



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

On playgrounds and the archive. Joan Littlewood's Stratford Fair, 1967-1975

Citation for published version:

Bonet Miro, A 2019, 'On playgrounds and the archive. Joan Littlewood's Stratford Fair, 1967-1975', *Architecture and Culture*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 387-398. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20507828.2018.1525114>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1080/20507828.2018.1525114](https://doi.org/10.1080/20507828.2018.1525114)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Architecture and Culture

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Architecture and Culture on 12/04/19, available online:
<https://www.tandfonline.com/eprint/qNq5Jati2lkmbb2CxKB4/full?target=10.1080%2F20507828.2018.1525114&>

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



On Playgrounds and the Archive: Joan Littlewood's Stratford Fair, 1967-1975

Author:

Ana Bonet Miro

Author contact details:

*School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture, Edinburgh College of Art, The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom
Minto House, 20-22 Chambers Street, Edinburgh EH1 1JZ.
Ana.Bonet@ed.ac.uk*

Abstract: (approx. 100 words)

Joan Littlewood's Stratford Fair, a late manifestation of her Fun Palace idea, aimed – through community-led and temporary playgrounds - to reclaim public land compromised by local government slum clearance in East London. Scholarship to date has discussed the Fair as a trigger for the political imagination of local youth, but not the central role that media played in the constitution of its public agenda. This paper explores the archive as an active site of representation of the Fair. Recorded and circulated through monthly diaries, the fair's events generated affects that fostered attachment and identity, while its distributed media archive maintains a latent regenerative potential and invites plural historiography.

Key words: 8

Joan Littlewood; Cedric Price; Stratford Fair; Fun Palace; playground; archive; media; memory

Figure Captions:

Figure 1. Axonometric showing empty lot and adjoining building for Open Space Urban Program, 1972. Ink on translucent paper 38x72 cm. DR 1995:0257:001, Cedric Price fonds, Canadian Centre for Architecture.

Figure 2. Poster for Diploma in Environmental Design Easter event from Barnet Collage Faculty of Art, 1961-1974. poster 38,2x56 cm. DR 1995:0188:525:004:016, Cedric Price fonds, Canadian Centre for Architecture.

On Playgrounds and the Archive: Joan Littlewood's Stratford Fair, 1967-1975

6.7.68 / Look around area between Eton Manor – walled playing fields (half derelict) adjoining Hackney Marsh and Stratford Broadway – New high risers – dumps – dog kennels – 1840 – 60 houses half demolished, flattened areas between dwellings given over to dumping of usual filth, disintegrating mattresses, cars, scooters, broken glass. Refuse blowing about in wind. Pirate-dumps of rubble and dirt, in places spreading to curb stones. Patches of debris scheduled for gardens or car parks similarly disfigured. Broken fences and windows everywhere/ Over half of this area is no man's land. When will they rebuild? 1

This description, from a production meeting of the Stratford Fair in 1968, gives a vivid picture of the impact that local government slum clearance had in the area surrounding the Theatre Royal, Stratford, East London, where the radical theatre producer Joan Littlewood had settled her troupe Theatre Workshop in 1955. The desire to address the deprivation ravaging East London's urban life was a key motivation for the Fun Palace program, which she initiated in the early 1960s in a search for “a place to play, learn, and do what you will,” in which “everybody (is) an artist, or a scientist [...]”² According to Murray Melvin, archivist of the Theatre Royal and Theatre Workshop member since 1957, “the Fun Palace came out of the children in this area, the poor children [...] [Littlewood] started organising the children [...] doing street things with the children. And out of that came the Fun Palace as a bigger, vast [undertaking].”³

Littlewood transmuted the atmosphere of dust and social conflict into the democratic and transformative agency of the playground, one that could afford – as Cedric Price put it – “urban lungs of forms of breathing not yet imagined.”⁴ The cultural form of the playground constituted the master image for the whole Fun Palace program, as the promotional literature of the project stressed: “If to play is to employ oneself in

satisfying curiosity, vanity or pride, exercising the imagination attempting new skills and making new decisions then the Fun Palace is a playground. If it is acknowledged that lack of development of human potential is not due to inborn apathy in the individual but to lack of opportunity and incentive, to environments and educational systems which were not designed to release individual initiative but to stifle it then the objective must be to make current systems of development available without delay.”⁵ Such aspirations resonate throughout British post-war culture, and appear to share the educational and political agendas for a free society cultivated by contemporary cultural institutions such as the adventure playground during the 1950s and 1960s.⁶

