



Deposited via The University of York.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/159554/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Book Section:**

Black, Lawrence Edward Ian (2021) Radical Chic?: Centre 42, the Roundhouse and how culture countered Wesker in the 1960s. In: Saunders, Graham, (ed.) Arnold Wesker. Intellect Ltd., Bristol, pp. 20-38.

---

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

# 1 Radical Chic? Centre 42, the Roundhouse and How Culture

## 2 Countered Wesker in the 1960s

3 Lawrence Black

4 Centre 42 (C42) was Arnold Wesker's 1960s BIB-068 odyssey preoccupying his  
5 emotional and creative energies, and in the end ultimately draining them. The fame  
6 Wesker found in *The Trilogy* (1958-60) gave a platform to launch a bold cultural-  
7 political initiative. *The Trilogy* depicted working-class life and segued Jewishness,  
8 political belonging and socialism. Arguing that art and culture were central to the  
9 Labour movement's progress in a 1960 Trades Union Congress (TUC) motion  
10 (no.42), Wesker's initiative ran local festivals in 1961 and 1962. In 1964, it inherited  
11 the Roundhouse in North London, which became its spatial and symbolic home. By  
12 1970, C42 came to the end of the line struggling to synthesize and enhance  
13 working-class cultural life, failing to secure funding from the unions and Arts Council  
14 of Great Britain (ACGB) and superseded by other popular and counter-cultural  
15 activities at the Roundhouse.

16 Exploring C42's diverse activities and volatile narrative is itself a social  
17 history of the 1960s. In the opening piece of *Radical Chic & Mau-Mauing the Flak*  
18 *Catchers* (1970), Tom Wolfe's account of a Black Panther gathering with the liberal  
19 elite of Manhattan society at composer Leonard Bernstein's apartment in 1970 is  
20 suggestive of the same contradictions inherent in C42 (Wolfe 1970 BIB-108). There was

1 a similar air of radical chic to C42: a socialist playwright wanting to take art to the  
2 workers but marooned in a London post-industrial building which it envisaged as its  
3 national base, together with a glamorous cast of (sometimes) supporters and  
4 (supposed) political and artistic allies. The argument here is that whilst C42 nurtured  
5 varied cultural activity, it was thwarted by countervailing tastes, practices and policy  
6 agendas. The wider culture artistic, but also political, financial, personal and popular  
7 also countered Wesker's vision.

## 8 Wesker's 1960s: Cultural and Political Context

9 Wesker's sixties celebrity was notable. He was close to Arts Minister Jennie Lee and  
10 Prime Minister Harold Wilson as well as a member of the government's Youth  
11 Service Development Council from 1960 to 1966. *Tatler* profiled him in 1965 and by  
12 1967 *Roots* was an A-level text. During the tumultuous summer of 1967, Wesker was  
13 offered and declined a CBE. *Roots*' off-Broadway run in 1961 had critics comparing  
14 Wesker to Clifford Odets (Anon. 1961bBIB-002). His play *Chips with Everything* was a  
15 Broadway hit in 1963 was rollicking as Sgt. Bilko and casting Wesker as part of the  
16 British invasion (Anon. 1963CBIB-006). The buzz was such that Wesker sold the film  
17 rights for £10,000 in 1964 to kick-start the Roundhouse appeal by sponsoring a pillar  
18 and some bricks (AW 1963bBIB-080).

19 Wesker was the personification, a cliché even, of the 1960s radicalism. Active  
20 in the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) and a founder of the Committee of

1 100 in 1960 along with Doris Lessing, Lindsay Anderson, Shelagh Delaney and John  
2 Osborne, Wesker marched to Aldermaston, was arrested on a sit-down protest and  
3 served a month in Brixton Prison in 1961 (AW [1960aBIB-068](#); Wesker [1995BIB-064](#): 610,  
4 619). While critical of the Soviet Union, Wesker visited Cuba in 1964 and 1968, and  
5 although he condemned Castro's persecution of homosexuality, the British-Cuba  
6 Association headquarters was situated at the Roundhouse (Wesker [1969BIB-060](#): 15,  
7 21).<sup>1</sup>

8 C42 and the Roundhouse were part of the 1960s' DIY ethos of social  
9 innovation and underground entrepreneurialism (Curtis & Sanderson [2004BIB-028](#): 1)  
10 and the stages for the dramas and debates about popular, elite and counter-cultural  
11 content: London and the regions, the role of the state and the post-industrial use of  
12 buildings. Longer-term, it can be argued that they became the model for arts centres  
13 and for forging 'culture' as a political terrain.

14 In another register, C42 cast itself as a cultural wing of the New Left – an  
15 intellectual-activist political formation that from 1956 proposed an alternative vision  
16 of socialism to both social democracy and Soviet communism. Culture was the New  
17 Left's keyword, and C42 assumed that culture, in both content and practice, should be  
18 political. Yet, most accounts of the New Left point to a waning of this ideal in its  
19 'second' generation, where it turned from 1962 to theory rather than such practice as  
20 the Soho Partisan café, Left Clubs, new wave cinema or Wesker plays at the Royal  
21 Court (Rustin [1989BIB-053](#): 117–28).

1           This relationship can be found in the *May Day Manifesto* movement (1967-  
2 68), a revival of the 'first' generation New Left. Wesker was a signatory of the  
3 original 1967 *New Left May Day Manifesto* (Ponnuswami 1998BIB-049: 138). Yet,  
4 despite being edited by Raymond Williams, it said little about 'culture'. This extended  
5 to its critique of 'Labourism', in which it argued that it wasn't just a hostile culture  
6 that marginalized the left in national life, but that the British Labour Party and trade  
7 unions by comparison with European social democracy were too narrowly focused on  
8 parliament and wages, lacking a broader presence in civil society or ideological  
9 strategy for cultivating this. Yet, Jennie Lee as Minister for the Arts (1964-70),  
10 1962's Festival of Labour (Black 2016BIB-024) and modernizing Labour MPs like Tony  
11 Crosland and Roy Jenkins in culture indicate that it was not lack of interest, resources  
12 or will but rather popular cultural preference and the wider political culture that  
13 constrained Labour's cultural progress (Black 2007BIB-022: 149-62).

14           The Labour Party, like Wesker, were firm believers in a cultural hierarchy that  
15 it trusted Britons might be enticed to ascend. As with much of the permissive  
16 legislation enacted in the 1960s, arts policy was at odds with popular opinion;  
17 distinctively, it endeavoured to not only modernize traditional arts but also promote  
18 access to it, particularly in the regions. Jazz, much in evidence at the Festival of  
19 Labour and made eligible for Arts Council funding in 1967, was about as modern as  
20 its tastes ran to. Lee's 1965 Arts White Paper extolled how 'in the world of jazz the  
21 process has already happened; highbrow and lowbrow have met' (Cmnd. 2601

1 1965BIB-025: para. 71). This agenda was challenged by self-made commercial pop  
2 culture, not to mention the counter-culture that emerged in late 1960s Britain.

