

Cambridge Intellectual Property and Information Law

New Frontiers in the Philosophy of Intellectual Property

EDITED BY

Annabelle Lever



CAMBRIDGE

New Frontiers in the Philosophy of Intellectual Property

Edited by

Annabelle Lever



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town,
Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press,
New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107009318

© Cambridge University Press 2012

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without the written
permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2012

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

ISBN 978-1-107-00931-8 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or
accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to
in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such
websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

List of contributors

LAURA BIRON Research Fellow, Queens College, Cambridge and Greenwall Fellow in bioethics and health policy, Georgetown University and Johns Hopkins University, USA

JOHN CHRISTMAN Professor of Philosophy, Political Science and Women's Studies, Pennsylvania State University, USA

GEERT DEMUIJNCK Professor of Business Ethics, EDHEC Business School, Lille, France

ABRAHAM DRASSINOWER Associate Professor and Chair in the Legal, Ethical and Cultural Implications of Technological Innovation, University of Toronto Faculty of Law, Canada

GRAHAM DUTFIELD Professor of International Governance, School of Law, University of Leeds, UK

DAVID LAMETTI Director, Centre for Intellectual Property Policy and Associate Professor of Law, McGill University, Canada

ANNABELLE LEVER Associate Professor of Normative Political Theory, Department of Political Science and International Relations, University of Geneva, Switzerland

KATHLEEN LIDDELL Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Law, Cambridge University, UK

STEPHEN R. MUNZER Distinguished Professor of Law, UCLA Law School, USA

ALEX ROSENBERG R. Taylor Cole Professor of Philosophy, Duke University, USA

JORN SONDERHOLM Visiting Researcher, Department of Philosophy,
The George Washington University, USA

JAMES WILSON Lecturer in Philosophy and Health, Centre for
Philosophy, Justice and Health, and Comprehensive Biomedical
Research Centre, UCL, UK

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Blackwell Publishing for permission to reprint Jorn Sonderholm's 'Ethical Issues Surrounding Intellectual Property Rights', which was originally published in *Philosophy Compass* Vol. 5, Issue 12, (2011) 1107–15 and Palgrave Macmillan's permission to reprint substantial parts of Geert Demuijnck's 'Is P2P Sharing of MP3 Files An Objectionable Form of Free Riding?', published in Axel Gosseries, Alain Marciano and Alain Strowel (eds.), *Theories of Justice and Intellectual Property* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

We are also happy to acknowledge the assistance of the following institutions which helped to fund the conference, 'Philosophy and Intellectual Property', which inspired this book: The Mind Association, The Society for Applied Philosophy, the Aristotelian Society, the Department of Philosophy, Logic and Scientific Method, the London School of Economics and Political Science and the Institute of Philosophy, University of London. Without their help, the conference would not have been possible and, without the conference, there would have been no book.

We would like to thank Kim Hughes, Joanna Breeze our editor, Richard Woodham and Cambridge University Press, for their willingness to publish this collection and for their help in overcoming the numerous obstacles between contract and publication. We are extremely grateful to Lynn Aitchison, our copy-editor, for bringing order to such a large and diverse text, and to Kate Mertes for creating the index.

Finally, the editor would like to thank John Harris and the Institute of Science, Ethics and Innovation, Manchester University School of Law, for appointing her to an Interdisciplinary Bioethics Research Fellowship, and for their encouragement and support of this book. The Institute is a model of interdisciplinary research and John's love of a good argument, wide interests and support for junior colleagues gives the Institute its distinctive character and ethos. It is a wonderful place to work. Above all, thank you to my husband, Dan Grecu, who helped with this book and the conference from start to finish.