Between 1963 and 1975 experiments were undertaken under the sponsorship of the Fun Palace Trust, a charitable body constituted in 1965. It was the contingencies of shifting socio-political conditions, from the explosion of consumerism and its impact on the “leisure question” in the early Sixties, to the local effects (as vividly recorded in the opening quotation) of the Greater London Development Plan and the impetus its politics gave to local activism, that shaped the different expressions of the Fun Palace’s playground idea.⁷

In October 1966, after withdrawing the Planning Appeal relating to the main Fun Palace project and, significantly, arguing for action “more in the public interest,” Littlewood wrote to the Fun Palace trustees: “Having recently completed a social experiment in Tunisia which made successful use of several of the original ideas behind the Fun Palace, I think the project can be revived here cut to suit our poverty, that is as a travelling circus in a collection of inflatable structures, erected on traditional fairground or circus sites. Exhibitions, demonstrations, classes, do it yourself theatre; cinema and

design could function even if only for a limited period [...] for the local citizens.”⁸

Stratford Fair becomes the new rubric of Fun Palace communications between 1967 and 1975. Alternatively referred to as “Open Space Utilisation Programme E15” in the Cedric Price Archive and “The Salway Road Fair” in the Theatre Royal Stratford East Archive Collection, Stratford Fair was an educational initiative to reclaim public land through the production of community-led and temporary playgrounds and fair events in the vacant sites near the Theatre Royal. Coordinated by Littlewood and a small team, supported by the Fun Palace Trust and occasionally other public institutions, Stratford Fair’s agenda encompassed a renewable set of activities addressed to the local youth. “New playground territory in Newham” is the year’s objective in the undated record “Stratford Fair. Agenda,” a document that also listed fundraising events such as “Bubble City, mobile. Tower. Isle of Dogs” (1968), established in support of the initiative, as well as politically driven activities such as the formation of Newham Adventure Playgrounds Association.⁹ Crucially, the agenda highlights the need to build connections across the various experiments and with the community: “Playgrounds and their link with Bubble,” “Links with Local citizens.” These attachments aim to transform the Fair into an operative system, bottom-up and interconnected, capable of contesting the impact of local government politics in East London. In such a system, I claim, media play a crucial role. Littlewood stressed in a production meeting in January 1968 the ambition to collate a “complete report on the history of the playgrounds – as an experiment is useless unless recorded and a report on failure might be more to the point than the usual sociological success story.”¹⁰ Thus, the critical pamphlet *Bubble City*, produced in support of Stratford Fair, simultaneously records and conveys the networked agency of the playground idea through a heterogeneous collection of materials from the playgrounds’ recent history and direct

communication, to urge local action: “One or two people with ideas and energy meet on the site; in every street there are enough skills to change a tip into a playscape [...] Each one would be different, evolving from the ideas of the team who tackle it. [...] The new sites would link up and ideas exchanged. A ‘brain-bank’ could be set up and information piped from site to site [...] Piped learning is cheaper than a University building and more urgently needed.”¹¹

Bubble City is only one example of how the democratic ends and systematic means of Stratford Fair were constituted by the interweaving of playground and archive.

Scholarship to date has discussed Stratford playgrounds as a trigger for the political imagination of local youth, but has left unexplored the role that media played in the playground’s production.¹² Diaries and reports, meetings minutes, planning applications, promotional brochures and press cuttings – all these materials distributed across various archives both record the specific operation of the Fair and reflect its public nature. This paper explores these archive as a heterogeneous and complex active site of representation of Stratford Fair. The analysis of a range of archival resources grounds the discussion of the central role of media in the construction of Stratford Fair’s public agenda and its efficacy. A final remark considers the way the agency of the archive has shaped the reception of the Fair within architectural scholarship.

