavilion constructed in the park for the occasion. Similar celebrations took place throughout the country, even in those places still ambivalent about the benefits of Federation.

Perhaps symbolic of the hesitations many felt about Australia becoming a unified nation, the pavilion in Sydney was made of plaster-of-Paris over a wooden framework—in other words, ephemeral. The American-born cartoonist Hop, already familiar to Australians from his many illustrations in The Bulletin, captured this mood with his amusing portrayal of the first Prime Minister, the rather colourless ‘tosspot’ Edmund Barton (1849–1920), depicted as a dowdy mother holding her newborn unsteadily. The momentous deed had nonetheless been accomplished and Australia became the youngest of Western nations as the century started.

California was at the same time experiencing staggering population growth. By 1901, the increasing national importance of America’s Pacific coastline warranted the first visit by a sitting President. William McKinley (1843–1901)—the same man who had overseen expansion of American influence into the Philippines, Hawaii, Guam and other Pacific islands—arrived in California in May of that year to be greeted by enthusiastic crowds everywhere. Great throngs turned out especially in Los Angeles, a city that was then beginning its phenomenal transformation from a small Hispanic pueblo to a sprawling modern city. McKinley and his wife participated in the city’s most important civic event, the Fiesta de los Flores, a parade only recently concocted by the city’s merchants and political boosters. The parade was rife with emblematic expressions of Los Angeles’s desired place as part of the United States, in the West, and on the Pacific Ocean. President and Mrs McKinley rode in a flower-draped carriage to a podium. There they witnessed a carefully constructed procession of Southern Californian ethnicities, including a Chinese dragon; Mexican caballeros on horses bedecked in silver ornament; an assortment of Native Americans not necessarily of local tribal background; and beautiful young women from ‘good families’ dressed in white and surrounded by abundant floral arrangements grown in the Mediterranean climate for which Los Angeles was already acclaimed. Similar parades filled with floral symbols and patriotic banners celebrated the presidential visit in the northern part of the state, all meant to declare California’s participation in the expansion of American ideals into a new century and outward to the Pacific.

President McKinley’s successor was even more enthusiastic in his embrace of Pacific America. Theodore Roosevelt (1858–1919) would be the first true champion of the West, a figure who understood the region’s symbolic importance in the national psyche and its significance for future American ambitions in the Pacific. Roosevelt made one of his many visits to California in 1903, this time as the President rather than as the eager outdoorsman he had been on his earlier visits. His official gestures were rife with symbolism: he planted an orange tree in Riverside—birthplace of California’s navel orange industry—and a redwood tree in Santa Clara. He visited Yosemite where he met again with his old friend John Muir, who this time persuaded the President to establish the site as a federally controlled national park. He was feted throughout the state for his recognition of the West and for his sincere appreciation of the wonders of the Californian landscape.
Roosevelt was also aware of America’s increasing importance in the region beyond California’s western border. In Oakland, he gave a speech stating that ‘We must command the Pacific’—opinions that the Australian press reported with particular interest. As an expression of the United States’ growing naval might, the President in 1907 sent 16 American battleships throughout the Pacific and then around the world. This ‘Great White Fleet’ landed in Australia in August 1908, where it was greeted with elaborate fanfare for its representation of Anglo–Saxon hegemony on the seas.

The excitement generated by this event is evident in articles appearing in Art & Architecture, the journal of The Institute of Architects of New South Wales, which proudly published illustrations of the pavilion designed for the occasion by Walter Liberty Vernon (1846–1914), then government architect for the state.

The early years of the twentieth century, then, were for both regions a time of deliberate focus on their Pacific locations as distinct geographical and cultural entities. In Australia, this identity was framed in the context of a new Anglo–Saxon nation within the British Empire situated in the Pacific Ocean, and thereby a representative of imperial interests within that region and in relation to Asia to its north. In a similarly self-conscious attitude, California increasingly presented itself to the rest of the United States and the world as the ‘Gateway to the Pacific’ for an emerging American Empire, aware of its position as the westernmost American state with an enormous coastline facing out to Hawaii, Asia and the South Pacific.
Greater public consciousness about the Pacific region and the possibilities for trade with Asia and other Pacific nations led to the establishment of increasingly regular and frequent shipping lines between the American West Coast and the Southern Hemisphere. While steamship lines had operated for passenger and mail service from the 1860s out of San Francisco and Vancouver, Canada, to and from New Zealand and Australia, financial crises and competition dogged many of the lines well into the 1890s and ease of passenger travel was often played down. Advertisements for journeys to the South Pacific in this period still made the venture appear arduous and a bit uncertain for travellers.

This situation improved significantly by the early years of the twentieth century. Passenger travel to the South Pacific until World War I and then into the 1920s was as convenient and well-organised as it would ever be. Firms such as the Oceanic Steamship Company operated the American and Australian Line in conjunction with American and Canadian railroad companies. The purpose of such concerns was to provide regular and well-established transportation between Australia and the United States and Canada, and thereby on to England and Europe. Their brochures included advertisements that emphasised speed and experience. In one from 1904, a globe-headed figure appears above the statement ‘Pacific Meditation: Experienced Travellers Say That This is the Best Way’—meaning that the trip ‘home’ to the Old World was best accomplished by the Pacific route and then across the American continent. The ‘E. & A.’—the Eastern & Australian Steam Ship Company out of Brisbane and Sydney—produced an elaborate handbook in 1904, festooned with breezy illustrations of a smiling Japanese woman in kimono holding a parasol, while an Australian woman upholds the E. & A. maritime flag in an ornamental roundel above a ship passing through Sydney Heads on out to sea. The handbook’s text, which served as a guidebook to the exotic ports of call ‘via China and Japan, Canada and The United States’, focused on the traveller’s comfort and extolled the ‘beautiful scenery’ on a ‘smooth-water voyage’.20

In the same year, the California magazine Sunset included a full-page advertisement promoting the fledgling port city of San Diego, boldly entitled ‘Westward The Course of Empire Takes its Way’. The illustration depicts the Pacific shipping lines that converge on San Diego, ‘The City of Destiny, The Gateway to the Orient’. New Zealand and Australia figure prominently in the ad, with a direct shipping line from the South Pacific to San Diego dotted across the ocean. In the 1903 volume of Sunset that announced the opening of the first ‘Commercial Pacific Cable between San Francisco, Honolulu, Guam and Manila’, another ad announced the schedule of the steamers of the Pacific Mail to Asia and Australia.21 By 1904, the entire journey from Sydney to London via America—some 13,557 miles (21,818 kilometres)—took only 30 days, with the longest time at sea under six days between ports. Sydney to San Francisco was a 20-day cruise in 1904—a vast improvement over the 70 days or more required when the first gold-seekers were travelling to San Francisco from Australia in 1849.

As passenger service and expeditious shipping methods for the delivery of mail and freight between the two continents increased, the exchange of goods between America and Australia became by the turn of the century ever more commonplace. Among these goods consumed by Australians and Californians alike was a plethora of illustrated journals and printed material of all kinds. In the last decades of the nineteenth century, the production of popular illustrated magazines, books and posters had become a huge industry in
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By the 1910s, California and Australia were both considered, architecturally speaking, victims of an 'extreme colonialism'. Both regions for the most part depended on architectural styles adapted from European and East Coast American models—that is, from the styles of their home cultures—with some minor adjustments for geographical conditions. Although some professional architects began to have an impact on building by the beginning of the twentieth century, more commonly these styles arrived on the Pacific coasts either through immigrant itinerancy—individual self-trained builders brought their skills with them—or through the appearance of reproduced architectural renderings and instructions in pattern books, building manuals and journals. But growing awareness of the need for buildings that took advantage of the distinct climate, economic conditions and cultural attitudes on the Pacific Rim began to affect the kinds of

America, much more abundant, innovative and varied in subject matter than the output in England, Australia’s traditional source of printed matter. The western American states had by this time begun to develop a printing industry devoted to regional issues and to an expression of what was becoming a ‘Pacific coast’ lifestyle. These publications, along with hundreds of specialised trade and art journals from Chicago and the American East Coast, made their way onto the steamships that arrived in Sydney and Melbourne every week. Publications as varied as Harper’s, Century, Atlantic Monthly, Sunset, The Pacific Monthly, The Craftsman and even trade journals such as Brick were regularly quoted in the pages of Australian magazines and books. Most importantly, illustrations from these publications were often reproduced in local magazines for Australian audiences.

This exchange of visual imagery through reproduction was not confined to graphic illustration, photography, advertising logos and typography. These magazines and illustrated books also disseminated, through textual description and illustrations, the newest ideas in building and architecture to readers on both sides of the Pacific. As the most ‘utilitarian’ art, buildings as rendered through drawings and photographs offered particularly good opportunities for an expression of regionally shared cultural ideals. The exchange of images had concrete results. It led to buildings and houses that became material metaphors for the eclectic mixing of cultures that contributed to the shaping of these new Pacific nations. Alluring reproductions of new buildings also prompted many artists and architects to visit the other country. Architecture, then, became the field in which the process of stylistic assimilation and visualisation of a ‘Pacific’ modernity was made most obviously manifest.

At the time of Australian Federation, California and Australia were both still considered, architecturally speaking, victims of an ‘extreme colonialism’. Both regions for the most part depended on architectural styles adapted from European and East Coast American models—that is, from the styles of their home cultures—with some minor adjustments for geographical conditions. Although some professional architects began to have an impact on building by the beginning of the twentieth century, more commonly these styles arrived on the Pacific coasts either through immigrant itinerancy—individual self-trained builders brought their skills with them—or through the appearance of reproduced architectural renderings and instructions in pattern books, building manuals and journals. But growing awareness of the need for buildings that took advantage of the distinct climate, economic conditions and cultural attitudes on the Pacific Rim began to affect the kinds of
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structures, and especially housing, that accompanied population growth in both places by the early 1900s.

In Australia, a search for an appropriate national architecture that would convey the country’s new status as a separate nation within the British Empire led in one direction to what is now loosely labelled as the Federation Style. The art historian Bernard Smith, writing at the time of modernist hegemony, describes the evolution of this style (and claims credit for the coining of the term) in conjunction with political developments from the mid-1890s:

The style in question is an Australian style if ever there was one, and deserves its own name. My own nomination would be Federation style. For it was born within the context of a discussion about the nature of an Australian style which parallels the political discussion that led to the foundation of the Commonwealth. [It is a style] with characteristics as marked and definable as any domestic style within the tradition of western architecture ... Perhaps we have not grasped its originality because it has so often offended our architectural tastes.27

In reality, no clear set of architectural principles defined this so-called Federation Style. Instead, houses of the time increasingly combined several eclectic ideas, reliant on foreign sources with a few superficial Australian elements in ornamentation. A typical house of the late 1890s and into the early 1900s, built in the suburbs rapidly developing in Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, Adelaide, and even in Perth out in Western Australia, often included elements associated with a British-derived ‘Queen Anne’ Style, adding touches of Arts & Crafts or Art Nouveau inspiration;

Fig. 4.04 Appian Way House, Burwood, Sydney, New South Wales, c. 1905-1910. Author’s photograph.
some local interpretation of Henry Hobson Richardson’s (1834–1886) American domestic architecture; and a bit of vernacular verandah-and-tin-roof bush station often thrown in.28 The architectural historian Richard Apperly has even described some buildings of this period as ‘Federation Filigree’ and ‘Federation Anglo–Dutch’,29 indicating the wide range of sources from which Australian builders sought inspiration.