3 By contrast, C42 was less permissive and more prescriptive, defending folksy-  
4 proletarian culture as well as elite forms such as classical music. Contemporary critics  
5 such as John McGrath and later critics like Mulgan and Worpole felt that for C42 the  
6 problem was of taking existing art to the workers, not trying to create new forms of  
7 art (Mulgan & Worpole 1986BIB-047: 28-29).

## 8 Roots and Knots

9 Wesker's animus and the impetus behind C42 was that theatregoing was a minority  
10 pursuit compared to mass audiences for cinema and television. 'Is anybody listening?'  
11 (Wesker 1970BIB-061:13) he wondered in *The Modern Playwright or O, Mother, Is It*  
12 *Worth It?*, the 1960 pamphlet he sent to every Trade Union leader. In this, Wesker  
13 railed against the industrial relations satire film *I'm Alright Jack* (1959) and  
14 condemned the Labour movement for offering little alternative to cultural habits 'a  
15 neglect [...] almost immoral' (Wesker 1970BIB-061: 17) and instead focusing its  
16 efforts almost entirely on material improvement for its members.<sup>2</sup> For Wesker this  
17 was an impoverishing outlook, since 'if we are not to be materially exploited neither  
18 should we be culturally exploited'. Wesker saw exemplars of cultural well-being in  
19 'the Gorkis, Chekhovs, Millers, the Balzacs and Steinbecks, the Beethovens and the  
20 de Sicas, the Van Goghs and the Louis Armstrongs' (Wesker 1970BIB-061: 18).

1 Socialism, for Wesker and the writers of his generation (Rebellato 1999BIB-052: 11),  
2 meant not merely an economic organization of society but a way of living (Wesker  
3 1970BIB-061: 17), and Labour and the unions were perpetuating the fragmenting of  
4 work and leisure.

5 The birth of Centre 42 is well documented (Black 2010BIB-023). At the 1960  
6 TUC, a motion drafted by Wesker and Bill Holdsworth, active in the Hemel  
7 Hempstead Left Club, called for the involvement of trade unions in cultural activities  
8 (Wesker 1960CBIB-058: 67). The motion was moved by Ralph Bond, who told of  
9 attending an International Confederation of Trade Unions Film Festival, featuring  
10 Scandinavian, West German, Austrian and American films, but not a single British  
11 contribution, he was sad to say (TUC 1960BIB-054: 435). When a speaker backing the  
12 motion was interrupted by the Congress President 'I hope delegates will be brief as I  
13 want to take the economic section after this' this served to demonstrate the motion's  
14 critique of dominant materialist outlooks and coalesced support for it (TUC 1960BIB-  
15 054: 438).

16 C42 posters proclaimed, 'All Art should be Free' it is an experience not a  
17 commodity and reasoned that the principle of free art, like free education and  
18 medicine, would be accepted within a couple of decades (AW n.d.a). Novelist Doris  
19 Lessing told the first C42 council of management how '[u]nder the glossy mask of  
20 false prosperity which is the face of Britain now, people are being starved [...] 95% of  
21 the people are educated away from art' (AW 1961CBIB-073). Wesker proved relentless

1 in urging Harold Wilson to consider the arts as a way of improving Labour's image  
2 during the 1964 election campaign (AW [1964CBIB-083](#)). Wilson responded that his  
3 famous 1963 'white heat' speech had really been about technology generating the  
4 potential for leisure (AW [1964dBIB-084](#)). Jennie Lee, the Minister for Arts and Culture,  
5 initially endorsed Wesker's 'brave idea' that if politicians and economists had failed  
6 to rescue us from the torpor of a subtly totalitarian culture, the only thing left is to  
7 give the poet his chance' (Lee [1962BIB-041](#): 95-96).

8         Yet, Wesker and C42 were often seen as patronizing to working-class cultural  
9 tastes. Wesker once told the Finsbury Theatre Society in 1963 that the British public  
10 was philistine' (Anon. [1963aBIB-004](#)); in 1970, John McGrath, founder of the radical  
11 7:84 theatre company, and briefly a member of C42's council, condemned Wesker's  
12 crusade, claiming that 'the idea [...] that culture is a product to be sold by culturally-  
13 conscious (therefore superior) artists and intellectuals to a culturally starved (therefore  
14 inferior) workers, is based on the bourgeois concept of culture' (McGrath [1970BIB-044](#)).

15         Such attitudes were implicit in C42's cultural repertoire and preferences.  
16 Wesker's pet hates included the furore around the Beatles and intellectuals who  
17 'pretend to like Elvis' (Wesker [1971BIB-062](#): 5). In *Youth Service Magazine*, he  
18 explained: 'that the music of Bach is superior to the music of Elvis Presley [...] an  
19 indisputable fact that Presley himself would admit' (Wesker [1964BIB-059](#)). In *Chips  
20 with Everything* (1962), we see the Wing Commander's chagrin when the men chose

1 folk music in preference to Elvis ■ an echo of Beattie in *Roots* trying to educate her  
2 mother to appreciate Bizet.

3         Commentators like Richard Hoggart were similarly wary of American mass  
4 culture. Yet, C42 also exhibited what, in *The Uses of Literacy* (1957), Hoggart  
5 warned was a ■ middle-class Marxist ■ tendency found in the early New Left type: ■ a  
6 nostalgia for those ■ best of all ■ kinds of art, rural folk-art or genuinely popular urban  
7 art, and a special enthusiasm for such scraps of them as he thinks he can detect today  
8 [...] part-pitying and part-patronizing working-class people ■ (Hoggart 1958BIB-035: 5).  
9 In this sense, Wesker's C42 could be seen as practicing radical chic, *nostalgie de la*  
10 *boue* as Wolfe also terms it, romanticizing exotic primitive culture. C42's politically  
11 progressive, culturally traditional amalgam exalted indigenous national cultures in  
12 highly selective ways. It aimed to recover ■ authentic ■, traditional working-class  
13 experience just as this was reckoned to have evaporated or mutated. Significantly, the  
14 multiculturalism of 1960s Britain only faintly registered on C42's radar. C42 was an  
15 exercise in cultural defence against new forms of popular culture as much as against  
16 elitism – anti-establishment, but at the same time defending traditional ■ authentic ■  
17 forms and struggling to rival mainstream commercial culture. Its only non-classical  
18 musical tastes, folk and jazz, were of the ■ trad ■ (acceptable American) type,  
19 countering electric pop ■ although at the start of the 1960s, there was a revival in  
20 both, with popular and radical resonance (McKay 2007; Horn 2009BIB-037; Mitchell  
21 2014BIB-046).