Table of cases

Australia

Milpururru v. Indafurn Party Ltd (1994) 130 ALR 659 66

Canada

CCH Canadian Ltd v. Law Society of Upper Canada [2004] 1 SCR 339
207n.9, 218n.3, 291n.32

Cusenaire v. S. W. Imports Ltd (1969) SCR 208 19

Euro-Excellence Inc. v. Kraft Canada Inc. [2007] 3 SCR 20, 2007 SCC 37
218n.19

Harvard College v. Canada (Commissioner of Patents) 2002 SCC 76 196n.d,
199n.91

Court of Justice of the European Union

Case C-34/10 *Brüstle v. Greenpeace*, Opinion of the Advocate General,
10 March 2011; Judgment 18 October 2011 140, 166–9, 170–1

European Patent Office

Edinburgh Patent EP 06953351 (Opposition Division) 21 March 2003
147n.27

T0866/01 *Euthanasia Compositions*, 11 May 2005 148n.33, 150n.34

T19/90 *HARVARD/Oncomouse* [1991] EPOR 525 140, 152, 154

T0315/03 *HARVARD/Transgenic Animals* [2006] 1 OJEP 15 147n.30,
148n.32, 149, 150n.34, 154, 162

T0272/95 *HOWARD FLOREY/Relaxin* (Opposition Division) [1995]
EPOR 541; Decision of Technical Board of Appeal 3.3.4 [1995]
EPOR 357 150n.36, 152, 153, 154, 162, 201n.95

G0001/98 *NOVARTIS/Transgenic Plant*, 20 December 1999 150n.34

- T0356/93 *PLANT GENETIC SYSTEMS* (1993) 24 IIC 618 147n.30, 153, 154, 162
 G0002/06 *Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation (WARF)/Stem Cells* [2009] EPOR 15 140, 147n.27, 151n.38, 165–6

Inter-American Court of Human Rights

- Mayagna (Sumo) Awas Tingni Community v. Nicaragua*, 31 August 2001, Series C, No. 79 [2001] IACHR 9 77–81

United Kingdom

- Asahi Kasei Kogyo, KK's Application* [1991] RPC 485 255n.109
Beloff v. Pressdram Ltd [1973] 1 All ER 241 218n.19
Hyde Park Residence Ltd v. Yelland [2000] 3 WLR 215 218n.19
Lion Laboratories Ltd v. Evans [1984] 3 WLR 539 218n.19
Millar v. Taylor (1769) 4 Burr 302 212n.14
Moreau v. St Vincent [1950] 3 DLR 713 207n.9
University of London Press Ltd v. University Tutorial Press [1916] 2 Ch 601 244n.80

United States

- Application of Malcolm E. Bergy, John H. Coats and Vedpal S. Malik. Application of Ananda M. Chakrabarty*, decided 29 March 1979, as amended 19 April 1979 596 F.2d 952 (Fed. Cir. 1979) 196n.a
Association for Molecular Pathology v. US Patent and Trademark Office No. 09 Civ, 4515 2010 WL 1233416 (SDNY 29 Mar. 2010) 201n.96
AV v. iParadigms LLC 562 F.3d 630 (4th Cir. 2009) 218n.19, 221n.25
Baker v. Selden 101 US 99 (1879) 19, 206, 209–12, 221
Boy Scouts of America v. Dale 530 US 640 (2000) 250n.98
Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music Inc. 510 US 569 (1994) 218n.19
Dairy Queen Inc. v. Wood 369 US 469 (1962) 75n.36
Dallas Cowboy Cheerleaders Inc. v. Pussycat Cinema Ltd 604 F.2d 200 (1979) 248n.92
Diamond v. Chakrabarty 447 US 303 (1980) 145, 198
Feist Publications Inc. v. Rural Telephone Service Co. 499 US 340 (1991) 207n.9, 218n.19
Girl Scouts of the United States of America v. Personality Posters Manufacturing Co. 304 F.Supp 1228 (SDNY 1969) 250–1
Harper & Rowe v. Nation Enterprises 471 US 539 (1985) 218n.19