In her book Pioneers of modernism: The Arts and Crafts movement in Australia, Harriet Edquist argues that, instead of using the loosely defined ‘Federation’ term, the houses built in this period in Australia can most specifically be labelled as products of a local adaptation of the Arts & Crafts movement itself. Here one sees, Edquist argues, how closely Australian practitioners were beginning to look to America for inspiration:

While the British Arts and Crafts movement provided the initial impetus for the Australian movement, the way in which it was transformed here owed as much to Australia’s close ties to the United States of America. Both were countries of the New World where the social order was markedly different from that in Britain or Europe ... It picked up rather the American idea of the Arts and Crafts as a style of a democratic country, one that expressed freedom, both in terms of society and in terms of design.30

Given this wide-ranging search for architectural inspiration that included a view to North America, it is not surprising to find that one of the most innovative architects in Australia at the time was a Canadian-born, Boston-trained eccentric named John Horbury Hunt (1838–1904).31 Hunt arrived in Sydney in 1863, having left America (it is said) to avoid the Civil War. He quickly found work in the offices of Edmund Blacket (1817–1883), the colony’s leading ecclesiastic architect. In his many church projects, both while with Blacket and later in private practice, Hunt applied his knowledge of Gothic architecture and, most specifically, his understanding of the ideas of Eugène Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc (1814–1879), the French theorist of medieval architecture so admired in the Boston circle of which Hunt had been a part. In his use of motifs and ideas taken from Viollet-le-Duc’s famous writings, Hunt reveals a most important aspect of his influence in Australian architectural circles: he brought with him from America, and continued to acquire, the most comprehensive architectural library in the country, eventually numbering some 4000 volumes. Just as the Greene brothers in California would do a few decades later, he also maintained volumes of scrapbooks with cuttings taken from the many periodicals and newspapers that he continued to receive from America and Europe.

Along with his admirable work on churches and public buildings, in which he often combined elements of the Romanesque, ‘Lancet Gothic’32 and British Queen Anne Style, Hunt has lately been ‘rediscovered’ primarily for his remarkable series of houses built throughout the 1880s and into the 1890s. In buildings such as Pibrac, Trevenna, and especially in the grand house called Booloominbah, built for the pastoralist White family in Armidale, New South Wales, Hunt expresses his adaptation of the American Shingle Style as conceived by H. H. Richardson. While other Australian practitioners absorbed the timber-covered house style associated most frequently with American New England, Horbury Hunt produced the most original examples in the Australian colonies. He gained some official recognition during his earlier working years in the colony, but was nearly forgotten in his later life. His buildings appeared anomalies by the turn of the century, when so many styles were competing for attention as the so-called
Federation houses were being constructed. His works nonetheless prove that clearly American architectural sources had entered the Australian building vocabulary by the end of the nineteenth century.

What is most significant about buildings that fall under the Federation rubric is that they indicate a sincere desire to find a style, albeit derivative, that would represent a distinctively Australian way of living. This eclectic searching for suitable architectural modes to express new lifestyles ties Australia most directly to developments in California at the turn of the last century and ultimately leads to the most tangible expression of cultural affinities between the two Pacific coasts. Californians were also looking for ways to adapt architectural ideas to suit the needs and aspirations of a new population, in unprecedented demographic and geographic circumstances. Elaborate Victorian housing models copied from pattern books and vernacular farmhouse types that had accompanied the early agrarian American settlers to California appeared alongside American variations on Queen Anne Styles in the 1880s and 1890s, creating more exuberant wooden variants than houses built in Australia in those decades (see Fig. 4.06 on page 214). But it was soon clear to newly arrived Midwesterners and Easterners that the California climate required a different relationship between the outdoors and indoor living spaces. This circumstance was also increasingly apparent in Australia, where British Victorian building forms, no matter what kinds of local adaptations were tried, were wholly unsuited to the geography and climate.

The turn of the twentieth century marked a crucial moment of transition on the American west coast. Californian artists and builders began to learn through journals and books, and the arrival of idealistic immigrants to the West, of exciting new approaches to building, craft and design. Original inspiration came, as it did in Australia in the last decades of...
the nineteenth century, from the Englishman William Morris (1834–1896). His widely dispersed aesthetic philosophies about handicraft and design, along with the philosophical writings of artist and critic John Ruskin (1819–1900), transformed architecture and product design alike. These ideas were the basis for what came to be called everywhere the Arts & Crafts Movement. Given their adherence to all aspects of the home culture, Australians were particularly taken with these British models. Dispersed through journals such as Studio and absorbed by craftsmen and artists who had travelled abroad, Morrisonian elements began to appear in the Australian cities at the end of the nineteenth century, particularly in crafts such as stained glass and plasterwork applied to the interiors of houses.

Californian architects and designers looked most enthusiastically and immediately to these ideas as interpreted in the writings and designs of ‘the American William Morris’—the New York furniture-maker Gustav Stickley (1858–1942). This term linking Stickley to the British founder of the Arts & Crafts Movement came from the writings of the Pasadena artist, collector and writer George Wharton James (1858–1923), who would soon be an active participant in the Californian version of the style. Stickley’s journal The Craftsman, beginning in 1901 and continuing under his editorship until 1916, became the major organ in America for the dissemination of an aesthetic lifestyle as had first been espoused by Morris and his followers. The publication also provided the name, often vaguely and inaccurately applied, for a worldwide aesthetic movement that would preoccupy designers and architects throughout the 1910s. Stickley was not the first adherent of the Arts & Crafts aesthetic in America, but he was the most influential exponent. For the coalescence of the distinctly Californian brand of the movement, he and his magazine were the most significant catalysts.

Stickley first visited California in 1904. From that time on his journal was replete with articles that rhapsodised about the delights of the state’s Mediterranean climate, exhorting more of the artistically inclined in the state to follow the inspiring accomplishments of those landscape designers and architects developing a regionally appropriate style. As he wrote in one of his earliest articles about his California experience:

In order to assure the fitness and beauty in their works, it would seem as if, in this region, the builders of dwellings had but to follow the sure, clear indications given by Nature. The climate invites to out-of-door life. The vegetation is magnificent and rare. The atmospheric effects are too beautiful to be wasted. These facts alone should suffice to determine the style of California dwellings, as they have already done in several countries of similar situation.

Stickley’s enthusiasm was reciprocated: these same craftsmen and architects adopted his aesthetic of simplicity and integrated design with alacrity, enhancing with additional idealism a design for artistic living on the Pacific coast.

In the same year he first visited California, Stickley began publishing in The Craftsman a monthly series called ‘A Craftsman House’, in which a house design with pictures, floor plans and detailed instructions appeared. For three dollars any member of the Craftsman Homebuilders’ Club—essentially any subscriber to the journal—could purchase blueprints for each house. This series continued in the magazine for many years, providing an important practical source for the dissemination of the Craftsman style, whether bungalow or its other architectural variants. Californians who read and contributed to The Craftsman also began to have a bearing on the formulation and expansion of Stickley’s
Arts & Crafts ideas, including the features of the houses exhibited in each issue.

As The Craftsman craze grew throughout the United States in the first two decades of the century, other companies and individual artisans produced voluminous quantities of brochures, booklets and product catalogues, all with carefully designed type fonts, graphic formatting and, of course, photographs to extol the virtues of Arts & Crafts products. These publications were as important to the spread of Arts & Crafts ideas worldwide as The Craftsman magazine itself, widely copied by lesser, if just as ardent, practitioners of the style. In northern California, the Pacific version of The Craftsman ideas centred around Charles Keeler (1871–1937), described as a poet, ornithologist, traveller and ‘prominent oracle for the Arts & Crafts ideals’. Keeler and his close friend, the eccentric architect Bernard Maybeck (1862–1957), were fervently dedicated to the whole artistic notion of Berkeley, California, as the epitome of the ‘Athens of the Pacific’—the Mediterranean metaphor as the appropriate model for artistic California living. They espoused this notion of a special Californian aesthetic sensibility through writings and in actual construction. As a manifestation of their shared world-views, Maybeck prevailed upon Keeler to allow him to build a house for him in the Berkeley Hills. Here Maybeck expressed their common ideas about unadorned wooden homes set in natural landscapes. Soon he built other homes on the same hill for other Berkeley friends. They all demonstrate Maybeck’s eclectic utopianism, with stylistic elements taken from influences as varied as the Swiss chalet, New England Shingle Style homes, Classical architecture and Beaux-Arts motifs. They were, in other words, the epitome of the Californian house. The houses also convey the pair’s commitment to a

Fig. 4.07 A California house and garden, Myron Hunt & Elmer Grey, architects, in Craftsman, October 1907. Courtesy of The Huntington Library, San Marino, California.
communal lifestyle for like-minded artists, an aspiration that led others of the group to form The Hillside Club—named in honour of those living aesthetically in Maybeck houses on the Berkeley hillside and organised primarily by the women associated with these houses.

Out of this community and through his other pronouncements came Keeler’s Ruskin-inspired book, *The simple home*, a poetic explication of California-style Arts & Crafts sentiment about the home. The book was reviewed widely, receiving praise for its message of simplicity in *The Craftsman* and the other journals of the Arts & Crafts Movement. Here Keeler, in his role as ‘Policeman of the Arts’, condemned Victorian ornamentation as ‘the makeshift of a shoddy age’, as nothing but ‘veneer and stucco’. In California, where the surroundings were so salubrious, Keeler argued:

> The thought of the simple life is being worked out in the home. In the simple home all is quiet in effect, restrained in tone, yet natural and joyous in its frank use of unadorned material. Harmony of line and balance of proportion is not obscured by meaningless ornamentation; harmony of color is not marred by violent contrasts.

Maybeck’s early houses for the Hillside community embody this concept: made of wood, usually shingled redwood, and having sleeping porches to allow as much contact with nature as possible. Photographs of these houses as well as images of other vernacular influences such as Maori and Hawaiian buildings that Keeler saw on his world travels appeared in the original 1904 edition of *The simple home* (most of the photographs were taken by Keeler’s sister, Sarah Isley Keeler).

Other publications, such as the many books by Arts & Crafts publisher Paul Elder (1872–1948) about San Francisco and its artistic activities, and magazines such as *Sunset* and *The Craftsman*, were quick to champion these architectural precepts. Most significantly, these widely distributed publications dispersed...
images of the work of Maybeck, Keeler and the rest of the Bay Area Arts & Crafts followers to the world. An illustration of Maybeck’s early masterpiece, the Christian Science Church in Berkeley (1910), for example, appeared in the Australian architectural journal Building as early as 1915.

In Southern California, an Arts & Crafts-inspired lifestyle was championed most exuberantly in Pasadena, the prosperous winter residence of the eastern and Midwestern rich at the foot of the San Gabriel Mountains and next to the Arroyo Seco riverbed some 16 kilometres north-east of Los Angeles proper. From its beginnings as an agrarian settlement in the 1870s, Pasadena attracted artists and utopians as well, all intent on transplanting the cultural activities of gentility into an idyllic sun-drenched landscape. Proponents of the movement in Southern California took a slightly different tack than their Bay Area brethren, who aligned their practices more closely with Classical Mediterranean allusions. (They were, however, equally dedicated to the ideals of The Craftsman). While as eclectic as their northern counterparts, the Arts & Crafts groups in Los Angeles and Pasadena nurtured more immediately a romantic linking both to the region’s Spanish past and, in some cases, to a Westernised notion of Japanese styles.