1           The activities for which the Roundhouse would become controversial and  
2 (in)famous later in the 1960s were very different from the early offerings at C42's  
3 festivals between September and November 1962 in Nottingham, Birmingham,  
4 Leicester, Bristol, Hayes and Southall and (in 1961) Wellingborough. Standard C42  
5 fare included: pub and workplace poetry readings from Dannie Abse, Laurie Lee and  
6 Christopher Logue (AW [1962CBIB-076](#)); folk music from Ewan MacColl, Peggy Seeger  
7 and A. L. Lloyd and art and sculpture displays (including Barbara Hepworth and L. S.  
8 Lowry) in shops and community centres. The National Youth Theatre performed  
9 *Hamlet* (Shakespeare's Jimmy Porter as festival pamphlets dubbed it), and a theatre  
10 folk ballad *The Maker and the Tool* (1962) was constructed by Charles Parker from  
11 workplace recordings (Watt [2003BIB-055](#): 43-46). Wesker's short play *The Nottingham*  
12 *Captain* (1962) was written for the festivals with ACGB funding and dealt with the  
13 defeat of the 1817 Pentrich Luddite rising. It was scripted to a part-jazz (by David  
14 Lee, later musical director on BBC TV's *That Was the Week That Was*) and part-  
15 classical score (ACGB [1962BIB-018](#)). Jazz came from the Fortytwo Big band, led by  
16 Tommy Watt. The sixteen-piece's repertoire included the TUC twist and Wesker  
17 Jumps In and was well enough regarded to record with Columbia Records in 1964  
18 (Green [1962BIB-033](#): 1).

19           Yet, this folksy, nostalgic cleaving to some authentic workers' culture did not  
20 impress all. Playwright Shelagh Delaney, admired by the New Left and initially a  
21 supporter of C42, increasingly wondered why it seem[s] to think that 100 years ago,

1 everybody was speaking poetry in pubs (Anon. 1962BIB-003). Working-class artists,  
2 such as Ron Dellar in *New Left Review*, felt resentment when portrayed as romantic  
3 misfits whose works could only be [...] appreciated by an [...] upper middle class  
4 minority as much as when they had to debase their art by contributing to glossy  
5 magazines (Dellar 1961BIB-029: 60).

6 C42's answer to such concerns was to organize itself as a vanguard, a cultural  
7 hub in London which by its approach and work will destroy the mystique and  
8 snobbery associated with the arts:

9



10 If we do not succeed an army of highly powered commercial enterprises are going to  
11 sweep into the leisure hours of future generations and create a cultural mediocrity  
12 [...] a nation emotionally and intellectually immature, capable of enjoying nothing,  
13 creating nothing and effecting nothing. This is not an idle prophecy; it is a fact in the  
14 making.

15 (AW 1962a)

16



17 In addition to creating a space to nurture the best professional artists (AW 1962aBIB-  
18 074) and a new popular audience for the arts (not vice versa), C42 rethought spectators  
19 as more active participants. Wesker believed that given the right opportunities, art  
20 will return as the natural function of any community; without it a community is

1 soulless and in the end easily exploitable; a vote in a democracy may be the  
2 individual's weapon against political abuse, but [...] art can strengthen a man's  
3 personality against spiritual abuse (AW 1962bBIB-075). There was a clear theory to the  
4 nomenclature of a *Centre 42* prior to the Roundhouse.

## 5 Roundhouse: The Rise and Fall

6 Built in 1847 by Robert Stephenson as a turning house for locomotives, developments  
7 in rail design eventually rendered the Roundhouse obsolete. From 1869 until fashion  
8 tycoon Louis Mintz acquired the leasehold and gifted it to C42 in 1964, it was a liquor  
9 warehouse (Foster 1971BIB-032: 43). In 1954, it was categorized as a Grade II listed  
10 building. Plans for the Roundhouse, once it was acquired in 1964, were outlined by  
11 Wesker in the *Allio Brief*. This provided French theatre designer René Allio and  
12 architect Paul Chemetov with guidelines for redesigning this former railway shed as a  
13 multipurpose, state of the arts centre. Allio had worked on Roger Planchon's Théâtre  
14 de la Cité in Lyon and Malraux's Centres Dramatiques. Chemetov led the *Atelier*  
15 *d'urbanisme et d'architecture* in Paris and had worked on the new French Communist  
16 party HQ (Joly 1973BIB-039: 58-63).

17 The *Allio Brief* evoke[d] the atmosphere (Wesker 1970BIB-061: 52) and  
18 aesthetics of C42's vision. Architectural excellence was imperative; C42 artists ought  
19 to be warlike, audacious, gay, courteous, brilliant and no doubt drunk and the  
20 Roundhouse a place of pleasure and marvelous revelation and efficient, effective,

1 functional (Wesker 1970BIB-061: 55), including meeting rooms for local Co-ops, trade  
2 unions, church and youth groups. The building should relate the artist and the  
3 audience more intimately than in traditional theatres and result in developing a new  
4 and informed audience (Wesker 1970BIB-061: 58). Unlike Allio, Wesker liked the  
5 idea of sceptical youngsters lounging around in a building where there is music,  
6 theatre and debate in full swing and felt there ought to be a jellied eel stall, the  
7 FortyTwo fish and chip shop, the bookstall... And the drinking bar [...] must be  
8 available [...] as a pub throughout the day (Wesker 1970BIB-061: 59). More militantly,  
9 the Roundhouse was to be the place where if artists were to

10

forge a new language that will make society recognize its responsibilities to the arts  
it should be here. If they are to acquire that confidence that will eliminate the artist's  
nervous twitch of apology for his so-called inessential profession it should be  
here. And if all this adds up to a cultural revolution and if this revolution has a seat  
it should be here.

16

(Wesker 1970BIB-061: 60)

17

18 Yet, it can be argued that [t]he notoriety and achievements of the Roundhouse  
19 came *despite* C42 more than *because* of it (Etienne 2016BIB-030: 141). Indeed, the  
20 sorts of popular culture the Roundhouse housed for financial expediency superseded

1 C42's vision. The Roundhouse would not have happened so easily in a non-1960s  
2 context, yet the same context also undermined C42. Whereas it foundered, other  
3 politically engaged theatre companies developed away from London, for instance  
4 7:84, Red Ladder and The People Show (Itzin 1980BIB-038: 4-5). However, C42 was a  
5 precursory model for numerous local arts centres and 'carrot-cake' cinemas such as,  
6 variously, the Dagenham Roundhouse or Bristol's Arnolfini, which found its present  
7 site in a former tea warehouse in the city centre docks in 1975 often located in  
8 regenerated industrial buildings.

