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Problems of Intellectual Property

Knowledge Becomes Property
Do “IP” rights encourage or discourage knowledge creation?

Two kinds of knowledge: tacit/embodied vs. explicit/abstract

Tacit/Embodied: cannot be formally “owned”
- Knowledge as skill-based
- Trade secrets & guild membership

Explicit/abstract: can have intellectual property (IP) protection
- Mechanics and engineers
- “technical” knowledge emerges as science/knowledge-based
- Ideas as property precede the technical university
Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights

- Clear basis for patents: the mobility of useful knowledge
- Professional review and publication requirements
- Licensing regimes
- Use it or lose it (UK) and the politics of preemptive patenting

Trademarks: warranting for protection of both producers and consumers: protecting cultural icons—forever (NB: Gorby’s birthmark)

Copyright: exclusive rights of reproduction
- Established merely by authorial claim: myriad divisibility
- Increasing gray area between patents and copyrights
Knowledge As Property II

Franklin and Jefferson: “incentivizing” innovation

Monopolies and patents to foster the “general welfare”

Wealth of Nations (1776) and disdain for monopolies/patents; ditto for founders

Jeffersonian compromise: innovation to serve the “general good,” facilitated by temporary monopolies via IP laws

Sovereignty and the making of property
Religious Knowledge and the Rise of the Author: Don’t Confuse “authorship” with “ownership”

- Rabbinical, priestly knowledge and god’s exclusive authorship
- The Renaissance and secular authors
  - [Chaucer]
  - Dante, Boccaccio
  - Shakespeare, Molière
- “Authorship” more to warrant than to protect
- Newton, Leibnitz, and the politics of scientific attribution
Sovereignty, the State, and the Invention of Property: 1500-1800

- Land: authority versus ownership
- Literacy and the recording of rights
- Censorship and approval: ironic source of copyright
The Nineteenth Century: Print Culture and Modern Invention

Precedent: newspapers, journals, and popular reading in the 18th century

“Authorized editions” vs. pirated copies

Dickens, Twain, Zola and the link of publishers and authors: joint interest in maintaining exclusive rights

Difficulty in reproduction lessened the risk of piracy, but reproduction became cheaper after 1880: pulp paper & the Paige compositor

With the emergence of modern corporations after 1860, “knowledge” became an “asset” to be protected—Bayer aspirin, analine dyes, etc. Ivory soap.
Patents

- Clear basis for patents: the mobility of useful knowledge—protects invention and innovation
- Defined: 17-year term (from granting) on physical objects and processes
  - Must demonstrate no “prior art” (requires research)
  - Upon application for patent, details must be published & accessible at USPTO
  - Reviewed by “experts” at USPTO
  - Can be licensed out to others

- Some downsides of the patent régime
  - No “use it or lose it” rule (as in UK); the politics of preëmptive patenting
  - Strong incentives for “stealth” patent claims: SCO and Unix, NTP and RIM
  - Examiners are often not fully qualified to judge
Perhaps a Silly Patent…

US Patent # 6,293,874, awarded 25 September, 2000, described as a “User-operated amusement apparatus for kicking the user's buttocks”
The Social Cost of a Patent

The annual price of the “AIDS cocktail” according to Médecins sans frontières:

- Use of the IP-protected package: $6,000
- Use of Cipla’s (from India) off-patent/generic in South Africa: less than $140 and falling
- Average GDP per capita in Africa: $652

Bush’s program for combating AIDS in Africa pays Big Pharma a price closer to the $6,000/person/year than to the $140 deal (as of 3/04): who actually benefits?

Result: treat one person, and give the cost of treating 42 more to Big Pharma!

Cost of AIDS to South African business: disincentive to invest in workers’ skills
Trademarks

Defined: a symbol or text snippet that is a forever-monopoly for the owner, granted by the PTO

must be registered to have effect

cannot be commonly used (one can’t trademark a crucifix)

needs to be unique, like Gorbachev’s poet-wine mark

Purpose: warranting/branding

Can be licensed to external parties; example: the “Block ‘M’” owned by UofM Athletic Department

Visual fraud is sometimes easy, but legal: the Yellow Pages logo
Copyrights

Defined: protection not of ideas per se, but of the expression of ideas in “tangible media” (includes digital)

Term (latest revision with CTEA, 1998):
Life of author plus 70 years
95 years after publication or 120 years after creation, whichever is shorter, for “works for hire” (corporate assets)
At end of term, works enter the public domain

No requirement to register since 1976, renewals are automatic as well

Digital Millennium Copyright Act (1998), discussed below, vastly reinforces rights of IP owners: makes © a criminally prosecutable offense (was civil only)

Strength of copyright claims mitigated by doctrine of “Fair Use,” now under corporate assault
“Fair Use” Defined by Law

From US Code, Title 17, Chapter 1, § 107: “Limitations on exclusive rights: Fair use”

Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 106 and 106A, the fair use of a copyrighted work, including such use by reproduction in copies or phonorecords or by any other means specified by that section, for purposes such as criticism, comment, news reporting, teaching (including multiple copies for classroom use), scholarship, or research, is not an infringement of copyright. In determining whether the use made of a work in any particular case is a fair use the factors to be considered shall include:

- the purpose and character of the use, including whether such use is of a commercial nature or is for non-profit educational purposes;
- the nature of the copyrighted work;
- the amount and substantiality of the portion used in relation to the copyrighted work as a whole; and
- the effect of the use upon the potential market for or value of the copyrighted work.