Dreamers of the Southern Californian stripe were exemplified by people such as the ex-Methodist preacher and ethnologist George Wharton James (1858–1923). James had already worn many cultural hats by the time he fashioned himself into a high priest of the Arts & Crafts Movement, most notably and prolifically as a writer on south-west Indians and their basket making. These interests brought James into the sphere of those constructing a south-western image revolving around the California missions. As early as 1905, James published articles in The Craftsman, first about the history of the Franciscan missions in the state. Encouraged by the response to this topic, he then wrote another article about the ‘Mission Style’ and its influence on contemporary architectural practice. In emulation of Stickley’s model, James, along with another English-born member of his circle, the artist, teacher and stained-glass designer William Lees Judson (1842–1928), also began his own journal in 1909, appropriately named Arroyo Craftsman. James hoped to establish a thriving Arroyo Seco artists’ group, which he and Judson dubbed The Arroyo Guild. Emulating Morrisonian ideas of a monastic order of artists, he fashioned himself as ‘Frater Primus and Editor’ of the journal.

Despite all of James’ optimistic aspirations for an artistic community centred on the journal, he was only able to publish one issue. This issue emphasised architecture and landscape gardening, including ‘the elevation and plan, with full description, of one of its houses’. The house illustrated was a cottage built in Santa Barbara by the well-established Los Angeles firm of Robert F. Train (1869–1951) and Robert Edward Williams (1874–1960)—described here grandly as ‘directors of the architectural department of the ARROYO GUILD’. While the style of the cottage is a relatively conservative adaptation of ‘Old English’ motifs, James’s lengthy description of the details of the construction, all done by the master craftsmen associated with his group, focus on the specifically Californian elements of the design: the sleeping porch, an open plan, and such distinctive features as ‘the pair of large French windows leading out into the rear garden’, which in James’s florid prose would ‘tone down into delicious restfulness the clear flood of sunlight which California so richly bestows upon its well-favored inhabitants’. Just as Keeler and his San Francisco followers appealed to the idea of a shared aesthetic sensibility, so too did James and the other Pasadena Arts & Crafts members speak.
of ‘Beauty and Service’.\textsuperscript{53} \textit{Arroyo Craftsman}’s masthead stated that the Guild’s purpose was ‘simple living, high thinking, pure democracy … honest craftsmanship, natural inspiration, and exalted aspiration’.\textsuperscript{54}

James’s vision was one of the most utopian, hyperbolic and opportunistic of the many voices that contributed to the construction of a culture-driven lifestyle in Southern California in the 1910s and into the 1920s. His embrace of the \textit{The Craftsman} message, as well as his harking back to the remnants of the state’s Hispanic Mission heritage, was shared in many other publications and put into practice by other, more serious, artists, designers and architects. James nonetheless had more influence on local events and popular understanding of these Arts & Crafts attitudes than subsequent writers will sometimes admit.

For the championing of Southern California’s Spanish–Mexican architectural roots and as an antidote to the ‘aesthete’ pronouncements of George Wharton James, no figure was more influential than the flamboyant newspaperman and mythmaker of the southwest, Charles Fletcher Lummis (1859–1928).\textsuperscript{55} His friend Charles Keeler characterised him as ‘William Morris turned into a New Mexican Indian’.\textsuperscript{56} As Kevin Starr described him, ‘[he] wanted Southern Californians to see themselves as the moral heirs of Spain. He encouraged them to internalize in an American way the aesthetic austerity of the civilization which had prepared the way for their own’.\textsuperscript{57} Lummis had been a tireless booster for his romantic view of Southern California ever since he walked there from Ohio in the 1880s. The epitome of the energetic Californian eccentric, he began dressing as his own version of a south-western Mexican don, with corduroy suit of tight pants, Spanish wide-brimmed hat and sash. He knew everyone in the state who was interested in his brand of cultural campaign and he was involved in every ambitious activity that had to do with enhancing an understanding of the region’s Hispanic and Indian heritage.

Lummis’s work as President of the Landmarks Club was instrumental in saving the then-derelict Franciscan missions of California from destruction. His efforts along with those of other members of the club led to the missions’ renovation and
romantic integration into the image of the new, modern California. In 1897, Lummis was able to offer Charles Keeler and his wife ‘two livable old rooms in the Mission San Juan Capistrano’ where Keeler would write a tour guide to Southern California for the Santa Fe Railroad.\textsuperscript{58} He built his own house by hand on the Arroyo Seco in what is today the suburb of Highland Park, close to Pasadena. He christened his domain El Alisal, The Sycamore, after the native trees that surrounded it. The house manifested in a rough-hewn manner all of Lummis’s heartfelt vision of an Old California frontier rancho: built around a courtyard out of enormous boulders with timber beams and concrete floors, he hoped it would ‘last for a thousand years’.\textsuperscript{59} Lummis also oversaw construction on the hill above his house of The Southwest Museum, the place where he displayed his superb collection of Native American artifacts, at the same time nurturing and implementing visual and literary versions of his Spanish–Indian–Californian Weltanschauung. The museum’s concrete tower still looms above the Pasadena Freeway as a kind of Spanish fortress. The architect Charles Moore describes the experience of this magical place:

It is just a bit reminiscent of a Spanish monastery or perhaps a fortress in the Pyrenees or a castle in Castile or a hastily built movie set. The romantic vision slides in and out of focus, between wonder and sleaze. Dense landscaping of dark foliage obscures the foundations, so the building appears as an outcropping of the hill itself. But even the hill has something suspicious about it.\textsuperscript{60}

\textbf{Fig. 4.10 Charles Lummis, (arch.), El Alisal, Highland Park, California, 1895–1910. Courtesy of The Huntington Library, San Marino, California.}
Moore has captured perfectly the romantic, larger than life presence of Charles Lummis and his architectural legacy to Southern California in the first decades of the twentieth century. When the Australian James Peddle was working in Pasadena, the opening of The Southwest Museum provided an important point of conversation for architects in town.

One of Lummis's most lasting contributions was his own lifestyle journal, *Land of Sunshine*, which he founded in 1895 and edited until 1903 (the magazine’s title changed to *Out West* in 1902). Here he pontificated on all manner of south-western topics in his robustly masculine manner. His most enduring logo for the magazine included a picture of a mountain lion above an ornamental vignette of emblematic California poppies; and he referred to his editorial column as ‘In the lion’s den’. An example of his aggressive advocacy of the superiority of Western living appeared in this column a few months after McKinley’s visit to the state:

Were not the Westerner incorrigibly modest, it would never do for him to revisit the pale glimpses of the East. Conformed, now, to horizons he does not dent with his elbows every time he turns around; shriven of provincialism by travel and comparison; fond of the people who still stay where they happened, while he lives where he likes; living next door to Nature and just across the street from the only Better Country that the heart of man hath conceived—by all he is peculiarly surefooted and of well-seasoned head, warranted not to swell. He can view with good-natured pity, and no notion of arrogance, the stuffed-doll ‘life’ of his unremoved contemporaries. It does not make him vain that ‘we do these things rather better’—for he expects travel, elbow-room, climate and other evolutionary forces of the first magnitude to have some effect. He remembers what they have done for him, and that he did not invent them.

One of the topics he most frequently discussed in this freewheeling manner, or invited others to discuss, was architecture. Most predictably, given his lifelong activism for a recognition of the region’s past cultures, Lummis wrote most vividly about California’s Hispanic heritage as offering the most appropriate model for the
region’s future buildings. As early as 1896, Lummis, along with another Landmarks Club participant, the architect Arthur B. Benton (1859–1927), wrote about the need for a truly Californian architecture, emphasising particularly the appropriateness of the patio and the verandah. The synthesis of stylistic elements that would finally merge into the housing form transported to Australia as ‘the California bungalow’ was taking shape a few miles up the Pasadena road from Lummis’s idiosyncratic structures, while the journalist Lummis in his writings gave eloquent voice to—and indeed prepared the way for—the architectural ideas that would determine the next important Californian style to cross the Pacific, the Spanish Revival and all its eclectic offshoots.

The steps in the merging of architectural elements leading finally to the so-called California Bungalow—and the central role played in this architectural process by reproduced images in magazines such as The Craftsman—are nowhere more vividly and spectacularly seen than in the work of the Midwestern transplants to Pasadena, the brothers Charles (1868–1957) and Henry Mather Greene (1870–1954). They arrived in California in 1893 to join their parents, having already studied and worked as architects in Boston. En route to the west coast, the brothers stopped in Chicago to visit the World’s Columbian Exposition, the famous ‘White City’ that would figure so prominently as an inspiration around the world for artists and architects of the coming century. The Greenes had their first experience of genuine Japanese architecture there and saw the monumental achievements represented by the fairgrounds’ buildings of Daniel Burnham, Louis Sullivan and many others. When the brothers got to Pasadena and found it to be more than a provincial country town—that it had already ‘developed into a resort land of genteel bohemianism’, inhabited by wealthy residents who wanted to display their cultivation and wealth through the houses they built—they set up practice. Their early work, in the late 1890s and first years of the new century, displayed among other influences aspects of the Shingle Style and Beaux-Arts design, then so popular back east for prestigious homes. They also began to demonstrate their knowledge of new developments in domestic architecture out of Chicago. While their sense of solid craftsmanship was already apparent, their models were still eastern and Midwestern ones.

In the early 1900s, the Greenes, who had always kept scrapbooks of design ideas gleaned from all the architectural journals, books and international magazines that they could find, began to formulate their own elegant interpretation of Arts & Crafts philosophy, geared consciously to the idea of a Californian house adapted to the Pacific state’s landscape and climate. One of their major discoveries in this exploration was Stickley’s The Craftsman. Their exposure to design ideas through like-minded wealthy patrons and friends in Pasadena, who read Ruskin and Morris and were committed to the Arts & Crafts Movement, also gave them the impetus and the freedom to experiment on a grand scale. What followed from 1903 until the beginning of World War I was a series of magnificent, uniquely formulated homes that stand at the pinnacle of West Coast Arts & Crafts design. Despite, or perhaps because of, their stylistic variations, these buildings have been described as representing ‘the ultimate bungalow’.

Whether defined as showing stylistic affinities to Japanese buildings, Hispanic ranchos, Swiss chalets, Native American motifs or English cottages, the emphasis in a Greene & Greene house of this period was on lovingly handcrafted interior woodwork and a masterful use of custom-made leaded...
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Glass and other fixtures. The Greenes often called for Stickley furnishings to be installed throughout, an example of their adherence to the Arts & Crafts Movement’s demand for organic interior design. Landscape design was also a significant part of most Greene & Greene projects. The architects were said to have designed The Gamble House (1908) around two large eucalyptus trees already on the property and the garden was carefully planned by the brothers to complement the house and the setting.