9 Harold Wilson had gifted the Roundhouse George Hoskins (a coffee shop  
10 entrepreneur and former civil servant) and Robert Maxwell, MP, already reputed for  
11 his unscrupulous business practice (Anon. 1966BIB-009), allegedly to lend gravitas to  
12 fund-raising initiatives (AW 1965aBIB-087). A DIY ethos remained from C42's  
13 regional festivals, which not even the business nous of Hoskins and Maxwell could  
14 dispel. In January 1967, the Greater London Council declared that the present  
15 condition of the premises falls short of the required standard (AW 1967aBIB-094).  
16 Efforts to put things on a more commercial footing institutionally uncoupled C42  
17 from the Roundhouse Trust. This saw the Roundhouse used variously for TV, adverts,  
18 ice shows, Campaign for Real Ale festivals and a British Film Institute-*Sunday Times*  
19 'cinema city' exhibition, visited by Harold Lloyd and Gene Kelly.

20 Without secure funding or cultural roots, C42 and its property were also  
21 overrun by popular and counter-cultural activities, far from the blend of high-end

1 culture or authentic-folk-proletarian culture Wesker envisaged. Dubbed 'the cathedral  
2 of the permissive society' (Anon. [1971BIB-015](#)), the Roundhouse was a trip through the  
3 1960s. It hosted two key London counter-culture events: the 1967 Dialectics of  
4 Liberation conference and the launch of *International Times (IT)* in 1966. Neither was  
5 designed by C42, but its rates made the Roundhouse cheap to hire. Jim Haynes, an *IT*  
6 editor and founder of London's ArtsLab and Edinburgh's Traverse Theatre, argued  
7 that Wesker's financial ambitions for converting the Roundhouse overrode C42's  
8 cultural output. At the same time as the Dialectics conference took place Wesker was  
9 at a fund-raising tea party at Downing Street with political leaders and entertainment  
10 impresarios like Sir Billy Butlin and Lew Grade. This coincidence of the Dialectics  
11 happening and the No.10 tea party encapsulated the cultural chasm between the vision  
12 of C42 and the day-to-day life of the Roundhouse (Green [1988BIB-034](#): 119; Cooper  
13 [1971BIB-026](#)).

14 The 1960s Roundhouse was evidence of class, status and culture in flux as  
15 new money and lifestyles, and new artistic forms, flourished. By 1971, performances  
16 included a rock version of *Othello* and Peter Brook's trapeze interpretation of *The*  
17 *Tempest* (1968), bands such as The Doors and The Who and Andy Warhol's first  
18 play, *Pork* (1971).

19 The Roundhouse, more soberly, was also a political venue favoured by 1960s  
20 radicals. In 1967, it hosted the anti-Vietnam War 'Angry Arts' week, sponsored by  
21 Jonathan Miller and Vanessa Redgrave, featuring Ewen MacColl, Peggy Seeger and

1 Harold Pinter, and recorded as a TV documentary (Anon. 1967bBIB-011). It was also  
2 used by anti-Apartheid groups, *Black Dwarf*, and the Revolutionary Socialist Student  
3 Federation conference in November 1968, addressed by Daniel Cohn-Bendit. The  
4 schizophrenic nature of the venue was such that it also hosted 'high' cultural events  
5 like the British School at Rome Painting Group and recordings of Beethoven by the  
6 New Philharmonia Orchestra. There was a frisson to the Roundhouse — its radical chic  
7 was encapsulated in the fact that it was a scene to be seen at and not where the  
8 common herd frequented (AW 1971BIB-101: 27–31).

9 By 1969, the Roundhouse had become louche, a rowdy place. That year, the  
10 GLC Public Services Entertainment sub-committee refused an extension of an all-  
11 night music licence (Anon. 1969aBIB-013). When the Roundhouse lost its Camden  
12 Council subsidy in 1970, this was the final rupture between C42 and the Roundhouse  
13 (AW 1971BIB-101: 18). Relating his decision to resign to the architect Paul Chemetov,  
14 Wesker wrote that the 'building has a certain cachet in London [...] every slick  
15 enterprise wants to hire it', but he now had 'nightmares about it' (AW 1970BIB-100).

## 16 Friends (and Foes and Funds)

17 Away from such dramatic gestures, much of the story of C42, the Roundhouse and  
18 Wesker was concerned with a running battle to win the argument for a particular  
19 vision of culture and to win material support to practically enact it. Neither proved  
20 easy. The six 1962 Festivals had left C42 £40,000 in debt, which made Mintz's offer

1 of the Roundhouse particularly appealing in lending C42 not only an artistic space,  
2 but also a permanent base. Yet, it also left C42 with the task of fund-raising to convert  
3 the Roundhouse into a cultural hub. Lord Harewood (the Queen's cousin and director  
4 of the Edinburgh Festival) launched the appeal at the Roundhouse in July 1964 in the  
5 presence of Mintz, Wilson and James Callaghan, the Chancellor of the Exchequer  
6 (AW 1964eBIB-085). Harold Pinter, John Osborne and the TUC's George Woodcock  
7 and Vic Feather turned down invites (AW 1964fBIB-086). The target was £590,000  
8 (approximately £11.3m in 2018) to be funded from national and local government, the  
9 public, trade unions, charities and business.

10         Despite arguing in 1963 that trade unionism needed to address spiritual as well  
11 as material poverty, Vic Feather (1963BIB-031:124), the TUC's Assistant General  
12 Secretary, proved a thorn in C42's side. According to the British Film Institute's  
13 Stanley Reed, when C42 was mentioned to him in 1962, Feather bemoaned  
14 'eccentrics knocking on the doors of the TUC' (AW 1962dBIB-077).<sup>3</sup> Wesker had urged  
15 the new TUC General Secretary George Woodcock in 1960 to show 'vision' (Wesker  
16 1960bBIB-057), but by 1963, Woodcock bemoaned C42 for being 'long-haired and  
17 starry-eyed' (Anon. 1963bBIB-005). Two years later, Wesker retaliated by branding the  
18 TUC 'old men [...] paralyzed by the narrowness of your preoccupations' (Wesker  
19 cited in Coppieters 1975BIB-027: 47). The hostilities meant that the TUC ceased to  
20 support C42.

1 C42 called on local authorities to contribute, as permitted by the 1948 Local  
2 Government Act. However, with the London County Council (LCC) expanding into  
3 the GLC between 1963 and 1965, many local authorities deferred such decisions. In  
4 1966, Bromley Councillor Raymond Pope denounced C42 as a 'proletarian piffle' and  
5 any donation as 'throwing [...] public money down the kitchen sink' (Anon. 1966BIB-  
6 009). The GLC and LCC were minded to hear how the ACGB felt about C42 before  
7 committing (AW 1963aBIB-079). Likewise, the ACGB's Chairman Lord Goodman was  
8 keen to see match-funding for any ACGB support (AW 1966aBIB-091).

