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Abstract

Peter Muller is one of the most unique Australian architects of the 20th century possessing a passion for organic architecture realised in several significant Australian and Indonesian design exemplars. His inquiry in the organic style of architecture stylistically mirrors that of Frank Lloyd Wright whom wrote to Muller expressing his pleasure in his successful pursuit of this style in Australia.

This paper considers the position of moral rights under the Australian Copyright Act 1968 having regard to the Australian exemplars of Muller. It considers recent Australian debates about moral rights and projects that implicate several architectural and landscape architecture projects, the interpretations the legal fraternity are taking in approaching this topic, and positions the ideas, values, and attitudes of Muller in this context.

Muller’s personal opinion is expressed providing an insight into the thoughts of one senior contemporary Australia architect as to ‘their’ architecture and ‘heritage’.

images: Peter Muller 2008, + Muller House at Whale Beach, NSW, c.1960s
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image: Muller, Australian Parliament House design notional proposal linked to the drafting of the international competition brief
recent moral rights provision amendments to the Australian Copyright Act 1968, how does it relate to “creators”, contemporary works of state, national and or international heritage significance.

How does it relate to contemporary practitioners like:

- Harry Siedler (1923-06),
- Glenn Murcutt (b.1936),
- Harry Howard (1930-00),
- Ashton Raggatt McDougall
- Richard Weller

a new realm for planning and heritage administrators and practitioners
internationally prominent architect Peter Muller (b. 1927)

a personal strategy to express his concern at the lack of respect of integrity and moral rights courtesy.

quietly frustrated with the lack of respect given to his own built designs

publicly “disowning” particular precedents of his hand on his personal web site, www.petermuller.org

“Many projects over the years have undergone unauthorised alterations and additions, but those listed below more particularly so and can no longer be regarded as the genuine work of Peter Muller, two regrettably are disowned.” Peter Muller at www.petermuller.org
moral rights have not previously been the realm of heritage practitioners and managers.

but increasingly we are witnessing the local, national and world heritage listing of contemporary designs – largely creations of designers since World War II.

the time obligations within the moral rights provisions of the Act now necessitate an obligation for author integrity and respect and full attribution to be afforded.

Image: Muller: Richardson house, Palm Beach, 1955
the Burra Charter + the Copyright Act 1968, place an obligation upon the heritage practitioner
- to seek primary research material
- to document and guide conservation measures for the place under study, and
- recognises that the living designer is a primary research component in their own right.

But, ... how do we proceed ...?

Image: Muller: Melbourne Olympic Stadium Competition entry, 1952
for the Sydney Opera House, architect Jørn Utzon (1918-08) was directly consulted on changes and renovations to the structure. We need to appreciate the nature of these engagements and discuss protocols on how to proceed with heritage places as a subset of the larger moral right discourse.
Mount Lofty Botanic Garden

Register of National Estate listed

*Mt Lofty Botanic Garden Conservation Study (2007)*

Landscape architect Allan Correy (b.1931) was directly consulted on his design intent and thoughts as to how to curate and manage the extant Mt Lofty Botanic Garden.


Images: Mt Lofty Botanic Garden, author Allan Correy in Sydney, c.1996.
National Museum of Australia (NMA), + the ‘Garden of Australian Dreams’

public debate:
• “Museum [being] told it’s lost the plot,”
• about the question of design authorship, attribution and integrity before and after construction.

the NMA wished to change physical components of the executed design that would compromise the design integrity of the ARM and Room 4.1.3 (by Richard Weller & Vladimir Sitta) multi-award winning and extensively photographed project.

a review report highly criticised the NMA’s “disjointed arbitrariness” ... in particular proposed a major review of the future of the ‘Garden of Australian Dreams’.
Weller, one of the designers of the ‘Garden’ lampooned the critique of the Garden.

Weller threatened to take legal action if the recommendations were actioned believing that “the plans are offensive to our artistic integrity”.

“to change our design makes a complete mockery of the entire process by which the work was chosen and created,”

“we don’t want (NMA review chair) John Carroll to be the first man in history to censor a garden”.