Two houses by Greene & Greene from this period are especially instructive of their attempt to find appropriately modern solutions for the appearance of the California house, in which the natural surroundings were considered as an integral part of the building’s design. Once again, the eclecticism of their sources and the originality of their combined elements stand as markers of a distinctly west coast approach to domestic architecture. In 1903, the brothers were commissioned to design a new residence for Arturo Bandini, descendant of one of the most prominent families of Old California, and, along with his wife Helen Elliott Bandini (her father was one of the original founders of Pasadena), an important figure in the region’s cultural life. As Bosley writes, ‘[h]ere … were clients with deep roots in California’s history inspiring them to draw from the regional paradigm to create a home that was uniquely Californian. In some respects, this was exactly what the Greenes had been implicitly searching for since they had arrived in Pasadena a decade earlier’.69

The result of this collaboration was a sprawling hacienda that owed as much to the
fashionable and immensely popular California romance *Ramona* (1884) as it did to the Greenes’ adaptation of true colonial *ranchero* style. The plan consisted of a U-shaped wooden house with continuous rooms surrounding a courtyard patio with garden and covered walkway that served as a communal outdoors area for the whole house. Indoors was consciously joined to outdoors. As an early enthusiast of the bungalow wrote:

> French doors open into this courtyard from every room that is in [a] sense a living room, even the bedrooms. The house rambles to suit its will, and there is plenty of ground, so that the wings of the house do not elbow each other.70

But even here, in a house so consciously and symbolically ‘Californio’ Hispanic, the Greenes were not purists to any historicist style. Having purchased a copy of Edward S. Morse’s *Japanese homes and their surroundings* during the construction of the Bandini house, they incorporated a traditional Japanese building technique into the posts holding up the verandah around the patio.71

This Japanese note, based entirely on the Greenes’ access to published illustrations of Japanese style, appeared most noticeably in the home they built for another member of Pasadena society. This time the patron was a newly arrived New Yorker with a substantial art collection named Theodore Irwin, Jr. In 1906 to 1907, the Greenes transformed an already existing residence on Grand Avenue into ‘a Japanese-inspired house made for America’.72 Filled with Craftsman furniture and the Irwins’ collection of Native American and

---

Fig. 4.13 Greene & Greene (archs), Theodore Irwin House, Pasadena, California, 1906–07. Photograph: Alfred Spain Collection, RAIA (NSW), Sydney, New South Wales.
Asian art, the interior spaces comprised fitted cedar joinery, complemented by warm brick fireplaces. Most significantly, the gardens were harmonised with the house itself—including not only a Japanese stone lantern in the front yard, but also a grand old eucalyptus tree that still stands on the grounds. In the Irwin House, as Bosley says, ‘the Greenes and their client painstakingly created a classic American Arts-and-Crafts environment, seemingly from (or perhaps for) the pages of *The Craftsman* magazine’.  

Now indeed the influences were reversed, as Greene & Greene houses began to offer illustrations of the new California style in the very same magazines that the brothers had initially consulted to formulate their original designs. The Bandini house is one of those illustrated as exemplary of the ideal bungalow in Una Nixson Hopkins’ 1906 article in *The Pacific Monthly*, reprinted in *The Architect and Engineer of California*. A view of the Irwin house appeared in *Craftsman* itself in 1907, in an article by another woman writer, Henrietta Keith, on Japanese influences in contemporary building. All of these publications came to Australia at the same time they appeared back east in New York and Boston. The word—and the image—of exciting Californian innovations in housing had arrived. By the early 1900s, thousands of bungalows in all housing strata began to appear throughout the United States, and nowhere more enthusiastically than in Southern California.

The rarefied architectural achievements of the Greene brothers for their wealthy clients, and even the romantic eccentricities of Keeler and Maybeck in northern California may seem
to have little to do with the kind of cottages that George Wharton James published or the romantic stone frontiersman’s *rancho* that Lummis concocted, and they certainly seem removed by great margin from the modest bungalow styles that Australians began to see and adapt to their own conditions in the 1910s. But all of these achievements, including the Greenes’ original masterpieces, contributed to the dialogue that led to the formulation of an identifiable Pacific coast bungalow style. This dialogue took place in the illustrated pages of the popular and trade press in which all of these accomplishments were lauded and advertised, and through which their images were reproduced and dispersed internationally.

While the national American magazines such as *Good Housekeeping*, *House Beautiful*, *House and Garden*, *Country Life*, *Harper’s* and *Century* were relatively quick to recognise and broadcast these developments, the most enthusiastic and influential proponents were, understandably, the West Coast magazines that began to appear at the same time. In the conscious construction of a Pacific lifestyle, *Sunset* magazine is one of the most important disseminators of imagery and philosophical outlook. Founded in 1898 by the Southern Pacific Railroad (SPRR), its initial purpose was ‘to promote and glorify the West in an effort to persuade Easterners to visit and colonize the still thinly settled region served by the railroads’. The name referred to the Sunset Limited, the Southern Pacific’s most elegant train. Its lofty aim, stated as early as 1900, was ‘publicity for the attractions and advantages of the Western Empire’. The covers by this time began to experiment with livelier modes of graphic design, incorporating photographs, allegorical figures and ornamental borders. At first this experimentation produced less than successful styles, and early content was also inconsistent in quality and pitch. But by 1903—the year of Teddy Roosevelt’s presidential visit to California—the graphic and ambitions of the magazine grew, so too did its emphasis on modern graphic design and a specifically Western aesthetic stance in text and illustration.

In 1902, with new editor Charles Sedgwick Aiken (1863–1911), illustration became increasingly important. Poetry and literature appeared by the likes of Jack London and San Franciscan Gelett Burgess (1866–1951; he of ‘Purple Cow’ fame); and political articles of interest to Californians and people of the Pacific coast focused on the Far East and the American presence there. The covers by this time began to experiment with livelier modes of graphic design, incorporating photographs, allegorical figures and ornamental borders. At first this experimentation produced less than successful styles, and early content was also inconsistent in quality and pitch. But by 1903—the year of Teddy Roosevelt’s presidential visit to California—the graphic and
textual tone solidified into something that moved beyond hackneyed promotion.

*Sunset*’s articles and illustration now focused increasingly on the special qualities of life on the Pacific Rim, in all its multicultural dimensions and with all the delights of its natural setting. In 1902, volume 9 included Western stories by the old San Francisco bohemian Joaquin Miller; photographs and articles about the Santa Barbara Mission by photographer Oscar Maurer (1870–1965) and his wife Madge Maurer (b. 1871; she was one of the co-founders of The Hillside Club in Berkeley); and illustrated advertisements for books on California wildflowers. Also in its pages were many landscape drawings by Francis McComas (1875–1938), ‘a young Australian who has his studio with the artists’ colony at Old Monterey’. 81

The interior graphics of *Sunset* also began to take on a more cohesively aesthetic and ‘modern’ look. The magazine’s subtitle by this time was ‘Magazine of the Border’, no doubt influenced by Lummis’s great push for an emphasis on California’s position at the Pacific border of the continent and on the edge of the Hispanic West. The magazine’s cultivation of a modern, exceptional, coastal lifestyle also included a focus on the ‘new woman’ living a carefree life outdoors along the Pacific coast. The July 1911 cover by J. A. Cahill depicted, for instance, an extraordinary image of a young woman surfing—only a few years after the introduction of surfing to California by the Hawaiians Duke Kahanamoku and George Freeth (see Fig. 4.15 on page 174). 82 The image would have stunned Easterners, but Australians would have found it comprehensible and amusing.

In 1912 *Sunset* bought out *The Pacific Monthly*, a magazine also founded in 1898 and published by the Pacific Monthly Company of Portland, Oregon. *Sunset* added the words *The Pacific Monthly* to its name on subsequent magazine covers; its coverage now became more inclusive of the other
western states. By 1905, its political stance was excitedly expansionist. An article by Arthur I. Street titled ‘Seeking trade across the Pacific’ announced:

The American people are beginning to discover that the Golden Gate is the front door to the Orient ... For, the Orient is not China alone ... It is New Zealand and Australia with their continental area, their rapidly expanding business conditions, and their assuring future potentialities.

Articles on the English-speaking nations of the Pacific now became a regular inclusion in the pages of Sunset.

By 1914 the Editors at Sunset had become so ambitious in their efforts to make the magazine the essential cultural magazine of the West that the SPRR sold it to a consortium of the staff. By this time, the ideological focus of the magazine was clearly centred on the West's unique landscape and lifestyle as manifested in its new architecture, gardens and tourist attractions. Fiction and editorial articles looked increasingly to the Pacific—to Asia, the Pacific Islands, Australia and New Zealand, as well as the other Pacific states. While articles on examples of new Western architecture and its gardens had appeared from the beginning of the magazine, in 1915 ‘The home in the West’ became a regular column.

Here one read about ‘The cactus garden’ and other examples of ‘Western’ style gardens. As early as 1915, this section included discussion of ‘California's first cubist house’, Irving Gill's 1913 concrete residence for Mary Banning.

Well-known and novice illustrators alike made significant contributions to the design of the issues, all emphasising the landscape of the south-west and the Pacific states.

By the 1920s this Western publication that had begun in emulation of Eastern journals such as Atlantic Monthly had travelled well beyond California's borders. Sunset was readily available in Australia from as early as 1909, and earlier to journalists and publishers such as J. F. Archibald and George Taylor. One sees elements of the Sunset magazine's style in their own journalistic endeavours, Archibald's...
ambitiously conceived cultural magazine *The Lone Hand* (1907–1921), with its similar ornamental vignettes and colour covers, and Taylor’s architectural trade journal *Building* (1907–1942), illustrated in some cases with images taken directly from *Sunset.*

The architectural steps leading to the formulation of the California bungalow—from country cabin to Greene & Greene and Maybeck masterpieces—was meticulously documented in these lifestyle magazines, spreading the message that exciting developments were taking place on the West Coast. The most pervasive source, however, for the eventual spread of the bungalow as the building style for suburban, middle-income housing was the plethora of promotional materials published as pattern books, real estate brochures and the catalogues for ready-made, prefabricated home designs. *The Craftsman* and its building instructions were only one in an enormous stream of illustrated publications for all price ranges. In these publications photographs of available house plans, usually depicted as already built and set in appropriately tasteful gardens on a city allotment, whetted the home-buyers’ appetite enough to purchase them.

*Bungalows and cottages in Southern California*, produced by the Los Angeles Investment Co. in 1908, was a quintessential example of this kind of brochure. The company was a branch of a larger organisation, in Los Angeles since 1895, in which all the employees were stockholders. The cover of this brochure, with its graphic illustration and artistic letter font for the title, identified the location as Southern California by prominently displaying a palm tree behind which was placed a bungalow with stone chimney and in the background some barren California hills. The interior design of the brochure included Art Nouveau-like ornamental flourishes surrounding the photographed images of available house styles (see Fig. 4.18 on page 178). All of the illustrated houses show elements that came to be identified with the California bungalow: deep porches with supports of wood or stone; sharply pitched, deeply gabled roofs; dormer elements and sometimes enclosed balconies or sleeping porches; wooden frames and cladding; simple, open interior spaces with built-in closets in rooms; and, most importantly, freestanding on a lot ready for gardening. The text—the sales pitch—was geared, as Robert Winter has argued, to the middle class and the working man’s desire for ‘respectability’. 

Southern California is known the world over for its large number of beautiful homes ... the visitor is impressed by the beauty of the home architecture and grounds of the laboring man ... Here the man who earns modest wages may have a home of beauty and comfort. The reasons for this are found in the development of the co-operative building idea, in the adaptation of beauty and comfort to moderate pocket books and in the climate, which quickly develops luxuriant foliage, making it the ideal home city of America.