9 The Gulbenkian Foundation donated £10,000 early in 1962 and £3,000 in  
10 1964 (ACGB 1964). Business patronage was also forthcoming from the ITV  
11 Companies Association Committee of Review of Grants to the Arts and Sciences.  
12 After 1964, business interest diminished as central ACGB funding and support  
13 increased (ACGB 1968BIB-021). The Arts Council's Secretary General, Sir William  
14 Emrys Williams, had suggested that 'Weskerism' was a 'false doctrine', premised on  
15 mass interest in the arts and told Wesker that business would want to see that C42 was  
16 'a sound and sane organization' (AW 1964bBIB-082). C42 submitted four unsuccessful  
17 bids to the ACGB by 1967. Ultimately, Goodman confessed his personal dislike of  
18 the C42 project to the ACGB and LCC (ACGB 1965BIB-020).

19 Wesker's celebrity and charisma gave the movement early impetus, enabling  
20 him to assemble union leaders Ted Hill, Frank Cousins and Bill Carron plus Doris  
21 Lessing, Tom Maschler and Jennie Lee on C42's first Council of Management (AW

1 [1961bBIB-072](#)). C42 was based on personalities as much as ideas long before its  
2 aspirations, directed to a primarily trade union audience, faded. Much energy was  
3 expended on schemes like the 1965 Stars Committee fronted by John Lennon,  
4 Vanessa Redgrave, Spike Milligan and Fenella Fielding (AW [1965bBIB-088](#); Anon.  
5 [1965BIB-008](#)). If Wesker's abrasive personality attracted controversy, his core concept  
6 of a cultural hub was no less contentious since it implicitly questioned current  
7 government policy and the dominant structures of artistic production. This explained  
8 why C42 was received so coolly by many otherwise politically or creatively  
9 sympathetic. Doris Lessing spoke as early as 1961 about "a great deal of malice being  
10 spread [...] about C42" (AW [1961aBIB-071](#)). Lessing reported that George Devine, the  
11 Royal Court's Artistic Director who had facilitated Wesker's breakthrough works,  
12 "seems to see this as an attack on himself".

13 Wesker's talent for ingratiating himself with the famous and the influential  
14 meant the "Friends of Centre 42" was bedecked with Lords, Ladys and Sirs as well as  
15 the Countess of Albemarle and luminaries John Berger, Sidney Bernstein, Gerald  
16 Gardiner, Peter Hall, Cleo Laine, J. B. Priestley, Alan Sillitoe, CP Snow, Kenneth  
17 Tynan and Raymond Williams (AW [1971BIB-101](#): 40-41). Most audacious was an  
18 approach to Prince Philip. Wesker explained he would "sooner have built 42 on the  
19 pennies and pounds of many hundreds and thousands", but this was not forthcoming  
20 (AW [1965CBIB-089](#)). He visited Buckingham Palace in May 1965, where Philip blamed  
21 government funding of sports and arts for reducing the interest of private or business

1 patrons. Wesker's request was rejected (AW 1965dBIB-090). In another instance  
2 Wesker simply pleaded for a millionaire to back him (AW 1966bBIB-092).

3 C42 always generated as well as hosted cultural debate and amidst the  
4 evidence of putative or fleeting friends and the uncertainties induced by its aura of  
5 radical chic, it is worth noting there were plenty who not only ignored but were  
6 downright hostile to either Wesker's vision or the workings of the Roundhouse. Noel  
7 Coward, a critic of the "dustbin school of drama" (Anon. 1961aBIB-071), disparaged  
8 Wesker's efforts in "all those dreary English towns organizing dreary festivals for  
9 those dreary people" (Anon. 1964BIB-007). Other cultural warriors saw C42 as more  
10 sinister. In 1968, Mary Whitehouse drew attention to "the headquarters of the left  
11 wing organization "Centre 42", adding that "the Roundhouse is used for activities of  
12 the "anti-university" and had hosted a conference on the "dialectics of liberation"  
13 [...] whose neo-Marxist ideas have kindled much of the present unrest in Europe"  
14 (NVALA 1968BIB-048).

15 But even C42's relationships with its friends were fraught. Wesker's hostility  
16 to pop music, including the Beatles, has been noted, but Lennon's association was  
17 keenly sought. Peter Sellars was listed amongst the Friends of C42, but *I'm Alright*  
18 *Jack* was regularly cited as unworthy of the Labour movement because it suggested  
19 trade unionists were self-interested, cynical and lazy. Impresario Jack Hylton was also  
20 a "Friend", but Wesker dubbed him a "cretinizing" cultural influence (Green 1962BIB-  
21 033: 7) and told Goodman he would "prefer to have Hylton's assurances in the bank"

1 (AW 1962eBIB-078). On the eve of the No.10 tea party, Wesker enjoined the  
2 Gulbenkian's Jim Thornton: 'let us hope that the industrial thugs who gather at  
3 Downing Street will be touched with your enlightenment' (AW 1967dBIB-097).

4 The New Left was as unforthcoming with ideological sustenance as the TUC  
5 or ACGB. Relations had been close ■ Wesker wrote in the first *New Left Review*  
6 (Wesker 1960aBIB-056) and touted his project as 'another focal point of activity'  
7 (Wesker 1960cBIB-058: 47) to match CND. Yet, actress and later Labour MEP Janey  
8 Buchan wrote to Wesker in 1960 explaining she had 'prodded Stuart Hall and *NLR*  
9 until I'm sick' to participate in the burgeoning fringe at the Edinburgh Festival (AW  
10 1960bBIB-069). She despaired of the New Left's Londo-centrism and felt that 'NLR  
11 need their heads looking at because they could have the most tremendous stage ready-  
12 made for them'.

13 Relations with Lee also faltered (Hollis 1997BIB-036: 246-96). Although Lee  
14 noted that Wesker 'agreed with me that an urgent priority is to try to set up counter-  
15 attractions to the influences of commercial television, betting, drugs' (AW 1967cBIB-  
16 096), Wesker's outburst at June 1967's Labour Arts and Amenities group meeting  
17 sealed the fallout (JL 1967BIB-042). The group chair told Lee: 'C42 is suffering from  
18 'Jennicide' [...]. Arnold is under the delusion that you are conspiring with Ted  
19 [Willis] to kill the C42 project' (HW 1967aBIB-106).

20 Goodman then undermined C42 with the Prime Minister. He had 'never felt  
21 much enthusiasm for the project', since it was

1

2

in direct contradiction to a policy [...] cultivated by Jennie and myself [...] that we do not impose our views or any central views on the local regions and [...] that pre-packaged London culture dispatched all over the place is the exact reverse of what we are trying to establish.

3

4

5

6

(HW 1967bBIB-107)

7

8

The July 1967 tea party at 10 Downing Street came a month after Wesker's

9

accusations against Lee. Donations totalled almost £80,000 (AW 1971BIB-101: 41-42).