“it has proven very popular with visitors, precisely because it looks and feels unlike normal gardens.”

the NMA review panel perceived the ‘Garden’ to be uninviting, its “expanse of concrete overwhelming” with “little that is explained clearly to visitors.” It proposed the addition of a lawn, sundial, Aboriginal rock art and tree planting.
National Gallery of Australia (NGA)

subject of two recent public controversies about its approach to renovations and moral rights.

a dispute by the architect to the NGA, Colin Madigan (b. 1921)

Madigan claimed that changes by architects Tonkin Zulaikha Greer in 2001 constituted derogatory treatment of his original design.

RAIA [AIA] interceded to seek the removal of liability infringement of architect integrity right that resulted in a “totally different design approach” that “established a preliminary methodology and a precedent for future consultations, a number of which are in the wings.”
Media reporter Farrelly expressed this debate in terms of a family law custody battle:

The current National Gallery debate is little more or less than a classic custody tussle. Architecture is always mixed progeny, with at least two – client and architect – and probably more assisting not only at birth but at conception. Grrrruesome.

Even thereafter, architects occasionally get all anal, hanging around to select every little thing down to carpet, cupboard handles, furniture, paintings.

Normally, though, and quite rightly, the architect moves on once the birth pictures are taken, leaving the infant edifice in full care and control of the client, loving or otherwise.

But later, much later? The question exercising many a professional mind is this: what rights, if any, should the original architect have when, years or even decades later, the now mature building needs amendment.

National Gallery of Australia

second debate - the Sculpture Garden, designed by Harry Howard in 1982, which was listed on the Register of the National Estate in 1993.

garden area is at risk of deterioration, economic-driven change over management and security costs and issues, and may never realise the original design concept and philosophy.

“little attempt was made by the new designers to understand the original design principles, the history or the significance of the place,” Barbara Buchanan
A Common Problem

Birnbaum, of the US National Park Service, concluded with an observation and a plea:

We must be committed to these landscapes that are often a part of our everyday lives, even those that we take for granted. If we allow these losses and modifications to continue—unmonitored by the profession and allied communities—we run the risk of erasing a significant chapter of landscape history.

image: Muller, Club Med Vanuatu, 1990, design
Weller’s frustrations are not an isolated incident...

it is simply a more forthright expression...

this frustration is prevalent, in Australia, in the architecture and landscape architecture disciplines, as well as in the emerging public art realm.

this frustration is not new,

but what is new is ... an ethical responsibility upon the host owner to afford greater respect to the work

image: Muller, Hoyts Cinema Centre, Bourke St., Melbourne, 1966, design
These dilemmas rotate around:

• intellectual property;

• the practice of relinquished design ownership;

• the role of peer design and heritage awards and heritage registrations;

• the position and merit of 20th century heritage in Australia;

• the role and merit of contemporary architectural and landscape architectural designs;

• ‘duty of care’ and moral rights; and specifically; and,

• where the living designer ‘fits’ within a ‘heritage’ place.

image: Muller, Taree Commonwealth Bank, NSW, 1958, design; photograph by Muller, c.2000
Ethical Questions:

• How does the living designer view the integrity and qualities of the executed design?

• It is a ‘stand alone’ design or precedent project, or a specific-client audience design, or is it a design that is simply a phase in a larger design inquiry and thereby ‘process design’?

• Does it possess ‘heritage merit’ from the living designer’s perspective ...?

• Should we be consulting these living designers ...?

• Does the living designer actually value the heritage listed place as ‘heritage’?

• Is the designer happy not to be consulted about the executed design’s prospective alteration, change, renovation and or demolition?

• Does the designer wish to be consulted ...? and,

• Does the designer actually care ...?

Important designs:
- Muller House (1954) at Whale Beach, Sydney,
- the Audette (1952) and Gunning (1960) Houses in Castlecrag, Sydney,
- a suite of IPEC and Hoyts Theatres across Australia (1964-68),
- the Oberoi in Bali (1973-01) including upgrades,
- the Oberoi in Lombok (1997), and
- the Amandari Hotel Village (1988-89) in Kedewatan, Bali,

educated at the University of Adelaide + Adelaide’s School of Mines & Industries (1944-48), Tuition Scholarship + a Fulbright Travel Scholarship (1950-51) to the University of Pennsylvania served with the National Capital Development Commission (1975-77) as Director in charge of establishing the Australian Parliament House design competition terms of reference.
Philip Drew has observed that Muller’s work,

-is influenced by Frank Lloyd Wright’s style,

-is very much individualistic and independent in its exploration than Wright’s, and

-is very site and culture responsive.