The company also extolled the fact that the entire construction process was in their hands: they owned the lumberyards, the mills, the factory and the stores. Their motto was ‘From Forest to Home’, exemplifying a modern approach to building that would be so important to the development of suburban neighbourhoods. Another business called Pacific Portable Construction Company exhibited its ‘Ready-cut’ System at San Francisco’s Panama-Pacific International Exposition of 1915 as ‘Built in Southern California—The Land of Beautiful Bungalows’ (see Fig. 4.19 on page 179). These illustrated brochures, promotional pamphlets and advertisements were the most effective means of spreading the bungalow aesthetic to the rest of the region, the country
Many of these bungalow books and plans have survived in the collections of Australian libraries and archives, for nowhere is the California bungalow, as a popular form for suburban housing, more enthusiastically received and adapted than in Australia. As Freeland has written, ‘[o]f all the exotic importations to Australian architecture the Californian bungalow was by far the most successful’. This transfer was tied to a sense of shared aspiration between Californians and Australians—albeit an affinity that was usually unacknowledged or only vaguely recognised at the time. Graeme Butler clearly expressed this idea in his book *The Californian bungalow in Australia*:

There is more to the bungalow and its ways, however, than the development of a house style. It accompanied a whole way of life. This was a life-style which embraced the holy 1/4-acre block, the nature strip, the motor car and its garage, easy bank home-buyer finance, lower building costs, ‘sleeping out under the stars’ and recognition of the Australian native planting for urban gardens. In short, everything Australians hold dear today. For an imported, essentially American, style, it seemed to include many Australian things.

That this transmission coincided with architectural formulations already underway in Australia is clear when one looks at
Federation-era houses built in the first years of the twentieth century. Australians had of course been aware of and involved in Morris-inspired Arts & Crafts ideas coming out of England from the 1870s, and many of these elements had already been incorporated into suburban house forms. During the peak years of the bungalow craze, from 1910 to 1925, native-born architects such as the Adelaide-based F. Kenneth Milne (1885–1980) and the Melbourne partnership of Oakden & Ballantyne were designing eclectically derived homes, with some knowledge of American architecture gained only through illustrations in journals. Harold Desbrowe-Annear (1865–1933) in Melbourne, inspired by Frank Lloyd Wright’s work and writings, began as early as 1902 to create his own delightfully original timber interpretations of Arts & Crafts forms with elements of the Swiss chalet. In northern Australia, a ‘tropical house type’ more dependent on original Indian bungalow models was also evolving into a distinct cottage style called ‘The Queenslander’, a house style most affectionately described by the Brisbane writer David Malouf. But the sheer number of publications about California houses, West Coast building materials and lifestyle choices that embraced outdoor living—all pouring into Australian newsagents, libraries and bookshops—made it inevitable that Australian architects and developers would discover this kind of bungalow style through printed sources and would adopt these forms from America with alacrity.

By the 1910s, not only were Australians consuming American bungalow magazines and pattern books, but Australian builders were also producing their own brochures, sometimes copying photographs directly from American sources (see Fig. 4.20 on page 215). A Sydney timber company, George Hudson & Son Ltd., even took up Pacific’s ‘Ready-Cut’ system, spelling it ‘Redi-Cut’, and included similarly ambitious illustrations showing their impressive timber yards and production facilities. By 1913, popular Australian magazines such as Home & Garden Beautiful were regularly referring to ‘Craftsman Furniture’, described in their articles about interior design as made in Australia of Australian hardwood. The magazine often included instructions on how to make Mission Style furniture. Trade catalogues for the Sydney furniture store A. Hall & Co. featured in 1915 ‘Mission furniture’, described as ‘Furniture of the correct design
for the modern bungalow home’. At about the same time, David Jones’, the most elegant department store in Sydney, proudly displayed an entire line of Craftsman Furniture, stating ‘it is noted for its good workmanship, and only the genuine Stuckley [sic] Work is sold by us’. Knowledge of these stylistic developments depended on the availability in Australia of the whole gamut of American publications, from *The Craftsman* to the most modest trade brochure.

As important as these illustrated publications were in the transfer of architectural ideas, other, more direct, methods in this period also played a part in the development of the bungalow style in Australian. Four events in the first two decades of the twentieth century particularly highlight the methods by which this architectural exchange occurred. The first occurred in 1907 when businessman, inventor and artist George Augustine Taylor (1872–1928) founded *Building* magazine in Sydney. Taylor was a fascinating character, an idiosyncratic enthusiast of, among other things, aerial flight, radio transmission and Australian nationalism. He began his career in the 1890s as a builder’s apprentice, but operated as well on the peripheries of Sydney’s artistic circles. He was a participant at one time in the Dawn and Dusk Club, Sydney’s equivalent of San Francisco’s Bohemian Club, and ultimately became its historian when in 1918 he wrote his memoir of the 1890s called *Those were the days.*

Taylor was always more of an ‘achiever’ than the louche members of bohemian Sydney. At the same time as he was supposedly carousing with artists, he had devised a new material out of sugar fibre to plaster ceilings with prefabricated designs of Australian flora and fauna. In 1909, he became the first Australian to build and fly a real airplane, and
he continued to write about flight throughout his life. He liked to produce caricatures, worked sometimes as a Black-and-White artist for journals and was fascinated by the history of illustrations, which he wrote about at length in his magazine. The subjects he examined were as varied as road building, town planning, engineering and brick-making. He also wrote short stories for the magazine, chiefly science fiction, which he illustrated himself.

From 1907 until the onset of World War I, Taylor through his magazine Building became a most important commentator in Australia about architectural and engineering developments in America. He was most ardent, if at times quirky, in describing the relevance of these developments to Australia’s built environment. With his wife, Florence (1879–1969)—the first woman architect and engineer in Australia—Taylor published the magazine until his death in 1928; Florence kept it going until 1961. As Apperly described the couple:

In many ways the Taylors personified Australian architecture itself. They felt satisfied and comfortable when confronted with traditionally-generated solutions, but at the same time they were excited by the vast technological possibilities of the twentieth century (and fascinated by its gadgets).

As an enthusiast for all modern technology, Taylor could not help but be impressed by modern American architecture, building innovations and town planning, but his opinions about these accomplishments were sometimes oddly misplaced. He and Florence were in the long run no champions of high modernism, but their enthusiasms for American trends in architecture and town planning dominated the pages of Building in the years before World War I. Increasingly that focus centred on California and the bungalow—and, later, on other Revival styles.

Building magazine was not the only publishing concern of the 1910s to champion the bungalow as the most suitable domestic architectural form for the Australian climate and landscape; but the two Taylors were the most vocal exponents of the style. Most importantly, the magazine reproduced images, especially of California bungalows, taken directly from photographs published in American magazines. In these articles, Taylor would usually include his own heartfelt opinions about how these ideas could be applied to Australia, and in what way Australian architects and designers could produce better,
more appropriate, results. The Taylors made constant reference to a huge array of American magazines and trade journals. Their writings give evidence that substantial numbers of even the most obscure journals, such as *Brick and Clay Record*, were available and accessible to Australians.109

As early as 1911, Taylor reprinted in *Building* a condensed version of an article originally published in *Sunset* by its editor Walter Woehlke.110 In *Sunset*, the article was titled ‘Los Angeles – Homeland’, and included numerous illustrations of Southern Californian homes as evidence of a new lifestyle prospering in this region.111 Taylor’s reprinted version was titled ‘Australia leads (but sleeps): Climate as a national asset’. It also included illustrations of California homes, although not the same ones that Woehlke had published. Tellingly, a note at the end of the article informs the reader that the illustrations were ‘courtesy of the Paraffine Paint Co., whose Malthoid plays an important part in California bungalows’.112 Taylor never failed to sing the praises of those companies that advertised in the magazine and he seemed to have a particularly close association with the San Francisco-based Paraffine Paint Co., which had offices in Sydney.

Interspersed among these illustrations in the article, the Taylors included reproductions of bungalow designs submitted by Australian students for a competition of The Institute of Architects of New South Wales. As an introduction to the article, Taylor also includes the following exhortation to his Australian readers:

> Australia’s climate is world-famed. It gives us the lowest death-rate of any country on earth, and the development and improvement of local government services is helping Nature to make our living still more healthy.

> For long Australia’s climate has won the recommendation of the world’s physicians for healthy living for invalids. It’s about time it won better recognition for healthy living for the well and wealthy.

> There is no reason why the world’s millionaires tired of their money-building should, [sic] not end their days in this land of sunshine and health.

> America makes much out of little, and it found a passable climate in California, at Los Angeles, and it is making it a national Homeland.

> It is claiming it as the world’s health spot; yet is it not so healthy, nor as bracing, nor has the vitalising tang of eucalyptus-scented Australia.

> And it knows it—so it is trying to ring it up by planting Australian gum-trees everywhere. It is trying to steal our climate, and make money out of it. Here is the story of what it is doing—Walter Woehlke tells it in ‘Sunset’.

> It holds a lesson Australia should learn, and learn at once.

> Now then N.S.W., with your Sydney harbor charms, your mountain salubrity; Victoria, with your Gippsland sweetness, Queensland with your champagney springtime—get to work!113

Taylor ends the article with his typically kick-in-the-pants comment, ‘What is Australia going to do about it?’

Stimulated by their voracious consumption of American magazines and books, the Taylors poured out a stream of articles praising American advances, comparing them to Australian practices. The achievements of the Chicago School particularly caught their attention. The covers of the magazine in 1912 and 1913 included ornamentation lifted bodily from Wright and Sullivan; and the contents reprinted articles by and about Frank Lloyd Wright, Walter Burley Griffin, F. W. Fitzpatrick, and Daniel Burnham.

From the beginning of the competition...
for the design of Australia’s national capital, Canberra, Taylor was the greatest champion of Walter Burley Griffin and Marion Mahony Griffin’s submissions. Just as emphatically, and for seemingly personal reasons about the Griffins’ pacifist stances during World War I, the Taylors turned against the Griffins once they were in Australia.114 Building also published accounts of Australian architects’ impressions of America, such as reports from Sydney architect John Burcham Clamp (1869–1931) recounting his state-sponsored trip through the United States in 1914. In these articles Clamp particularly extolled the wonders of its steel frame structures, and was especially taken with Los Angeles and Chicago.115

In 1914 the Taylors were able to travel to the United States themselves, an event heralded in Building with great fanfare. In the May issue, Taylor expressed his excitement and his mission:

America has always been a wonder world in my imagination. The great deeds of great men in that wonderful country of ‘make haste’ seemed always to summon me to ‘come across’ and people my wonder world with reality ... America is inspired by the same motives as inspire us, and is doing things generally in almost every sphere of activity as we should have done them ... I propose mainly to study building legislation and civic government, constructional methods and modern architecture, town planning, and, of course, the commercial and literary sides of the press. By the courtesy of Walter Burley Griffin and other good friends, I shall have the opportunity of meeting some big people in those particular spheres; architects like Fitzpatrick, Louis Sullivan and Frank Lloyd Wright, for instance; all men whose work is ‘up with the times’... My mission is to strengthen the practical journalism of ‘Building’ Magazine ... and to make it even a more courageous and perturbing influence in deciding the big things that matter.116

The Taylors began their trip in June 1914 and provided continuous reports for the magazine of all manner of things that they discovered. Florence wrote about ‘women’s issues’ such as civic duties, schools and kitchens,117 and George was particularly impressed by America’s roads and suburban streetscapes. They stocked up in the United States on magazines and photographs, which continued to be gleaned for material to reproduce in Building for years to come.