10

This amounted to a survival rather than a development package, confining C42 to a

11

virtual entity, existing in name and imagination alone.

12

Wesker's suspicions that C42 had ended up as tenants of the Roundhouse,

13

rather than having a prior claim on it, [...] hood-winked by tycoons, railroaded by

14

commercial imperatives and deserted by [...] Lee and the TUC? (Black 2010BIB-023:

15

167) were not unfounded (AW 1966CBIB-093). Ted Willis, TV playwright and Labour

16

Lord, was a longstanding foe of C42. He had suggested that it merge with Unity

17

Theatre in 1963, and in a 1966 interview with Susan Barnes (partner of Labour MP

18

Tony Crosland) in *The Sun*, Willis berated Wesker for suggesting that [...] to write for

19

television would be dipping his pen in mud? Willis felt Wesker suffered from a

20

messiah complex, seeing himself in shining white robes coming down [...] the Old

1 Kent Road and converting everybody there to Bach and Beethoven. Such hysterical  
2 sincerity was patronizing (Willis 1966BIB-103).

3 Other critics argued C42 was too profligate and that cultural output should  
4 always precede the needs of funding and a permanent base. Again, Willis was among  
5 their number, writing in *Tribune*: Wesker seems to think that he alone has the tablets  
6 of stone [...] on art and the rest of us are either philistines or cheats. He insisted C42  
7 needed to show us in deeds not words (Willis 1967BIB-104). For Mike Kustow, the  
8 ICA (where he was Director from 1967 to 1971) was artistically superior and ArtsLab  
9 more successful as a meeting place (Anon. 1969bBIB-014). In fact, the uncoupling of  
10 the Roundhouse and C42 was apparent to most commentators from 1967 onwards.

11 *London Look* (Anon. 1967aBIB-010) were wowed by the spectacle and presence of the  
12 building but put-off by its ambitious funding demands and felt C42 was essentially a  
13 landlord to other cultural providers. *Jackie*, the teenage magazine for girls (itself  
14 evidence of how the Roundhouse was a fixture in popular youth culture), observed  
15 that with its late-night bars and psychedelic lighting, the Roundhouse was a really  
16 jumping scene but during daytime reverted to the rather solid sign of a social and  
17 cultural arts centre (Anon. 1967cBIB-012).

18 The popular reception C42 elicited proved equally constraining. C42's local  
19 festivals met the uneven reception that the project as a whole encountered. J. B.  
20 Priestley was supportive of Wesker's noble simplicity and efforts to counter  
21 admass but imagined Halifax workers faced with C42's cultural fare remarking, ah

1 couldn't make head nor tail of it' (Priestley 1965BIB-051). For his part, Wesker saw in  
2 Priestley 'a popular touch which seems to have eluded me' (Wesker 1995BIB-064: 144).

### 3 Conclusions

4 Interviewed by Catherine Itzin and Glenda Leeming for *Theatre Quarterly* in 1977,  
5 Wesker conceded (indeed almost felt 'fulfilled' by) the suggestion that 'your earlier  
6 career seems to be slightly overshadowing your later career' (Wesker 1985BIB-063:  
7 100). C42 and the Roundhouse were the buffers against this earlier success. Wesker at  
8 least thought that C42 had 'created a spirit and focused attention on the arts in a way  
9 that has inspired' (AW 1968BIB-098). Itzin reckoned that as fringe theatres and arts  
10 centres flourished in the 1970s, C42 had 'come true, independent of its originators'  
11 and foreshadowed the heyday of radical theatre (agit-prop, avant-garde, feminist,  
12 black, gay) in the 1970s (Itzin 1980BIB-038: 103-15). Wesker tended to look back in  
13 anger. In 1967, he reflected: 'I have been too charming or innocent in my dealings  
14 with "the powers that be"' (AW 1967bBIB-107).

15 Like many contemporaries, historical comment on C42 has tended to judge it  
16 harshly. For Coppieters, the idea of a Centre controlled by artists was radical enough  
17 to generate political unease, threaten commercial dictates and question artistic  
18 hierarchies 'its potential was 'betrayed' by elite opposition and union antipathy  
19 (Coppieters 1975BIB-027: 51). By contrast, Marwick notes that efforts to transform the  
20 Roundhouse into a political theatre 'inevitably flopped' (Marwick 1998BIB-045: 343).

1 The terms of such perceived failure disclose much about the pattern, and limits, of  
2 the 1960s cultural revolution. Nonetheless, this chapter's argument moves beyond  
3 such a simple dichotomy to see Wesker as thwarted by wider cultural tastes and  
4 emerging practices, the broader political culture and by the project's own  
5 contradictions: in short, culture(s) countered it. In addition, whilst C42 fell short in its  
6 own terms, it served to inspire as a model for others after 1970.

7       What C42 lacked in cultural provision (once in the Roundhouse it is hard to  
8 envision precisely *what* C42's output was to be), it made up for with a vision. Its  
9 legacy was here rather than in its own cultural turns in the 1960s in modelling rather  
10 than realizing the cultural turn. Wesker would return to Buckingham Palace to collect  
11 a knighthood in 2006. By then the Roundhouse had undergone many changes: it had  
12 remained culturally iconic but dishevelled in the 1970s (Preston 2005BIB-050), failed in  
13 efforts to become a black arts centre with GLC support in the 1980s, became subject  
14 to preservation by English Heritage in the 1990s and reopened in 2006 as a renovated,  
15 bespoke arts centre, with private financial backing, as well as English Heritage and  
16 Arts Council support. Echoes of C42 and Wesker resounded: Pink Floyd offered  
17 financial support, there was a sponsored brick scheme and a studio 42, whose first  
18 play was the suggestively titled *The Foolish Young Man* by Jeremy Weller. Politics  
19 was apparent in that it hosted US radical filmmaker Michael Moore's first UK stand-  
20 up performance, albeit one that ended in claims of Moore being short-changed by the  
21 venue and organizers (*Guardian* 2003). This all tied in with the 1990s' and 2000s'

1 New Labour rhetoric of the creative industries. If this was a cultural revolution, it was  
2 not as Wesker planned or envisaged, and while he nourished and hosted it, he ended  
3 up being consumed by it. Radical, mostly; chic, definitely!

#### 4 References

BIB-001

5 Anon. (1961), *New York Times*, 26 February.

BIB-002

6 [REDACTED] (1961b), *The Nation*, 25 March.

BIB-003

7 [REDACTED] (1962), *Sunday Citizen*, 23 September.

BIB-004

8 [REDACTED] (1963a), *Guardian*, 9 February.

BIB-005

9 [REDACTED] (1963b), *Observer*, 14 July.

BIB-006

10 [REDACTED] (1963c), *New York Daily Post*, 28 October.

BIB-007

11 [REDACTED] (1964), *Daily Mail*, 5 June.