The Agency of Media

The concept of cultural techniques as discussed by the German media theorist and historian Bernhard Siegert is particularly relevant for this discussion, for it analyzes material objects such as doors, grids, or registers and the related practices that they represent –controlling boundaries, encoding space or constituting subjectivities -in

relation to their agency in the production of specific cultural situations. Siegert conceptualizes cultural techniques as those historical practices and related technologies “involved in operationalizing distinctions in the real.”¹³ Accordingly, the cultural techniques of dwelling produce the house as the expression of distinctions between inside and outside, those of spatial control produce public and private space, and those of time measurement come to mark the distinction between productive and leisure time.. Facilitated by specific “technical objects capable of performing – and to considerable extent, determining these operations, the concept of cultural techniques recognizes on one hand, the involvement of networked agency in the creation of cultural situations, and on the other, the symbolic dimension of such productions.¹⁴ Cultural techniques constitute acts of meta-communication of specific cultural values attached to the operations in question. As such, these techniques may not only disseminate and institutionalize those values, but through transgressive usage, deterritorialize and destabilize them.¹⁵ This point recalls the earlier work of Michel de Certeau, which emphasized the range of tactical procedures and minuscule appropriations exercised by the ordinary users of a given system. These constitute a culture of practice that grows from below whose tactical and active inventiveness is posed against the usual rhetoric of consumer passivity. As De Certeau claimed, “everyday life invents itself by *poaching* in countless ways on the property of others.”¹⁶

A range of archival records show how Stratford Fair was promoted and pursued the kind of tactical arena described by DeCerteau. For instance, the applications for temporary planning permissions, signed by Cedric Price -permissions which ranged from a few weeks to a few months-, illustrate the reclamation of public land from the local authority as tactical temporal suspension of the established order.¹⁷ However, it is

De Certeau's discussion of the art of memory in relation to the practice of storytelling that allows us to appreciate the key role played by the archive of Stratford Fair. For De Certeau, memory provides a body of knowledge to mobilize in the attainment of the most meaningful and effective transformation of any given situation. As he explains, memory is precisely the weapon of the Greek *metis* that "drawing its knowledge from a multitude of events among which it moves without possessing them, it also computes and predicts the 'multiple paths of the future' by combining antecedent or possible particularities."¹⁸ The actualization of memory in storytelling resembles, for De Certeau, that subtle and productive operation of *metis* capable of overcoming the difficulties of any given situation: "The less force there is, the more memory-knowledge is required; [...] the more memory-knowledge there is, the less time is required [...] the less time there is, the greater the effects."¹⁹ Such a "journalistic practice- claims De Certeau- (...) consists in seizing the opportunity and making memory the means of transforming places."²⁰

[[I am quite confused about what de Certeau is actually arguing for through memory. I think if this can be set out a bit more clearly, then the discussion that follows will have much more weight]]. [[Is 'journalistic practice' a phrase quoted from de Certeau here? If not, then I wouldn't put it in inverted commas, and I'd restore "consists in" to the quote]]. [[I have reworked this section a bit and completed the quote from De Certeau.]]

Drawing on the concept of cultural techniques, it can be argued that specific – which is to say, tactical – techniques of playing, facilitated by particular technologies and objects of dramatic representation, constitute the distinctive cultural form of the playground. In a similar way, specific cultural techniques of documenting, aided by assorted media, constitute the archive. Siegert's discussion leads to an understanding of a distributed

agency across the range of material artefacts and ephemera produced and their localization in the archives, all of which become co-producers of the fair. How then do these objects and the practices that they constitute speak politically about Stratford Fair's public ambition in the expanded site that stretches from the pitch to the archive?