In Chicago, they met with Frank Lloyd Wright (1867–1959), who gave ‘Captain Taylor’ an inscribed copy of his own deluxe edition of the Wasmuth portfolio of his works published in Berlin in 1910.118 Taylor also met the grand old man of Chicago architecture, Louis Sullivan (1856–1924). At this time he produced a caricature of himself, dressed as a derelict bohemian beside an amusing depiction of the dapper Sullivan (see Fig. 4.24 on page 184).119 Clearly the Taylors were immersing
themselves in the most innovative aspects of American regional architecture.

The couple was in Chicago meeting with Wright when World War I began in August. They returned to Australia in October of that year. While *Building* continued to demonstrate interest in American housing and building ideas, including more images of California designs and housing plans, the United States’ hesitation to enter into the war effort offended the Taylors’ nationalistic sentiments—a fact made clear by a number of Taylor’s anti-American cartoons in the magazine. Now articles focused increasingly on Australian adaptations of American ideas and the work of Australian architects in ‘modern’ directions. The December 1914 issue—one in which the Chicago-style ornamentation on the cover is still there but overtaken by a superimposed drawing of an Australian soldier—includes an article on ‘The bungalow’ that hints at this direction:

The Californian bungalow is seen at its best in Pasadena and Los Angeles, and to an Australian there is a remarkable familiarity of setting inasmuch as the Australian Gumtree having been introduced into Southern California is bringing an Australian atmosphere into that semi-tropical country. But the Californian bungalow depends for its main features upon spreading eaves, simplicity of line and novelty of treatment of the chimney. In Pasadena a feature is made of cobblestones let into the brick or cement work, giving a quaint and at times highly artistic effect. This feature ... would be too artificial for Australia.  

The accompanying illustrations depicted Australian examples of bungalow building. While Taylor’s unrealistic expectations of America had been tempered now by his own experience and coloured by his personal eccentricities, he, along with an increasingly involved Florence, continued to disseminate through *Building* the best examples of American archi-
itectural developments and to reproduce the images that they found in American publications for an Australian readership. While their comments accompanying the images became by the 1920s increasingly odd and often missed the mark, the significance of Building’s photographic reproductions in introducing an Australian audience to new architectural ideas cannot be overestimated.

The Taylors’ many endorsements and ultimate excoriation of Walter Burley Griffin (1876–1937) in Building’s pages points to the second exemplary event in architectural exchange between America and Australia during this period. In 1911, the Chicago architect and landscape designer Griffin, an early colleague of Frank Lloyd Wright, won the international competition to design Canberra, the new Australian capital. His success in the competition stemmed largely from the exquisite drawings of his proposed plans for the capital—drawings completed by Griffin’s wife and fellow architect, Marion Mahony Griffin (1871–1962). Marion Lucy Mahony worked in Wright’s office for 14 years and was considered by many to be, as critic Reyner Banham described her, “the greatest architectural delineator of her generation, which included mere men like Lutyens, Loos and Wright”. Five years Griffin’s senior, she married him in 1911 just before their submission of the drawings to Australia (they found out about the competition on their honeymoon). The watercolour renderings for the Canberra competition, 12 in all, reveal the Griffins’ immersion in the achievements of Frank Lloyd Wright and Prairie School design, as well as an awareness of the most advanced architectural ideas in Europe. Marion’s finely lined watercolours and her use of gold to accent the contour drawings sent to Australia is reminiscent of the work of the innovators of the Viennese School, Otto Wagner (1841–1918) and Adolf Loos (1870–1933), indicating the close link between members of the Chicago School and their Austrian counterparts (George Taylor also included articles on Loos and Wagner in Building at this time).

Except for a detailed city plan drawn on a contour map of the proposed site, the Griffins’ drawings were essentially ‘dream sketches’, short on specificity, of the future ‘Organic City’ they envisioned. The “View from summit of Mount Ainslie”, for example, shows at the centre a futuristic Parliament House tower, appearing ever so much as if it had been transplanted from Angkor Wat or some otherworldly sphere.

Perhaps it was this lack of detail, as well as suspicion of a ‘Yankee’ designing the Australian capital, that led to immediate infighting among the Australian political parties about the design. After much political wrangling and bureaucratic interference, the Griffins were allowed to come to Australia to oversee the implementation of the winning plan in 1913. This was the moment at which Taylor’s energetic defence of Griffin saved his overall city plan, at least temporarily, from bastardisation. In the end, however, Griffin was only able to implement his innovative radial layout of Canberra before, in 1921, the bureaucratic jealousies became too overwhelming and he was forced to leave his dream of an Organic City in the hands of an Australian-led committee. As Richard Apperly states, Griffin ‘was exposed to the typically Australian reaction reserved for The Gifted Foreigner—an attitude compounded from equal parts of awe and mistrust’.

The Griffins built no structures in Canberra. The first buildings that appeared there, most of them overseen by Federal Capital Advisory Board Chairman John Sulman (1849–1934), clearly demonstrate nonetheless that aspects of Chicago School-inspired design, as well as Mediterranean-style approaches in vogue by the time the city began to be built, had made
some impact on those involved with the new city’s streetscapes and homes.

Even before leaving the Canberra project, the Griffins worked in Melbourne, where their main commissions were a renovated restaurant, the Café Australia (1916; now demolished), complete with superb murals depicting the Australian plants that had already captured Marion’s artistic imagination (see Fig. 4.26 on page 187); University of Melbourne’s Newman College (1915–1918), a *cause célèbre* about which Florence Taylor culminated in her attacks on the Griffins;123 and the stupendous Capitol Theatre (1921–1924), with its cave-like foyer (now destroyed) and ‘living rock’-lighted ceiling.126

After moving to Sydney in 1925, the couple purchased with shareholders 650 acres of rocky woodland on the north shore of Sydney Harbour. Here in the suburb of Castlecrag, the Griffins sought to design an entire community of homes, inhabited by like-minded souls who believed in their architectural aesthetic and would participate in communal activities (by this time Marion especially was involved in anthroposophic philosophies). As Graham Jahn writes, Griffin ‘laid out the streets, designed the houses and established a pattern of behaviour to which the residents should subscribe’.127 While the Griffins built several houses that still exist in Castlecrag, such utopian architectural thinking was in advance of most Australians’ attitudes at the time. In the end, the Griffins’ greatest contribution to the Australian cultural landscape centred on their ideas about town planning and the integration of landscape design into an organic conception of building and surroundings. They ‘introduced revolutionary ideas to Sydney, embracing the relationship of buildings to their sites, a reverence for native flora, open planning and a decorative
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*Fig. 4.25 E. O. Hoppé, *Canberra, Sydney & Melbourne Buildings, ACT, 1930. Photograph. © E. O. Hoppé Estate, Curatorial Assistance, Inc., Los Angeles, California.*
language anchored in imagination rather than historical precedent’. }

Eric Nicholls (1902–1966), Burley Griffin’s Australian partner in Sydney, continued to use Griffin’s name for his firm after Griffin’s death in India, where he had gone to carry out a new project in 1937. Nicholls, too, continued to construct houses based on Griffin’s ideas—houses that would represent some of the most modern seen in Sydney until the end of the World War II. While the number of Griffin’s buildings in Australia was relatively small, the publicity generated by the presence of these two Americans—conduits for all the Chicago-based ideas about organic architecture also influencing Californian practitioners of the time—introduced Australians first-hand to modern American style that the Taylors and others had been presenting through illustrations in their magazines.

The third exemplary event connecting Australian and Californian architecture occurred in 1912, when the English-born architect and designer from Sydney named James Peddle (1862–1930), already 50 years old, arrived in Pasadena. He was determined to learn all he could in California by working there. Several Australian architects had, of course, made study trips to the United States before this time and, as Horbury Hunt’s houses demonstrate, North American architectural trends had had an impact on Australian practice as early as the 1870s. In the 1890s ‘American Romanesque’, based on an Australian interpretation of H. R. Richardson’s ‘Stick Style’ and Richardsonian commercial building, had also made a brief splash in Sydney and Melbourne. In the early 1900s, some Australians gained scholarships to attend the School of Architecture at University of Pennsylvania, then considered ‘the greatest one of them all’, according to Jack...
Hennessy (1887–1955), who attended in 1909 to 1910. Along with Hennessy, at least two active Sydney architects, Percy James Gordon (1892–1976) and Carlyle Greenwell (1897–1971), attended this Philadelphia program in the 1910s. Hennessy and Greenwell graduated from the university’s Department of Architecture in the Class of 1911. (Gordon is not listed in School archives, although he may have attended without graduating or did not respond to the School’s offices when the book of graduates was compiled.) They would have just missed studying under the great Beaux-Arts architect Paul Cret (1876–1945), who brought renown to the university before leaving the faculty in 1907. Beaux-Arts training would have still been the main focus of the department’s program. The minutes of the meeting of The Institute of Architects of New South Wales for 1912 records that ‘We are pleased that Mr. Jack Hennessy and Mr. Carlyle Greenwell have returned and intend to remain among us’, Eastern American architectural ideas, then, determined the work of many Australian architects by the 1910s.

Tours, study trips and subsequent articles by Australians about American architecture had usually concentrated on the East Coast and Chicago as locations of the most innovative styles and important practitioners. Peddle’s decision to concentrate on Southern California demonstrates a recognition that important things were now happening there architecturally—that an Australian could learn in California about cutting-edge styles and building practices that had a special validity for conditions back home. James Peddle was born in England and trained there as a furniture- and cabinet-maker. His father worked in London as a manufacturer for Edwin William Godwin (1833–1886), one of the Aesthetic Movement’s leading designers. James arrived in Sydney in 1889, commissioned by Walker Sons & Bartholomew (later Beard Watsons) to oversee construction of the interiors of the Hotel Australia. In Australia Peddle was able to reinvent himself as an architect, but his interest in interior design and woodwork endured. From 1899, when he designed the Mosman Council Chambers, until 1906, Peddle designed everything from terrace houses to shearing sheds. His houses of the period display a modified Queen Anne design then fashionable in Sydney’s better North Shore suburbs. The business recession in 1909 to 1910 may have been one of the deciding factors in Peddle’s move to California. With his background in woodworking and furniture-making, Peddle would have been particularly drawn to the craftsmanship of Greene & Greene designs that he had seen in journals, although no record exists that explains why he decided to try his hand in California.

Peddle arrived in Vancouver aboard the Zealandia on 11 March 1912, then travelled down the West Coast to Los Angeles. He spent his first six months in the city studying to pass the examination to practice architecture in California. He had his licence review before the California State Board of Architecture on 29 July 1913 and received a licence some time in 1914—an accomplishment about which he was proud for the rest of his life. The review report also indicates that the Board panel included, among others, the Los Angeles architects Sumner P. Hunt and Frederick L. Roehrig. Once he received his licence, he set up practice in Pasadena, in the St Louis Block at 42 North Raymond Avenue, room 305. In the same building, in room 310, was Irish-born architect Louis du Puget Millar (1877–1945), who wrote an important article about Pasadena’s first bungalow courts. Other architects who contributed to the emergence of the Pasadena style also listed offices in this block of Raymond Avenue. Most intriguingly, Peddle’s office was across the street from those of Greene & Greene, in the Boston
Building, at that time at the height of their careers.139 City directories show that Peddle lived in the 500 block of North Fair Oaks Avenue, very near downtown Pasadena; he was joined there by his 23-year-old daughter Elsie in July 1913.140

While in California, Peddle did carry out some actual building projects, including a house at 480 East California Street (demolished) for an Illinois lumber broker named Joseph Means141 and a substantial house at 735 Winona Avenue (demolished), built for Frank May (1858–1942), an ambitious building contractor and civic leader.142 May was married at that time to the sister of James Culbertson, one of Greene & Greene’s most important clients. May had worked as Culbertson’s private secretary in Pennsylvania and both families came to Pasadena between 1900 and 1910.143 Peddle built the Winona Avenue house for May next door to the property in which Cordelia Culbertson, May’s sister-in-law, lived while Greene & Greene were building a house for her in another part of town.144 These associations place Peddle squarely amidst the most exciting developments in Pasadena architecture in these important years.