...natural materials and spiritual principles of cultural architecture guide Muller’s responses ...

thus, topography, climate, light, tectonic form rather than scenography and the tactile sense rather than the visual are extremely important variables.

Drew has concluded that:

Peter Muller occupies an important place in post-war Australian architecture as the leading romantic architect of his time, one who has developed, as an alternative to the modern movement, an organic conception of architecture.
Only Heritage Listed project designed by Muller:

IPEC Building (1964), in Frewville, Adelaide, included on the State Heritage Register for South Australia, subject to a Conservation Study (1993).

Muller was not consulted on:
- the Study’s (1993) contents or recommendations,
- the State Heritage Listing of the complex,
- nor subsequent renovations and alterations, and
- neither was landscape designer Robin Hill about his associative landscape work on his project nor mentioned in the Listing or Study (1993).

for the IPEC Building Statement of Significance, see:

image: Muller, IPEC Headquarters, Frewville, SA, 1964; photograph of the present former IPEC complex, authors.
Copyright

Copyright is defined under the Copyright Act 1968 and it includes ... paintings, drawings, sculptures, digital imagery, craft works, photographs, engravings, films, videos, sound recordings, textual materials, as well as designs.

The Act details when other people, including architects, academics and students, other than the copyright owner, can use the copyright material with or without permission.

The Act was amended in 2000 to include copyright material using digital technologies and communication systems, including the internet.

A further amendment, gazetted in December 2000, sought to attribute creator ‘ownership’ over their designs and that their “integrity” of their work is respected.

- Australia, Copyright Amendment (Digital Agenda) Act 2000;
- Australia, Copyright Amendment (Moral Rights) Act 2000.

Image: Author, photograph of the Michell residence, Medindie, SA.
the Copyright Act 1968 now mandates that

the designer must be attributed into any change or demolition of their built or executed project,

whole or part,

and the ‘integrity’ of their design must be respected and due acknowledge made.

Thus,

where do we position contemporary heritage in this context?

how do we address the present failure of the attribution process?, and

how do we address the lack of clarity as to who monitors and ensures attribution and acknowledgement?

image: author, photograph of the Michell residence, Medindie, SA
under the Act, “artistic work” means:

• a painting, sculpture, drawing, engraving or photograph, whether the work is of artistic quality or not;

• a building or a model of a building, whether the built model is of artistic quality or not; or

• a work of artistic craftsmanship to which neither of the last two preceding paragraphs applies … [sic.]

Australia, Copyright Act 1968, Section 10 (1) “artistic work”.

as a general rule, copyright … for “artistic works” applies from the year of creation and lasts for some 50 years after the death of the “creator”.

however, copyright has expired if the creator died before 1 January 1955, except where a government owns the copyright.
the term “creator”, as distinct from ‘designer’, is used in the Act to describe individuals like … architects, … etc.

the personal rights of the “creator”, whether or not the creator owns the copyright or ever owned the copyright, are covered within this scope.

these rights require acknowledgement or attribution in three ways:

• a right of attribution of authorship;

• a right to not have authorship falsely attributed; and,

• a right of integrity of authorship.

Australia, Copyright Act 1968, Section 1.

images: author, photographs of the Michell residence, Medindie, SA
Muller & Heritage Thoughts

in pondering the concept of ‘heritage’,

it is not one that Muller has been previously asked.

it is a new notion in its terminology,

one that he does not use in his vocabulary when talking about his designs,

it is allied to Muller’s notion of “disowned project.”

... “it’s certainly an honourable recognition to have placed upon your work,” but often the owners do not wish it.
The Muller House (1954)

a classic contemporary design

extensively compromised by extensions and alterations by the current owners without consultation with Muller.

“Basically the site determined the house [and I] threaded the architecture through the marvellous 200 year old Angophora tree.”

It is a house that was been photographed at the time by Muller and Max Dupain portraying the unique sculptural arms of the Angophora (Angophora costata) branches embracing the house and reflected in the water-filled roofs.

“That house taught me how to respond to the site.”

images: Muller, plan of Muller House, 1952, & Max Dupain photograph, c.1953; now “disowned” by Muller due to renovations and changes
Frustrated with despoliation of a house and studio that Muller personally designed for himself, that expressed his ‘reading’ of the North Shore landscape characteristics, Muller has written that...