The Playground in Instalments

Temporary action is the tactic that articulates Stratford Fair's democratic agenda within the specific time and space of the Stratford community – the time of the school holiday and the space of land scheduled for private development. A total spatial grid, which grows in continuity with the axonometric facade of the Theatre Royal in one of the drawings of the project, filed in Cedric Price archives as “Open Space Utilisation Programme,” is significantly left unoccupied (Figure 1). Meanwhile, it is another type of grid, the Stratford Fair's activity program of 1975, a record duplicated in the main folder “Fun Palace” of the same archive as well as in the Theatre Royal archive, that announces when and where the place will become public, and designs the occasion for community gathering. Sequences of activities for the public of all ages run simultaneously “in theatre” and “on pitch” to bring closer the otherwise separate, autonomous rhythms of the Theatre Royal and the Salway Road playgrounds: “Easter Monday March 31st. Stratford Fair [of 1975] / BRING A STALL / slideshows / CRAZYSPORTS / PONY RIDES / fortune telling / fire-eaters / PUNCH & JUDY [...] / 2pm. Grand Parade Outside / 3pm. Kids Show Inside / 8pm. Val Walsh & Victor Spinetti & 500 stars (bring your music and dancing shows) / BAR WILL BE OPEN.” The advertisement closes with a call for support: “The more you can help, the better it

will be / COME ON, WHAT CAN YOU DO? Phone 534 6760 after 5pm and speak to Pat for a start. And INSIDE ... 10p for a peep – what we've been up to so far....”²¹

<Figure 1 near here>

Such a popular form of entertainment requires suitable media to reach its broad audience. The Fair's activity program was produced as a cheap folio-typed pamphlet, duplicated onto coloured sheets of foolscap, and stapled to the Fun Palace Trust Report “Diary of January, 1975.”²² Thus what the program offers for a peep inside, for a small fee, is a chapter of the distinctive dramatic construction of Stratford's playground story. Signed by the team and proclaimed valuable for “its humour and factuality,”²³ the diary – which was part of the fundraising effort- offers a picaresque story of the “villains,” the local children in the playground, which grows in episodic form through short daily logs, one story which ends with a “trial pending” evolving into the “Villains' Pilgrimage” to St Paul's. A later instalment titled “Report on Kids Village Easter Fair – Two Week Easter Holiday” reports the Fair's success in the past tense and in high spirits: “At 2:30 pm - The parade assembled at Stratford Station. The sound of drums, pipes and music brought all the people in the flats opposite out on to their balconies – and everyone on site was craning their necks as the CIRCUS CAME INTO TOWN.”²⁴ A “Bumper colouring book” stapled to it announces, at the price of 5p, the plans for the immediate future: “Summer Holiday '75. Kids Village Stratford-on-Sea-E15. Phone 5345696.”²⁵

What was then the purpose of these reports? On one hand, the systematic daily log structure in each report and the instalment format modulated action to give continuity and stability to the fragile playgrounds, a fragility acknowledged in the concluding paragraph of the diary of December 1974: “ON TO THE NEW YEAR. IT BECOMES

OBVIOUS THAT WE ARE ALWAYS HELD UP BY LACK OF MATERIALS AND LABOUR. THE SAME URGENT REQUIREMENTS FACE US EVERY WEEK. INADEQUATE SHELTER MEANS ENGAGING THE KIDS IS AD-LIBBED. PERHAPS ONE GOOD SCROUNGER OR ONE HEALTHY INJECTION OF CASH WOULD HELP? HAPPY NEW YEAR TO ONE AND ALL. COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS WOULD BE WELCOME.”²⁶

On the other hand, the phone number given in the activity program suggests the personal interaction with locals that the activities aimed for. Defined as a very “local event,” the Fair consolidated the activism in the area with the main contribution of the recently formed Newham Federation of Tenants Association, along with “Newham Volunteers Bureau, Newham Rights Centre, [...] the Community Development project, and Newham Docklands Action Group,” also participating.²⁷ Significantly, handwritten notes of the foundational meeting of the Newham Tenants' Association in the Theatre Royal archives reveal the essence of the Fair’s program - to organize politically the Stratford community. The “Bumper Colouring Book” stapled to the report, self-produced by local children for distribution at 5p, situates the youth within the overarching agenda of cultural activism: “We celebrated the arrival of spring with an Easter Monday Fair, a local event organised by us, but made to happen only by hundreds of local people who participated.”²⁸ In repeating the achievement of 1974’s fair – as captured in Figure 2 – Easter Monday and the related playgrounds were no longer little threads of success, but a cultural system of public land constitution embedded in Stratford’s culture and modulated by a rhythm of action in instalments.