- Hurley v. Irish American Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Group of Boston* 515 US 557 (1989) 250n.98
- Juicy Whip Inc. v. Orange Bang Inc.* 185 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 1999) 145
- Kelly v. Arriba Software Corp.* 336 F.3d 811 (9th Cir. 2003) 221n.24
- Lovell v. Lewis* 15 F.Cas. 1018 (CCD Mass. 1817) 145
- Mattel Inc. v. Walking Mountain Productions Co.* 353 F.3d 792 (9th Cir. 2003) 249
- Nichols v. Universal Pictures Corp. et al.* 45 F.2d 119 (2d Cir. 1930) 208n.9, 289n.17
- Pacific Gas and Electric Company v. Public Utilities Commission of California* 475 US 1 (1986) 250n.98
- Sheldon v. Metro-Goldwyn Pictures Corp.* 81 F.2d 49 (2d Cir. 1936) 208n.10
- Tiffany & Co. v. Boston Club Inc.* 231 F.Supp. 836 (D Mass. 1964) 248n.90
- Tiffany & Co. v. L'Argene Products Co.* 324 NYS 2d 326 (NY App. Div. 1971) 248n.90
- Tiffany & Co. v. Tiffany Productions Inc.* 188 NE 30 (NY 1933) 248n.90
- West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette* 319 US 624 (1943) 21n.42

World Trade Organization

Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), negotiated in the 1986 Uruguay Round under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 99, 110, 116, 142

Table of legislation and treaties

Africa

Constitution of Angola

Art. 10 75n.38

Constitution of Botswana

s. 8(1) 75n.38

Constitution of the Republic of Namibia

Art. 16 75n.38

Constitution of South Africa

s. 25 75n.38

Copyright Law, PNDCL No. 690 (17 May 2005) (Ghana) 73n.33

Australia

Patents Act 1990 (Cth)

s. 18(2) 144n.12

Canada

Civil Code of Quebec, SQ 1991, c. 64

Art. 6 303n.70

Art. 985 294n.42

Copyright Act 1985 RSC c. C-42

s. 3(1) 206n.6

s. 5(1) 207n.7

Patent Act 1985 RSC c. P-4

s. 2 198n.89, 207n.8

Europe

- Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, 9 Sept. 1886, as amended at Paris, 24 July 1971 and amended in 1979, S. Treaty Doc. No. 99-27 (1986) 304n.72
- Code de la propriété intellectuelle (France)
Art. L122-5 276n.48, 278n.55
- Convention on the Grant of European Patents of 5 Oct. 1973 (European Patent Convention)
Art. 53(2) 131n.20, 140, 143, 145-6, 148, 149, 150, 151, 155, 156-64, 164n.66, 325
- Directive 98/44/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 July 1998 on the legal protection of biotechnological inventions (Biotech Directive) OJ L/213 30.7.98
Art. 6 143n.6, 145n.25, 155, 164nn.66, 67, 166
- EPC Implementing Regulations to the European Patent Convention
Rule 28(a)-(d) (formerly numbered 23d(a)-(d)) 143n.8, 164nn.66, 67
- Loi no. 2009-669 of 12 June 2009 280n.61
- Regulation (EC) No. 141/2000 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 Dec. 1999 on Orphan Medicinal Products, OJ L/18 22.1.2000 133n.26

Latin America

- Law No. 27811, Introducing a Protection Regime for the Collective Knowledge of Indigenous Peoples Derived from Biological Resources, *El Peruano, Diario Oficial*, 10 Aug. 2002 (Peru) 74n.34

United Kingdom

- An Act for the Encouragement of Learning by Vesting the Copies of Printed Books in the Authors or Purchasers of such Copies, During the Times therein mentioned, 1710, 8 Anne c.19 290
- Patents Act 1977
s. 14(3) 257n.115
s. 48A 160n.61
ss. 55-58 160n.60
s. 60(5) 160n.62
- Statute of Monopolies 1624 142, 169
- Trade Marks Act 1994
s. 10(3) 247-8

Treaty of Versailles [1919] *United Kingdom Treaty Series* 4 (Cmd. 153)
(signed 28 June 1919, entered into force 10 Jan. 1920)
Art. 231 60

United States

Constitution

Amendment V 75n.38

Amendment XIV, s. 1 75n.38

Article I, s. 8, cl. 8 290n.20

Copyright Act 1790 290, 291, 293

Copyright Act 2000 17 USC

s. 107 276, 291

Digital Millennium Copyright Act 1998, Pub. L. No. 105–304, 112 Stat.
2860 293n.37

Lanham (Trademark) Act 15 USC § 1051 et seq., ch. 540, 60 stat.
427 248

Organization of American States, American Convention on Human
Rights, 22 Nov. 1969