... house [has been] totally ruined over time by insensitive alterations and additions ... including the removal of the magnificent 200 year old Angophora gum tree to make way for an additional room.

The grey brickwork and natural timber fascias throughout have been painted white....a disaster.

The whole colouring of the house originally co-ordinated with the natural bush setting.
Muller was drawn into the demolition discourse about this structure in 2003-04.

“I did not have any special feelings about” this house.

... it was sold by the Lance family, and the new owner wrote to Muller “seeking my okay for demolition.

“I replied in writing saying ‘okay’, ‘no problem’, [and] I don’t care.”

... despite this unusual approach to the original architect, the prospective demolition resulted in an unsuccessful court case wherein key argument launched was the heritage and architectural significance of the building and thereby the international standing of the architect.
... a theory behind this response is the belief by Muller that his designs are for the client at the time to live and evolve in.

Muller ‘reads’ both the client and the site to realise a design that is more often “conceived as a piece of sculpture.”

changes in ownership break this special relationship and thus the house loses its ‘design’ spirit – “it’s sense of place”.

in Muller’s mind, such cannot be encapsulated in heritage listings as “how can you preserve the integrity of the building?”

images: Muller, Muller House, Whale Beach, NSW, 1954; Max Dupain photographs, c.1953; now “disowned” by Muller due to renovations and changes


... similarly,

“...I was not concerned with time” in my designs and their ‘historical’ occupation and

“I wasn’t concerned with heritage.”

“For me, it was the intellectual engagement with the client and the place” that was important.

... each design was separate and not evolutionary, as each design was site-responsive yet laden with culturally stylistic explorations.

“In the end, one’s photos and memories are really all that is left of the past which is gone and no longer a reality,

the future is a concept,

not a reality,

because it hasn’t happened ... only the immediate present is real [sic.]”

images: Walcott House, 1956 design and image, now “disowned” by Muller due to renovations and changes
for the IPEC Building state heritage listing, or indeed research leading up to the listing, and subsequent alterations, Muller was not consulted.

when discovering the listing,

“... naturally at first one is quite flattered, but the reality comes later.”

“I found that the owners of the buildings are not always pleased, and,

in the case of the IPEC building in Adelaide for example,

they decided ... [to alter] its configuration to suit their particular needs and simply rented out the spaces and let the property run down.”

images: IPEC Building model, 1964 by Muller; photograph, Muller, c.1965.
Muller’s ... relationship to time is also an important aspect in his view of ‘heritage’.

to Muller, time is transient.

to Muller, time in design is linked to the client for whom he designed the house and the occupancy-span of time within which the client resides in the house.

... change the client and occupant and you stop time.

... thus, demolition is a feasible option once this occupancy-span ceases.

“... [I] am more inclined to accept the inevitable

... all is transient

... best to look forward to the next project as if it were your only one.”
But, how do you deal with the following dilemma?

In 1964 Muller prepared some sketch designs for Dr Walsh while working in Adelaide on the IPEC project.

No design fees were paid and no construction drawings were prepared.

Yet, the house was constructed to the design sketches, very much in the materiality and ethos of Muller's style, and has been lovingly cared for and respected by two families since 1964.

It was a complete surprise to Muller, in 2008, to discover that the house existed, and more so that it accords with his approach, even with recent bathroom renovations, that respected his design integrity.

Yet, he did not know it was executed.

Where are moral rights in this instance?
The Richardson/’Kumale’ house (1956) in Palm Beach, Sydney, is presently being renovated by architect Walter Di Qual in direct consultation with Muller.

While the house is not heritage listed, it is a portfolio precedent in Muller’s mind.

images: Richardson/’Kumale’ House, Palm Beach, NSW, original perspective sketches; photograph by Max Dupain, c.1965
in pondering changes to this house, Muller has responded:

“... my contention is that one should be free to make changes to one’s own designs as he see fit. “

“Historians wish to retain buildings as they were originally conceived but that makes no sense for buildings which are in continuous occupation and need to allow for changes in personal ownership requirements and changes in technology... “

“... [in these instances, I support] the strict proviso that the original creator, if still alive, should be involved and in control of all design decision making. “

“Only he really understands how to maintain the integrity of the original concept.”

images: Richardson / ‘Kumale’ House, Palm Beach, NSW, original perspective plan; photograph by Muller, nd
... further questions to ponder are,

“... why do we not ask the living designers which of their executed projects they deem ‘heritage’ of their genre”,

and secondly,

whether these places should be heritage listed.