Peddle also participated in Los Angeles’s architectural organisations. From talks he gave in the States and once he was back home, Peddle seemed particularly interested in aspects of the business of running an architectural practice, licensing of architects, issues dealing with building ordinances, the Garden Suburb idea and town planning. In a speech given to the American Institute of Architects in Los Angeles shortly after his arrival, Peddle stated that he was ‘making an extended tour throughout the United States, and plans to spend a year or more studying American architecture’.145 Later speeches back in Sydney refer to his experiences in places such as Berkeley and Seattle, so he must have done some travel at least along the West Coast (or he had visited them en route from Vancouver to Los Angeles).146 He stayed in the States until 1914, when, forced by urgent dilemmas confronting his architectural office at home, he returned to Sydney, to continue his practice there, filled with first-hand knowledge of Californian ideas, both aesthetic and practical.

The impact of Peddle’s direct contact with Californian styles was apparent in the buildings he and his partner constructed in the years immediately after his return. Peddle had returned to Sydney earlier than planned because his draughtsman Samuel George Thorp (1889–1967) had won the competition for the design of the ‘Garden Suburb’ of Daceyville, the first planned low-cost housing project of the Housing Board of New South Wales.147 Thorp had been running Peddle’s Sydney office, but was not yet qualified as an architect. He needed Peddle and his qualifications to implement the process of design. The small cottages they formulated for the project reveal some evidence of Peddle’s discoveries in California—the use of reinforced concrete as a home building material was especially noted by many Australian builders and architects as an American innovation148—although not freely expressed because of the size restrictions of the government project.

The most obvious influences appear in the houses made by Peddle, along with Thorp, now a certified architect, in the period up to 1925. First came several ‘bush bungalows’, constructed in the rustic environs of Sydney, incorporating such elements as large verandahs, low eaves, stone fireplaces and timbered ceilings.149 At Lyndholme Farm, Bundanoon, an early summer resort in the Southern Highlands some 150 kilometres from Sydney, Peddle and Thorp created in 1919 a sprawling residence reminiscent in proportions of the Greenes’s Irwin House, replete with gabled eaves, porches with timbered roofs, and stonework columns and foundations.150
Peddle’s Pasadena experiences also informed the designs for a spate of larger homes built by the firm between 1915 and 1922 on Sydney’s North Shore and in the newer suburbs such as Bellevue Hill. For George Hudson, the owner of Hudson’s Timbers and the initiator of the ‘Redi-cut’ building system similar to the kind produced in Los Angeles, Peddle designed Ga-di-Rae in Bellevue Hill in 1916. Here he was able to indulge his preference for timber—wooden floors, panelling, built-in furniture—in emulation of the Pasadena Craftsman aesthetic and playing into his past experience as a furniture-maker (see Fig. 4.29 on page 192).\(^{151}\)

Soon Peddle’s partner Thorp began to absorb these Californian stylistic elements as well. Their joint project at 4 Lynwood Avenue, Killara, in 1917, is a good example of how the California style was adapted in Australia, most noticeably in the use of brick instead of timber for construction.\(^{152}\) As Apperly writes, ‘The ground-hugging horizontality of the house is most effective, and the rafter-ends project well clear of the gutters in approved Californian style’.\(^{153}\) The resulting design is often described as comparable to Greene & Greene’s smaller bungalows, but the use of brick so changes the Craftsman aesthetic that it more properly represents the direction that the best of Australian bungalow design would follow than any simple emulation of California style.

The most telling example of Peddle’s adaptation of Pasadena style as interpreted by a partner who had not seen the California examples first-hand is Thorp’s own house The Cobbles, 49 Shell Cove Road, Neutral Bay, on Sydney’s North Shore (see Fig. 4.30 on page 193).\(^{154}\) Begun by the team in 1918, the house again substitutes clinker brick for timber, but includes a rounded river-stone chimney (hence the name), leaded glass windows and exposed interior rafters. The interior also showcases a brown-tiled fireplace with built-in bookcases and other evidence of Peddle’s concern for handcrafted wood. Subsequent extensions by Thorp in 1927 and 1935 retained some of the rustic feeling associated with the California style as it appeared in Sydney’s early examples, retaining the open proportions unlike more conventional building in the city at the time. But Thorp was less interested in Craftsman-era handicraft. His elements are less committed to wood. As his own focus shifted to a so-called Spanish Mission or Mediterranean style he used more arches.\(^{155}\)

S. G. Thorp’s brother Frank Thorp (1903–1968) returned from his own time abroad to join the firm in 1925. The firm’s third partner,
F. H. Earnest Walker (1900–1950), who joined the partnership in 1924, had also studied in the States with Aymar Embury (1880–1966) and the ‘prominent Gothicist’ Bertram Grosvenor Goodhue (1869–1924). Once Walker joined the company, their style of building changed in scope, with less emphasis on Peddle’s small-scale designs and Arts & Crafts-style workmanship, and more projects for apartments and office buildings. Peddle now concentrated increasingly on writing and administration, on the running of an architectural firm and work for The Institute of Architects of New South Wales. When he died in 1931, S. G. Thorp became the senior partner. The firm that they founded was already on its way to becoming, as Peddle, Thorp, & Walker, the leading Sydney architectural group for large-scale projects that as PTW Architects it is today.

Although Peddle seems to be the only Australian architect of the period to set up a practice in Pasadena at this crucial and creative period, his experience in America was by no means the only example of an Australian architect learning about California bungalow style and West Coast Arts & Crafts ideas by visiting the country. Alfred Spain (1868–1954), a Sydney architect active from the 1890s, travelled to Southern California in the 1910s and brought home several photographs of Los Angeles and Pasadena houses, including Greene & Greene’s Irwin House. These were found in his effects when he died, along with a book entitled Artistic homes (1903) by Herbert C. Chivers, Architect, St Louis—a pattern book with over 800 house designs (see Fig. 4.13 on page 172).

Even more directly, the younger architect John Moore (1888–1958) travelled in steerage in 1914 to San Francisco, then via Mexico on to New York, where he worked briefly in the renowned firm of Bertram G. Goodhue—just at the time when Goodhue was designing the Panama–California Exposition for San Diego in 1915. Moore remained in contact with Goodhue for the rest of Goodhue’s life, and
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Fig. 4.28 James Peddle (arch.), Country house at Bundanoon for Eric Lloyd Jones 1919, Lyndholme (now Spring Hill), Bundanoon, New South Wales. Courtesy of PTW Architects, Sydney.
while serving in the army during World War I, sent to his New York office photographs of North African architecture he had acquired while travelling there. He worked again for Goodhue in 1919 before returning to Sydney to set up practice, where his residences in Mosman show strong evidence of his American experience and of his discussions with Goodhue about architecture for sunny climates. That Moore stayed in touch with Goodhue until the American’s untimely death in 1924 is only one of many examples of the enduring bonds established between Australian and American practitioners intent on devising new architectural styles suitable to their shared geographic conditions and aesthetic philosophies (see Fig. 7.02 on page 297).

By the time Peddle returned to Sydney in 1914, the absorption of California bungalow forms was well under way among architects throughout the country, as can be seen in the pages of Building, New South Wales’ Salon and Home & Garden Beautiful magazines, and in the ambitious real estate book Real Property Annual. In the period between 1910 and 1925, Australian architects throughout the country, inspired by a combination of direct experience, illustrations in journals, bungalow books and product catalogues, and through interaction with other architects both at home and abroad, created a distinctly Australian approach to what continued to be called the California bungalow style. At the highest architectural level, figures such as Sydney architects Alexander Jolly (1887–1957) (see Fig. 4.31 on page 194), B. J. Waterhouse (1877–1965), Howard Joseland, Edward Orchard and Donald Esplin (1874–1960); Melbourne’s Oakden & Ballantyne and Harold Desbrowe-Annear; and Kenneth Milne in Adelaide demonstrated in many ambitious projects their interpretation of the bungalow’s formal elements and spatial relations (see Fig. 4.31 on page 194). They were rarely as low-
slung as the Pasadena models, were never as grand as a Greene & Greene home and seldom applied as much lovingly crafted woodwork. In proportion and scale, emphasis on verandahs and eaves, and conscious connection between house exterior, interior furnishings and garden design, the California lineage is nonetheless clear. For these architects, an understanding of the Californian form was transmitted entirely through reproductions and word of mouth: none of these architects, who produced some of the most interesting and well-formulated bungalows, ever travelled to California themselves.

Finally, in the pivotal year of 1915, a fourth event occurred that had particular bearing on the Australian adaptation of the California bungalow—and, ironically, on its demise as an innovative style. A Sydney real estate developer named Richard Stanton (1862–1943) imported a prefabricated house from California, christened ‘Redwood’ and installed at Rosebery, one of his suburban development projects (Rosebery was usually described as an ‘industrial suburb’).161 (See Fig. 4.32 on page 195.) The architectural historian J. F. Freeland wrote that ‘the house itself was vastly important and influential because by introducing a full-blown, genuine and undiluted example of the Californian bungalow to the Australian scene, it acted as stimulus, catalyst and model’.162

Apperly is less categorical in his assessment of Redwood’s significance, but acknowledges that Stanton’s import introduced Sydney to the kind of middle-class or working-class suburban bungalow proliferating all over the American West Coast in the 1910s:
It indicated an acceptance by the Californian small-homes market of the idiom evolved a few years earlier by the Greenes and Maybeck. It represented the kind of house most likely to be acquired by a Californian family in the middle to low-income group, and it was thus quite suitable for putting on exhibition in the working man’s suburb of Rosebery.\footnote{163}

What made Redwood so unusual to Sydneysiders was not only its simple compact size and open plan. It was also revelatory for its use of stained undressed redwood timber—an unheard-of construction material in a place convinced that ‘real’ urban homes must be made of brick or stone, and where such luxurious wood was hard to come by. As soon as Redwood appeared, \textit{Building} magazine described it at length, praising its ‘beautifully grained natural wood panels finished with dull stain and wax finish’.\footnote{164} This article further emphasised a most important aspect of the whole enterprise: it prominently identified the Redwood Export Co., with offices on Castlereagh Street, Sydney, as providers of the wood. Stanton’s exhibition house, then, was promoted largely as an advertisement for product companies and for his suburban development projects, rather than touted as the work of a particular builder or architect or aesthetic style.

In this outlook and his other ambitious endeavours, Stanton represents a new type of figure in the architectural landscape: the salesman/developer, whose main aim is promotional rather than aesthetic. Stanton was one of the best of these salesmen, but he was certainly not without an interest in the architecture itself. He moved with his family to Haberfield in 1907, buying the venerable Dobroyde Estate, which had been the property of...
of an important colonial family since the 1820s. Here he built The Bunyas, a two-storey Queen Anne Style villa (probably built by his development’s architect D. Wormald) with extensive gardens. His property was prominently displayed in the pages of Home & Garden Beautiful, depicting Stanton as living the country gentleman’s life.