<Figure 2 near here>

Recording and Reporting to the Archive

Following Littlewood's insistence on "keeping systematic records" in different production meetings,²⁹ the monthly journals discussed earlier not only stabilized Stratford's fleeting playgrounds and fair events in reproducible media but, taken together, constitute the memory archive of Stratford Fair, one that significantly adopts a distributed form. Through the postal system and the cheap reproduction techniques, the journals promptly inscribed Stratford Fair's achievements within the institutional and personal archives of the addressees noted in the "Mailing List for Fun Palace Trust Reports."³⁰ Together with The Fun Palace Trustees and Cedric Price – who appears on the mailing list in the category "miscellaneous" – the inclusive list gathers activists, funding agencies and the local authority. The operation of inscription was not without tension, to judge from the location of Stratford Fair records as they appear in Cedric Price archive. Mostly part of the main folder "File 46: Fun Palace Project," a small group of records dated 1972 constitute a separate folder "File 15: Open Space Utilization Programme E15 (OSUP)."³¹

An examination of the distinctive operations of recording, reporting, distributing and storing – mediated by the related diaries – makes clear the reciprocity between the playground and the archive as active sites of representation of Stratford Fair. While the recording the Fair's memories conferred archival depth and the various modes in which these were reported distributed its agency, storing brought about a certain "otherness" in the related hosting archives, that is, an element of tension in the Fun Palace history caused by the archival classification of the Fair's documents.³²

The analysis of the agency of the Fair's distinctive distributed archive – the question to explore here – draws on historian Aleida Assmann's conceptualization of "functional"

and “storage” modes of cultural memory, which offers a flexible interpretation of the opposition between memory and history. Linked to an addressee, functional memory legitimizes the group it represents, conferring its identity. Latent in words and images in the archive, storage memory constitutes a pool of uncommitted resources that is necessary for renewal and change in a given culture.³³ Yet, as Assmann notes, the transformative potential that can be actualized on the basis of the material an archive holds is subject both to identification and selection and to the extent and openness of public access.³⁴

Following Assmann’s model, the Fair’s diaries constitute both the functional memory of Stratford Fair and its stored public archive. Functionally linked to the local youth, the diaries collated the immediate affects attached to the group’s activities which helped forge their identity, while their circulation and their storage in institutional archives secured access to the Fair’s latent memory and held open the potential for forms of future re-actualization. However, such an actualization depends on the recursive action between the archive’s configuration and its critical reading by scholarship. In particular, the Fair’s otherness as indicated by its location in Cedric Price’s archive suggests an ambivalent attachment to this initiative of Littlewood - here Price seems to act more as an archivist, interrupting by classification the Fair’s vital continuity with the Fun Palace, than an activist.³⁵ Beyond the heterogeneity of the Stratford Fair material, its presence in Price’s archive crucially conveys the Fair’s radical value and its resistance to fixed categorizations. Such an ambivalent configuration of the archive reverberates in the silences found within Stratford Fair’s scholarly reception, as evidenced in certain studies on the agency of the playgrounds as well as in key scholarship on the Fun Palace project.³⁶ Meanwhile, it is from scholarly and non-scholarly initiatives on Littlewood,

which trace the Fair's records in complementary archives, that Stratford Fair's past is remembered and actualized.³⁷

In conclusion, the analysis of the range of archival records grounds the interpretation of Stratford Fair as a tactical system of public land constitution and identity formation addressed to local youth. Its approach is one of temporary occupation of scheduled land for development and the recording and reporting of its living memories through cheaply produced and accessible monthly journals. Together with the playground, the distributed archive where these journals can be found becomes a complex site of production and of representation of the Fair. If memory is a means of transforming places and subjectivities, the agency of the Stratford Fair archive is one that at the time conferred legitimation, representation and identity on the Stratford East community. Now, it holds open for plural and critical historiography the potential and experience of the playgrounds as a tactical realization of the Fun Palace idea – one largely liberated from the usual material and economic constraints that attend architecture.