Muller certainly has not been asked these questions previously until recently in interviews.

images: Richardson Ski Lodge, Thredbo, NSW, 1959, original perspective sketches; photograph by Muller, c.1960
the Copyright Act 1968 has laid a framework for moral rights respect of the integrity of constructed designs

but there has been little legal precedent ... to ensure that such respect does occur.

... clearly where a contemporary designed structure ... has obtained heritage registration,

there is a greater ethical and procedural responsibility placed upon heritage and planning development administrators and practitioners to

ensure respect of integrity of design, and

authorship is adequately and responsibly ensured

because such listing implies the place is of community wealth and legacy to Australians.
Heritage practitioners in Australia need to better ensure respect to integrity of place and authorship in their conservation studies but also in their assessments, renovations and recommendations pertaining to contemporary designed places that have been local, state and national heritage listed.

images: Hoyts Cinema Centre, Bourke Street, Melbourne, 1967, original foyer perspective; by Muller, c.1967
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special thanks is given to Peter Muller for his advice and interviews, together with the advice of Ian McDougall (ARM), Allan Correy, Clifford Frith, Robin Hill, Ian Barwick, Glenn Murcutt, Carolyn Wigg, Mrs Luther Scammell, Paul Stark & Katherine Brooks.

images: Muller, Amandari Hotel, Kedewatan, Bali, Indonesia, 1989
Table 1: "Disowned Projects" by Peter Muller

Many projects over the years have undergone unauthorised alterations and additions, but those listed below more particularly so and can no longer be regarded as the genuine work of Peter Muller, two regrettably are disowned.

**MULLER House**

The house looked before it was totally ruined over time by insensitive alterations and additions ... including the removal of the magnificent 200 year old Angophora gum tree to make way for an additional room. The grey brickwork and natural timber fascias throughout have been painted white...a disaster. The whole colouring of the house originally co-ordinated with the natural bush setting.

**WALCOTT House**

The house has been recently extensively modified against the wishes of the Local Council, the National Heritage Commission, Peter Muller and J.C. Urford.

**GUNNING House**

GUNNING House 369 Edinburgh Rd, Castlecrag has been rendered and painted white with many other alterations enough to make this house “un-Muller”

**PATRICK House**

PATRICK House, The Scarp, Castlecrag has been demolished and rebuilt to a completely new design but incorporating some features of the original design. Peter Muller was not consulted.

**NICHOLSON HOUSE.**

NICOLSON HOUSE. Angophora Cr. Forestville - Demolished

**PURCELL House**

PURCELL House, Fisher St. Balgowlah - Demolished

**VICTA H.O.,**

VICTA H.O., Horsley Rd. Milperra NSW - Demolished

**REGENT/PARIS,**

REGENT/PARIS, Theatres & Shopping Arcade – Demolished

**DICKSON HOTEL,**

DICKSON HOTEL, Dickson, Canberra - Demolished

**WINNS Department Store,**

WINNS Department Store, Fairfield - Demolished

4 Drive-in theatres (NSW & Vic) for Hoyts Theatres - Demolished

Properties known to have been demolished.

- **ROCKDALE PLAZA & BOWLING, Rockdale, NSW - Demolished**
- **PATRICK House, The Scarp, Castlecrag - Demolished**
- **LANCE House, Darling Point - Demolished by Michael Dysart in February 2004**
- **WALDER House, Bellevue Hill - Demolished by Kerry Packer to extend garden**
- **WALDER House, Cabarita Rd. Stokes Point - Demolished**
- **WALKER House, Arterial Rd. St. Ives - Demolished**
- **VICTA H.O., Horsley Rd. Milperra NSW - Demolished**
- **REGENT/ PARIS, Theatres & Shopping Arcade - Demolished**
- **DICKSON HOTEL, Dickson, Canberra - Demolished**
- **WINNS Department Store, Fairfield - Demolished**
- 4 Drive-in theatres (NSW & Vic) for Hoyts Theatres - Demolished
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