Also, a generally recognized “right of first purchase”: the right of the purchaser to dispose of the purchased item as s/he sees fit.
Copyrights’ Tangled Path & Interpretation

- Problems of reproducibility
  - Works of art as inherently unique: authorship embodied in the work; art forgery
  - Lithography and the emergence of mass-produced “art”
- Literary & musical protections
  - “classics” as public: when is something “classic”—CTEA?!
  - Other work as needing limited protection
- Sheet music
Art/Literature in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction: 20th Century

- Sheet music, piano rolls, musical recordings, radio, house music, jukeboxes

- Publishing as an industry
  - Music publishers
  - Book publishers

- Artists, writers, and intermediation
Authorship and Distribution

- The standard business model for IP

  - Converging interests among whom?
  - Do audiences make value?

- Monopolization of distribution: Not all artists are created equal—artists as captives of distributors

  - Artists and consumers vs. producers?
  - Who is captured by the contract?

  - Mariah Carey @ $25 million
SciTech as Collective Product?: Locating Ownership

The research establishment & Bayh-Dole (1980)

The university as passive infrastructural research environment vs university as part owner

“Basic” research vs. “applied” research

The subsidy state?

ISU, DES, and locations of knowledge vs property rights

The crisis in scholarly publishing

Control of copyrights & distribution channels by an oligopoly restricts circulation of publicly-funded research results

A solution? The Public Library of Science and e-journals
Diffusing and Limiting Knowledge

The contradiction: public space/culture and private remuneration

Temporal limitation of IP rights

Preemptive invention: Big Pharma

The politics of patent and copyright extension: generic drugs, CTEA/Eldred

Criteria for awarding patents: the judgment calls

How new? Process vs. product vs. “one-click”

Question of repackaging and value-added

PTO as site for creation of value

Problems at the PTO
Contemporary Issues

- Napster, Gnutella/Morpheus/Kaaza and file sharing
  - peer-to-peer systems replace intermediaries
  - Are the old media distributors now simply parasites?
- DMCA and the legal backing of copy-protection; the politics of encryption & reverse-engineering
  - Diebold & voting machines; DeCSS
- Patenting life: GM foods & "Roundup-ready" seeds
  - Diamond v. Chakrabarty (447 U.S. 303 1980): “made” organisms can be patented; broad interpretation is very risky…
- Alternative, licit models for content distribution
- Data resales, by government & businesses
- Universities as R&D sites; who owns academic ideas?
The Politics and Practices of Enforcing IP Rights

Non-legal (not *illégal*) means

- Copy-protection; now endorsed by DMCA
  - Encryption and serial numbers
  - Difficulty of reproduction
  - Costs of implementation vs. costs of cracking…

- Legal means
  - Copyright & patent law
  - Costs of litigation; quasi-SLAPP* suits & the RIAA

*SLAPP = “Strategic Lawsuits Against Public Participation”
Politics and Practices: Stakeholders

• “Content Producers”
  • Artists, writers, performers, s/w developers, etc.
  • Distributors: studios, publishers, record companies

• Substitutes
  • Alternative media & venues
  • Libraries

• Intermediaries
  • Technology firms, music & film companies
    • [the upcoming demise of movie theaters?]
  • Pipelines

• Consumers…
Who Wins, Who Loses?

- Is “old” IP law sufficient?
  - Enforceability issues
  - Fungibility and ease of reproduction
  - Current problems: DMCA, CTEA, hardware-based protections: going overboard?

- Public space, private goods: compatible?
  - The shopping-mall precedent
  - Fate of libraries
The Balancing Act: Protecting Property and Access

- Rights of consumers of information
  - “Fair use,” including education & quotation
  - Personal use
  - Backups

- Rights of information producers
  - Amortization of investment
  - Financial return on artistic effort
  - Incentives
  - How effective in context of monopsonistic distribution?
Emerging New Models of Content Delivery that Try to Protect IP

- [What, really, are the true losses to piracy?]
- Subscription: HBO, ESPN
- Pay-per-view
- Legally-protected encrypted streams & paths; example: the “broadcast flag”
- End of the general-purpose computer?
  - Microsoft, Longhorn/Vista, and DRM/“Trusted Computing”
  - Is it really techies vs. distributors?
- Photocopy police => IP police? Who enforces?
- Open alternative: direct payments & direct distribution: overt disintermediation
Breaking News…

• Sony just used “rootkit” malware to implement copy protection (aka DRM—digital rights management), allowing a back door into users’ systems.* As of 2005-11-12, two worms had been discovered that exploit the security hole. Remember that under the DMCA (1998), users can be prosecuted for disabling Sony’s DRM—even if they only want to make their PCs secure!

• AG Alberto Gonzales has proposed a law that criminalizes © infringement on non-registered works; hence one can be prosecuted for not doing research before copying. [This implicitly] reduces the incentives for rights holders to register.

*In its DRM software, Sony pirated code from LAME, an open-source mp3 encoder—so in the name of protecting its own IP assets, Sony violated others’ IP rights!