References

Assmann, Aleida. 2011. *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization: Functions, Media, Archives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

de Certeau, Michel. 1984 [1980]. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley, CA and London: University of California Press.

Hardingham, Samantha. 2016. *Cedric Price Works 1952-2003: A Forward-Minded Retrospective*. London: Architectural Association Publications and Montreal: Canadian Centre for Architecture.

Hebbert, Michael. 1998. *London: More by Fortune than Design*. Chichester: Wiley.

Holdsworth, Nadine. 2007. "Spaces to Play/Playing with Spaces: Young People, Citizenship and Joan Littlewood," *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance* 12, no. 3: 293–304. Accessible online: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569780701560164>.

Kozlovsky, Roy. 2016. *Architectures of Childhood. Children, Modern Architecture and Reconstruction in Postwar England*. New York: Routledge.

Littlewood, Joan. 1968. *Bubble City*. London: The Fun Palace Trust.

Littlewood, Joan. 1994. *Joan's Book: Joan Littlewood's Peculiar History as She Tells It*. London: Methuen.

Miro, Ana Bonet. 2016. "Sigma Portfolio and Bubble City: Ludic Sites for a Mobile Fun Palace Program," *Architecture and Culture*, vol. 4, no. 1: 137–161.

Siegert, Bernhard. 2015. *Cultural Techniques: Grids, Filters, Doors, and Other Articulations of the Real*, trans. Geoffrey Winthrop-Young. New York: Fordham University Press.

Ward, Colin. 1990 [1978]. *The Child in the City*. London: Bedford Square Press.

¹ “Report – Week of 6th March, 1968,” folder DR 1995:0188:525:003, Cedric Price Archive, CCA.

[[The way in which the numbers of the archive material is shown needs to be consistent. I’ve removed the colons, following the entries that appear below. Following the mandatory caption received from CCA I have added the colons to all the references. These indicate folder references for the unnumbered documents, so I have added ‘folder’ before the reference]]

² Littlewood, *Joan’s Book: Joan Littlewood’s Peculiar History as She Tells It* (London: Methuen, 1994), 64.

³ Murray Melvin, interview with the author, November 9th, 2014.

⁴ “Land Use – Stratford E15,” letter from Cedric Price to Joan Littlewood, dated February 1st 1974, folder DR 1995:0188:525:003, Cedric Price Archive, CCA.

⁵ “Report and Accompanying Drawings [...] [for] the Use of an Area of Public Open Space as Pilot Project – in the Content and Operation – for some of the Aspects of the ‘Fun palace’,” folder DR 1995:0188:525:005, Cedric Price Archive, CCA.

⁶ Roy Kozlovsky, *Architectures of Childhood. Children, Modern Architecture and Reconstruction in Postwar England* (New York: Routledge, 2016), 48.

⁷ On local activism provoked by the Greater London Development Plan, see Michael Hebbert, *London: More by Fortune than Design* (Chichester: Wiley, 1998), 85.

⁸ Letter from Joan Littlewood to Lord Harewood, October 10, 1966, folder DR 1995:0188:525:003, Cedric Price Archive, CCA. For the planning appeal, see “The Fun Palace Planning Appeal,” folder DR 1995:0188:525:003, Cedric Price Archive, CCA.

[[Are these two meant to have the same archive number?]]

-
- ⁹ DR 1995:0188:525:003:012, Cedric Price Archive, CCA.
- ¹⁰ “Minutes of Meeting Held at Blackheath, Saturday Jan 27, 1968,” folder DR 1995:0188:525:003, Cedric Price Archive, CCA.
- ¹¹ Joan Littlewood, *Bubble City* (London: The Fun Palace Trust, 1968), 17.
- ¹² See Nadine Holdsworth, "Spaces to Play/Playing with Spaces: Young People, Citizenship and Joan Littlewood," *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance* 12, no. 3 (2007): 235. Accessible online: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569780701560164>.
- ¹³ Siegert, *Cultural Techniques: Grids, Filters, Doors, and Other Articulations of the Real*, (New York: Fordham University Press), 14.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 11.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 14.
- ¹⁶ Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (Berkeley, CA and London: University of California Press, 1984), xii.
- ¹⁷ Planning Application, dated June 7th 1972, folder DR 1995:0188:525:004, Cedric Price Archive, CCA.
- ¹⁸ De Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, 82.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 83
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*, 87.
- ²¹ “Easter Monday March 31st Stratford Fair,” folder DR 1995:0188:525:004, Cedric Price Archive, CCA.
- ²² “The Fun Palace Trust – The Fun Palace Minutes,” Theatre Royal Stratford East archive, London. A copy of this document exists also in folder DR 1995:0188:525:004, Cedric Price Archive, CCA.
- [[What is the TRSE Archive, and where is it? Added]]
- ²³ Jan Sender Diary 1975, p. 4, TRSE archive.