BIB-008

12 [REDACTED] (1965), *Daily Mail*, 21 July.

BIB-009

13 [REDACTED] (1966), *Kentish Independent*, 6 May.

BIB-010

14 [REDACTED] (1967a), *London Look*, 28 January.

BIB-011

15 [REDACTED] (1967b), *Morning Star*, 3 July.

BIB-012

16 [REDACTED] (1967c), *Jackie*, 22 July.

BIB-013

17 [REDACTED] (1969a), *Holborn Guardian*, 21 March.

BIB-014

18 [REDACTED] (1969b), [REDACTED] Mike Kustow, ICA [REDACTED], *Guardian*, 5 December.

BIB-015

19 [REDACTED] (1971), *She*, October.

BIB-016

20 [REDACTED] (2003), *Guardian*, 7 January.

- BIB-017 1 Arts Council of Great Britain (ACGB) archives, London: Victoria and Albert  
2 Museum.
- BIB-018 3 [REDACTED] (ACGB 1962), ACGB to Wesker, 29 November, Box 34, File 89.
- BIB-019 4 [REDACTED] (ACGB 1964), Gulbenkian Press Release, 14 February, Box 34, File 208.
- BIB-020 5 [REDACTED] (ACGB 1965), Abercrombie to Goodman, 12 October, Box 34, File 89.
- BIB-021 6 [REDACTED] (ACGB 1968), ACGB Grants, 1964-68, Box 38, File 42.
- BIB-022 7 Black, Lawrence (2007), 'Arts and crafts: Social democracy's cultural resources and  
8 repertoire in 1960s Britain', in I. Favretto and J. Callaghan (eds), *Transitions  
9 in Social Democracy*, Manchester: MUP, pp.149-62.
- BIB-023 10 [REDACTED] (2010), *Redefining British Politics: Culture, Consumerism and Participation,  
11 1954-70*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- BIB-024 12 [REDACTED] (2016), 'Festival of Labour', [http://www.labourpains.group.shef.ac.uk/the-  
13 festival-of-labour-1962/](http://www.labourpains.group.shef.ac.uk/the-festival-of-labour-1962/). Accessed 19 October 2018.
- BIB-025 14 Cmnd. 2601 (1965), *A Policy for the Arts: The First Steps*, London: HMSO.
- BIB-026 15 Cooper, David (ed.) (1971), *The Dialectics of Liberation*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- BIB-027 16 Coppieters, Frank (1975), 'Arnold Wesker's Centre Fortytwo: A cultural revolution  
17 betrayed', *Theatre Quarterly*, 5:18, pp. 37-54.
- BIB-028 18 Curtis, Helene, and Sanderson, Mimi (eds) (2004), *The Unsung Sixties: Memoirs of  
19 Social Innovation*, London: Whiting & Birch.
- BIB-029 20 Dellar, Ron (1961), 'Centre 42', *New Left Review*, 11.

- BIB-030** 1 Etienne, Anne (2016), 'Visions don't work?' The role of Wesker's theatre and  
2 Centre 42 in 1960s British culture', *Studies in Theatre and Performance*,  
3 36:2, pp. 130-44.
- BIB-031** 4 Feather, Vic (1963), *The Essence of Trade Unionism*, Oxford: Bodley Head.
- BIB-032** 5 Foster, Michael (1971), 'The Roundhouse', *Architectural Association Quarterly*, 3:1,  
6 pp. 43-55.
- BIB-033** 7 Green, Benny (1962), 'Big band noise for C42', *Scene*, 4, 25 October.
- BIB-034** 8 Green, Jonathan (1988), *Days in the Life: Voices from the English Underground*  
9 1961-71, London: Pimlico.
- BIB-035** 10 Hoggart, Richard (1958), *The Uses of Literacy*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- BIB-036** 11 Hollis, Patricia (1997), *Jennie Lee*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- BIB-037** 12 Horn, Alasdair (2009), *Juke Box Britain*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- BIB-038** 13 Itzin, Catherine (1980), *Stages in the Revolution: Political Theatre in Britain since*  
14 1968, London: Methuen.
- BIB-039** 15 Joly, Pierre (1973), 'Oscar Niemeyer Joue avec la Faucille et le Marteau', *L'Œil*,  
16 219, pp. 58-63.
- BIB-040** 17 Jones, Mervyn (1966), 'Labour and the arts', *New Statesman*, 18 February.
- BIB-041** 18 Lee, Jennie (1962), Letter in *Encounter*, August, pp. 95-96.
- BIB-042** 19 Lee, Jennie Papers (JL) (1967), Labour Arts and Amenities committee, 19 June, Open  
20 University, Milton Keynes, File 4/1/2/8.

- BIB-043 1 Levin, Bernard (1970), *Daily Mail*, 6 March.
- BIB-045 2 Marwick, Arthur (1998), *The Sixties*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- BIB-044 3 McGrath, John (1970), 'Reviews: Friends and enemies', *Black Dwarf*, 14:35, 12 June.
- BIB-046 4 Mitchell, Julia (2014), 'Subterranean Bourgeois Blues: the 2nd English Folk Revival, 1945-70', Ph.D. thesis, London: University College London.
- BIB-047 6 Mulgan, Geoff, and Worpole, Ken (1986), *Saturday Night or Sunday Morning? From Arts to Industry*, London: Comedia.
- BIB-048 8 NVALA Annual Convention (1968), May, National Viewers and Listeners Association (NVALA) archives, Colchester: Essex University Library, 2000 accession, Box 7.
- BIB-049 11 Ponnuswami, Meenakshi (1998), 'Histories of the New Left: Arnold Wesker and the angrier young men', in D. Reade (ed.), *Arnold Wesker: A Casebook*, London: Routledge, pp. 137-62.
- BIB-050 14 Preston, John (2005), *Kings of the Roundhouse*, London: Viking.
- BIB-051 15 Priestley, J. B. (1965), 'Gay with the arts?', *New Statesman*, 23 April.
- BIB-052 16 Rebellato, Dan (1999), *1956 and All That: The Making of Modern British Drama*, London: Routledge.
- BIB-053 18 Rustin, Mike (1989), 'The New Left as a social movement', in Oxford University Socialist Discussion Group (eds), *Out of Apathy*, London: Verso, pp. 121-27.
- BIB-054 20 TUC (Trades Union Congress) (1960), *Annual Conference Report*, London: TUC.