In 1901—the year of Federation—Stanton had developed at Haberfield an estate marketed as a Garden Suburb in which he integrated all aspects of the real estate transaction along with the construction of model homes as part of an overall marketing process. As the epitome of Federation-era exuberance for the Garden Suburb idea and as Australia’s first real subdivision, the slogan of Haberfield was ‘Slum-less. Lane-less. Pub-less’. The development’s focus was on detached brick single-storey houses sitting on individual lots (see Fig. 4.33 on page 196). Of the more than 700 houses designed by its architects, D. Wormald and John Spencer-Stansfield, no two were alike. Each had roofs of Marseilles tile, leadlight windows, front verandahs, garages and indoor plumbing. Appealing to the idea of genteel respectability so desired by the striving middle and working classes, and latching onto a current concern for the idea of town planning, Haberfield was a tremendous success, largely owing to Stanton’s genius at marketing and his eye for practical architectural solutions. While Haberfield did demonstrate a commitment to high standards of architectural integrity and town planning, Stanton’s accomplishment had more to do with recognising a housing trend and capitalising on contemporary needs for such housing. As his biographer has written: ‘Stanton was influenced by an astute assessment of the real estate market, rather than by attachment to the rus in urbe ideal.’

Richard Stanton’s approach to housing sales and real estate development demonstrates a clear connection with wholesale building linked to ‘modern’ advertising as practiced on the other Pacific coast. He had travelled to North America in 1905 and made other world tours in 1913, 1923 and 1927. Stanton may have been in direct contact with Redwood’s manufacturers. In any case, he had seen any number of bungalow books and West Coast product catalogues in Australia and had focused on housing development on his world tours. Just as the projects of companies...
like the Los Angeles Investment Company, the ‘Redi-Cut’ systems and other West Coast bungalow suburbs were constructed and sold primarily by builder-businessmen rather than designer–architects, so, too, did Australia engender its own mass-housing developers. Men like Stanton and Australia’s own ‘Redi-cut’ man George Hudson appealed to a new class of aspiring homeowners: the middle-class wage-earner, eager to escape landlords and rent payments and to own a freestanding, comfortable home with access to an individual garden.

In the States, a similar figure was ‘housing entrepreneur’ Jud Yoho (1882–1968). Yoho, who was based in Seattle, took over the publication of Bungalow Magazine from 1912 to 1918; it had previously been published in Los Angeles by Henry L. Wilson, ‘The Bungalow Man of Los Angeles’. Yoho in this period created an entire industry centred on his ‘Bungalow Books’ which presented house plans for buyers. His Take Down Manufacturing Company manufactured ‘Craftsman Master Built Homes’, which were in some examples similar in construction to Stanton’s Redwood. In Yoho’s case, the emphasis given to timber construction as the most affordable material was based on, as he wrote in his Take Down catalogue, ‘the fact that we are located in the heart of a vast timber region, and being at the base of supplies we are able to purchase lumber and other materials at prices much lower than can be obtained in other cities’. This was not the case in Australia, where timber was less plentiful, which may account for some of the Australian aversion to wooden houses.

What does link Yoho’s enterprises to Stanton’s is that both were primarily salesmen. As Janet Ore has said of him, ‘[t]o Yoho, Craftsman bungalows were products to be sold, not symbols of a reform impulse associated with a larger Craftsman movement’. Just as Stanton at Haberfield and Rosebery emphasised the inclusion of modern conveniences in each house and focused on tidy neighbourhoods, so did Yoho tout household technology and ‘modern’ features to sell his mass-produced houses. He was also aware enough of the symbols of prestige and respectability to remember to keep ‘Craftsman’ in the title of his publications. Both entrepreneurs depended on the popular press and illustrated catalogues to promote their products. Their housing projects were also based on new financing arrangements by which consumers could buy their homes on credit. This social and economic attitude marks the beginnings of the consumerist society for which the United States and Australia, as the newest countries of the Western world, began in the 1920s to stand as the leading exponents.

Yoho abandoned bungalows altogether as interest in the style waned and housing construction declined by 1920. Stanton’s efforts at large-scale production of small bungalows based on pattern books or prefabricated
building such as Redwood also signalled the end of the hegemony of the California bungalow in Australian housing styles. As Richard Apperly points out, ‘[i]n his hands the once-fresh Californian idiom rapidly deteriorated into a lifeless collection of motifs which were applied to the stodgy body of the already well-established Australian suburban house’. Once the bungalow mode was applied to mass housing in Australia and California, its originality disappeared. American developers continued to apply the bungalow’s open plan, albeit in a more formulaic method, to the early expanses of California’s ‘tract houses’. These layouts enshrined the quarter-acre lot, and homeowners clung fiercely to their patch of the outdoors. Equally dedicated to the individual plot of land, Australian builders of the burgeoning suburbs nonetheless reverted in most cases to the small-roomed, many-doored interior with central hallway and high-pitched roof of the English cottage. The red Marseilles tile roof, however, became ubiquitous in all Australian suburbs, just as the tiled roof came to dominate Californian houses in the 1920s. In this element, Australia and California again shared practical reasons for adopting the tiled roof: both arid regions on the Pacific were prone to raging wildfires in the places where new houses were being built by the thousands.

The ‘bungalow craze’ in America and in Australia established two significant factors that would have lasting implications for future architectural development on the Pacific Rim. The first was that California could now be seen as expressing its own architectural and aesthetic idioms, and these idioms were recognised as having something to say to practitioners on the other side of the Pacific. The second was that West Coast-produced ‘lifestyle’ magazines, illustrated catalogues and advertising images—a true mass media—became a major source of shared inspiration for these cultures on the periphery. In the decade of the 1920s, these factors would play an increasingly significant role in the adoption of other eclectic building styles, especially in housing.

NOTES
4. Some documents give Bushton’s first name as William, others as Timothy. A search of genealogical and census records indicates that a Timothy Bushton, Mason, who was 32 at the time of the 1850 US census, was born in England and came to Monterey from Hobart, Tasmania, with his wife and five children in 1850. They arrived in Monterey on board the American ship *Elisabeth Starbuck* on 18 June 1850. His wife, Jane, nee Lockyer, had been transported at age 16 for a seven-year term to Van Diemen’s Land (Tasmania) in 1834 for theft, arriving in Hobart on the ship *New Grove* in March 1833. See ‘The Proceedings of the Old Bailey’, ‘Jane Lockyer, William West, John Jones, Theft: Pick Pocketing, 4th September, 1834’, viewed April 2004, <http://www.oldbaileyonline.org/browse.jsp?ref=t18340904-189>. Timothy had arrived in Hobart, apparently as a free settler, in 1833. Jane and Timothy were married in Hobart in March 1836. Timothy, who seems to have gone by the name William once in Monterey, died some time between 1850 and 1852, whereupon Jane married Thomas Allen, by whom she had three more children. The house that Bushton had built now became known as The Allen House. Allen died between 1858 and 1859. By the time of the 1870 census, Jane had married again, this time to Jacob Kampner; but by the 1880s, she was again using the last name Allen. By the 1880s, two of her sons by Bushton, James and William, were serving sentences in San Quentin for murder. See San Luis Obispo, *Mirror*, 15 August 1889. Jane was still alive in 1900, by which time the census gave her birthdate as 1815, her age as 84, and includes the note that she ‘gave birth to 14 children, 5 living at present’. I am indebted to Colleen Paggi, Tulare, California, for her research on the Bushton family.
5. According to Peter Andrew Barrett in his thesis on architectural influences between Australia and
California, California carpenters often referred to Australian wood as ‘ironwood’, ‘because it was too hard to nail’. See ‘Building through the Golden Gate: Architectural Influences from Trans-Pacific Trade and Migration between Australia and California 1849–1914’, MArch thesis, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, 2001, p. 29; and Launceston Examiner, 2, 20 and 27 March 1850.

6. See Harold Kirker, California's architectural frontier, Peregrine Smith, Santa Barbara and Salt Lake City, 1973, p. 28; Adobes and old buildings in Monterey, WPA Project, project no. 4080 typescript, 1937, pp. 64–67; A. C. Jochmus, Monterey: All of it between two covers, 1542–1930, Pacific Grove, 1930, p. 34; and Jochmus, Monterey, California: First capital of the state, Pacific Grove, 1925. A recent article by Miles Lewis, Professor of Architecture, University of Melbourne, extends, corrects and substantially amends this information: ‘A myth has grown up about a house of Australian origin that was said to be the oldest-known building in Monterey … It was thought to date from just before the discovery of gold. William Bushton, an Australian carpenter, and his wife, Jane, are said to have set out for San Francisco in the belief that the climate would benefit their invalid daughter. After a dispute between the ship’s captain and the passengers, they were, in fact, landed at Monterey. Bushton bought land at the corner of Munras Avenue and Webster Street and put up a 12-room house that he had precut himself in Australia and brought with him. The building, partly of one and partly of two stories, survived in an increasingly decrepid and picturesque form until its demolition in 1924.
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This artificial impress of time was everywhere. Nothing seemed new and garish. Even the material of the building was not that glaring white plaster distinctive of Expositions of the past, but an ivory-yellow toned hydraulic lime trowelled to represent the streaked laminations of old travertine lime stone. That ivory tone was the base for the play of the whole of the color glories of Master Artist Jules Guerin’s palette.\(^{62}\)

All these brightly coloured confections succeeded as lofty, if ambiguous, metaphors both of exotic empires and Anglo–Saxon ideals to which California was meant to aspire. Grey Brechin called the exposition a ‘make-believe imperial city’ and ‘a brief realization of the Byzantine myth’.\(^{63}\) Their artistic and architectural impact on subsequent styles in California, however, was not groundbreaking. Some of the exposition’s conceptions of city planning—in terms of the grouping of public buildings, parks and sculptural monuments—did have some impact on California towns and cities, such as the project for the Pasadena civic centre built in the 1920s; but its architectural fantasies were too grandly phantasmagoric to have much practical application (see Fig. 7.13 on page 308). The aggressively imperialist attitudes of the exposition planners, moreover, became immediately problematic given the real tragedies of the war then being fought in Europe.\(^{64}\)

The exposition organisers were certainly not aspiring to be avant-garde. One need only read what the fair’s critics thought of the Italian contingent’s exhibition of Futurist art to see how far they were removed from any modernist aspirations. Ironically, the Australian Francis McComas, then firmly ensconced in the Bay Area’s artistic life, was highly praised as one of ‘fifteen distinguished American artists’ and received medals, while the Italian Futurist Umberto Boccioni’s *Dynamism of a footballer* (1913) hardly received a mention in any of the official documents or reviews of the fine arts section.\(^{65}\) John Barry, who wrote the most thoughtful review of the exposition’s art exhibits, was willing to recognise the ‘revolutionary’ qualities of the Futurists’ work on display, describing Boccioni’s *Dynamism of a footballer* as ‘sheets of beautifully colored tin, massed together’. But, he goes on to say, ‘whether the force that is represented here is mere eccentricity and wildness, or whether it is going to open new avenues to the artists of the future is a big question’. Of McComas, Barry writes, ‘[t]hough McComas was born in Australia, he is now accepted as a Californian on account of his long residence in or near San Francisco, and on account of his talent for painting Californian scenes’.\(^{66}\) In the end, the officially approved artworks as well as the modified Beaux-Arts buildings were so overlaid with exotic emblems of Empire that they were ill-suited for models of realistic modern artworks or structures—nor were they meant to be.

Ironically, the majority of sites, always