²⁴ “Report on Kids Village Easter Fair – Two Week Easter Holiday;” folder “The Fun Palace Trust – The Fun Palace Minutes,” TRSE Archive.

[[Are these two different documents held in the same archive? Or is one document inside the other one?]] These are the document title followed by the folder title in the archive

²⁵ “Report on Kids Village Easter Fair – Two Week Easter Holiday,” TRSE Archive.

²⁶ “Diary Report – Kids Town – December 1974,” TRSE Archive.

²⁷ “Report on Kids Village Easter Fair – Two Week Easter Holiday;” folder “The Fun Palace Trust – The Fun Palace Minutes,” TRSE Archive. [[See note on 26, above]]

²⁸ “Report on Kids Village Easter Fair – Two Week Easter Holiday,” TRSE Archive.

²⁹ “Minutes of Meeting Held at Blackheath, Saturday Jan 27, 1968,” folder DR 1995:0188:525:003, Cedric Price Archive, CCA.

³⁰ The agencies listed include: The Education Office of Local Authority, “Councillors and Influential People,” “Trust and Grant-Awarding Bodies” which include the Arts Council and Greater London Arts Association, City Parochian Foundation, National Playing Fields Association and Gulbenkian Foundation. [[Because you mention in the main text Cedric Price’s position in the mailing list, I don’t think you need to do it here OK, thanks]].

³¹ *Cedric Price* Archive, Canadian Centre for Architecture.

[[Why in French when all other mentions are in English? Can we put “Cedric Price Archive, CCA?]]

³² For instances of distribution, see “January Diary,” which is available in the TRSE archive, Michael Barker Collection at the University of Texas and Cedric Price Archive, CCA; “Uses of Land Awaiting Redevelopment 1967-1975” is both at the Cedric Price Archive and the Arts Council of England Archive. See Holdsworth,

“Spaces to Play/Playing with Spaces,” 304. For processes of archivization, classifications of the Fair’s documents could obscure relevant connexions with the larger Fun Palace project.

³³ Aleida Assmann, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization: Functions, Media, Archives*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 130.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 329.

³⁵ Significantly, the Stratford Fair is omitted altogether from the “Cedric Price Supplement,” a collection-with-commentary of work from Price’s office published in the magazine *Architectural Design* between October 1970 and January 1972, despite the resonance this supplement has with the throw away quality and user driven ethos with which the Fair actively constructs its media archive. See “Cedric Price Supplement,” *Architectural Design, 1970-1972*.

³⁶ Stratford Fair is not part of Colin Ward's rather gender-biased study of playground experiences that aim to re-connect the child to the city - see Colin Ward, *The Child in the City*, London: Bedford Square Press, 1990 [1978], 194–95. Ambivalent captions accompany key drawings of Stratford Fair in Samantha Hardingham's comprehensive retrospective of Price's work: Left: "Sketch summarizing the horizontal and vertical schematic layout for Fun Palace, 1974;" Right: "Cartoon on the subject of adaptability and multiple uses of one building." Hardingham, *Cedric Price Works 1952-2003: A Forward-Minded Retrospective* (London: Architectural Association Publications and Montreal: Canadian Centre for Architecture, 2016), 52–54.

³⁷ I refer particularly here to Holdsworth’s scholarship on Joan Littlewood, as well as to the non-scholarly initiative of funpalaces.co.uk, initiated in 2014 across the UK.