- BIB-055 1 Watt, David (2003), *The Maker and the Tool*, documentary performance and the  
2 search for a popular culture, *New Theatre Quarterly*, 19:1, pp. 41-66.
- BIB-056 3 Wesker, Arnold (1960a), 'The kitchen', *New Left Review*, 1.
- BIB-057 4 [REDACTED] (1960b), 'Vision! Vision! Mr. Woodcock', *New Statesman*, 30 July.
- BIB-058 5 [REDACTED] (1960c), 'Trade unions and the arts', *New Left Review*, 5.
- BIB-059 6 [REDACTED] (1964), 'Art: therapy or experience', *Youth Service Magazine*, January.
- BIB-060 7 [REDACTED] (1969), 'Aie Cuba! Aie Cuba!', in *The New Man in Cuba*, London: British-  
8 Cuba Association, pp. 1-5.
- BIB-061 9 [REDACTED] (1970), *Fears of Fragmentation*, London: Jonathan Cape.
- BIB-062 10 [REDACTED] (1971), 'It's an illusion', *Ark*, Spring.
- BIB-063 11 [REDACTED] (1985), *Distinctions*, London: Jonathan Cape.
- BIB-064 12 [REDACTED] (1995), *As Much as I Dare: An Autobiography*, London: Arrow.
- BIB-065 13 Wesker, Arnold Papers (AW), AW2 = 2nd accession, Harry Ransom Center, Austin:  
14 University of Texas.
- BIB-066 15 [REDACTED] (AW n.d.a), C42 Posters, Box 133.1.
- BIB-067 16 [REDACTED] (AW n.d.b), T. Watts, 'Jazz', Box 134.2.
- BIB-068 17 [REDACTED] (AW 1960a), Founding meeting, Committee of 100, Box 119.1.
- BIB-069 18 [REDACTED] (AW 1960b), Buchan to Wesker, c. August, Box 136.9.
- BIB-070 19 [REDACTED] (AW 1960c), Scrapbook on his work, Box 107.7.
- BIB-071 20 [REDACTED] (AW 1961a), Lessing to Wesker, c. June, Box 136.8.

- BIB-072 1 [REDACTED] (AW 1961b), C42 Council of Management minutes, 20 July, Box 136.8.
- BIB-073 2 [REDACTED] (AW 1961c), 'A cultural revolution: 1st stage', C42 management minutes, 12  
3 October, Box 147.5.
- BIB-074 4 [REDACTED] (AW 1962a), *Centre Forty-Two: First Stage in a Cultural Revolution*, Box  
5 141.9.
- BIB-075 6 [REDACTED] (AW 1962b), 'Draft appeal for funds and the 1962 series of People's  
7 Festivals', Box 137.4.
- BIB-076 8 [REDACTED] AW (1962c), 6-city festival pamphlets, Box 150.1.
- BIB-077 9 [REDACTED] (AW 1962d), Reed to Wesker, 27 April, Box 137.3.
- BIB-078 10 [REDACTED] (AW 1962e), Wesker to Goodman, 25 November 1962, Box 144.11.
- BIB-079 11 [REDACTED] (AW 1963a), William Hart to C42, 8 August, Box 143.7.
- BIB-080 12 [REDACTED] (AW 1963b), Open Road films to Wesker, 19 November 1963, Box 134.3.
- BIB-081 13 [REDACTED] (AW 1964a), Leslie Ash Lyons to Henshaw, 9 May, Box 134.7.
- BIB-082 14 [REDACTED] (AW 1964b), Report of meeting (Williams-Wesker), 2 June, Box 154.9.
- BIB-083 15 [REDACTED] (AW 1964c), Wesker to Wilson, 29 June, Box 154.8.
- BIB-084 16 [REDACTED] (AW 1964d), Wilson to Wesker, 1 July, Box 154.8-9.
- BIB-085 17 [REDACTED] (AW 1964), Harewood's Roundhouse launch address, n.d., Box 154.8.
- BIB-086 18 [REDACTED] (AW 1964f), Roundhouse launch invites and correspondence, Box 144.10.
- BIB-087 19 [REDACTED] (AW 1965a), Wesker to Hoskins, 11 April, Box 132.6.
- BIB-088 20 [REDACTED] (AW 1965b), Wesker to Lennon, 18 & 26 May, Box 144.6-7.

- BIB-089 1 [REDACTED] (AW 1965c), Wesker to Duke of Edinburgh, 19 January, Box 142.7
- BIB-090 2 [REDACTED] (AW 1965d), (The Duke's reply) Sir John Hunt to Wesker, 19 July, Box  
3 142.7.
- BIB-091 4 [REDACTED] (AW 1966a), Hoskins to Maxwell, 5 January, Box 136.4.
- BIB-092 5 [REDACTED] (AW 1966b), [REDACTED] Millionaire appeal, Box 133.1.
- BIB-093 6 [REDACTED] (AW 1966c), Wesker's memo to C42 council, 24 February, Box 137.4.
- BIB-094 7 [REDACTED] (AW 1967a), GLC Report, 27 January, Box 133.6.
- BIB-095 8 [REDACTED] (AW 1967b), Wesker to David Mercer, March, Box 150.7.
- BIB-096 9 [REDACTED] (AW 1967c), Lee to Hoskins, 31 May, Box 146.10.
- BIB-097 10 [REDACTED] (AW 1967d), Wesker to Jim Thornton (Gulbenkian) 19 July, Box 144.8
- BIB-098 11 [REDACTED] (AW 1968), Memo, Council of management, May, Box 149.1.
- BIB-099 12 [REDACTED] (AW 1969), Berman to Hoskins, 18 April, Box 157.6.
- BIB-100 13 [REDACTED] (AW 1970), C42 Council of management, 31 October, Box 148.6.
- BIB-101 14 [REDACTED] (AW 1971), Roundhouse Trust, *First Report 1965-71*, Box 156.5.
- BIB-102 15 [REDACTED] (AW2 1960), Holdsworth-Wesker correspondence, Box 5.6.
- BIB-103 16 Willis, Ted (1966), *The Sun*, 15 February.
- BIB-104 17 [REDACTED] (1967), *Tribune*, 2 June.
- BIB-105 18 Wilson, Harold Papers (HW), Oxford: Bodleian Library.
- BIB-106 19 [REDACTED] (HW 1967a), Ben Whitaker MP to Marcia Williams, 12 June, Box c.872.
- BIB-107 20 [REDACTED] (HW 1967b), Goodman to Wilson, 30 June, Box c.872.

- 1 Wolfe, Tom (1970), *Radical Chic & Mau-Mauing the Flak Catchers*, New York:
- 2 Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

---

## Notes

- 1 For critics like Bernard Levin, all this meant that 'on political matters' Wesker 'has a brain made of apfelstrudel' (Levin 1970BIB-043), a culinary reference borrowed from Wesker's *The Four Seasons* (1965BIB-087).
- 2 In the original address to the 1960 Oxford Drama Festival on which the pamphlet was based, Wesker's rhetoric extends to calling the film 'a sick cultural manifestation' (see AW 1960c).
- 3 This animosity did not prevent Wesker from using Feather as one of the inspirations for the character of Victor in *Love Letters on Blue Paper* (1977).