Art. 21 75n.37

Patent Code 35 USC

§ 101 144n.16, 145, 198n.89

§ 112 145

Contents

<i>List of contributors</i>	<i>page</i> vii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	ix
<i>Table of cases</i>	xi
<i>Table of legislation and treaties</i>	xiv
 Introduction: Philosophy of intellectual property – incentives, rights and duties ANNABELLE LEVER	 1
1 Autonomy, social selves and intellectual property claims JOHN CHRISTMAN	33
2 Corrective justice and intellectual property rights in traditional knowledge STEPHEN R. MUNZER	58
3 Designing a successor to the patent as second best solution to the problem of optimum provision of good ideas ALEX ROSENBERG	88
4 Ethical issues surrounding intellectual property rights JORN SONDERHOLM	110
5 On the value of the intellectual commons JAMES WILSON	122
6 Immorality and patents: The exclusion of inventions contrary to <i>ordre public</i> and morality KATHLEEN LIDDELL	140

7	'The genetic code is 3.6 billion years old: it's time for a rewrite' – questioning the metaphors and analogies of synthetic biology and life science patenting GRAHAM DUTFIELD	172
8	Copyright infringement as compelled speech ABRAHAM DRASSINOWER	203
9	Public reason, communication and intellectual property LAURA BIRON	225
10	Illegal downloading, free riding and justice GEERT DEMUIJNCK	261
11	The virtuous p(eer): Reflections on the ethics of file sharing DAVID LAMETTI	284
	<i>Bibliography</i>	307
	<i>Index</i>	329

Introduction: Philosophy of intellectual property – incentives, rights and duties

*Annabelle Lever**

The new frontiers in the philosophy of intellectual property lie squarely in territories belonging to moral and political philosophy, as well as legal philosophy and the philosophy of economics – or so this collection suggests. Those who wish to understand the nature and justification of intellectual property may now find themselves immersed in philosophical debates on the structure and relative merits of consequentialist and deontological moral theories, disputes about the nature and value of privacy, or the relationship between national and global justice. Conversely, the theoretical and practical problems posed by intellectual property are increasingly relevant to bioethics and philosophy and public policy, as well as to more established areas of moral and political philosophy.

Perhaps this is just to say that the philosophy of intellectual property is coming into its own as a distinct field of intellectual endeavour, providing a place where legal theorists and philosophers can have the sorts of discussions – neither reducible to questions about what the law is, nor wholly divorced from contemporary legal problems – which typify debates about freedom of expression, discrimination and human rights. These are all areas in which legal and philosophical ideas influence each other at the level of method as well as of substance. My hope is that this collection of essays will appeal to those who, whatever their professional specialty or training, share an interest in the philosophy of intellectual property, and

* With thanks to Laura Biron, Geert Demuijnck and Abraham Drassinower for commenting on parts of this Introduction, and with special thanks to Stephen Munzer for kindly reading and editing several drafts. Any errors, unfortunately, are all mine. However, without the help and support of John Harris, and the wonderful Institute for Science, Ethics and Innovation, The University of Manchester Law School, I would not have been able to see this volume to publication. It is a pleasure to be able to thank John and the Institute for appointing me to their Senior Wellcome Biomedical Ethics Fellowship, and for the help and support – and enjoyably energetic arguments – from which I profited as a member of iSEI.

that it will build upon and advance existing interdisciplinary dialogue and research in this complex, fascinating, and important area.¹

Most of the chapters in this collection were specially written for a conference on the philosophy of intellectual property which took place at the Institute of Philosophy, London, in May 2009. In organising that conference I had been hoping to learn what, if anything, unites patents, copyright, trade marks and trade secrets and distinguishes them from other forms of property. As a political theorist working on privacy, I had come to be interested in intellectual property as a way of thinking about the relationship between privacy and property rights, on the one hand, and of private and collective property on the other. Finding this hard going, I was keen to have a bunch of experts on hand to answer my questions for me.

My hopes for a ready answer to my questions, however, were dashed by the conference. It quickly became apparent that issues which have been so central to philosophical and legal theorising about privacy seem largely irrelevant to legal theorists and philosophers interested in intellectual property. In the course of editing these chapters for publication, and of thinking about their points of agreement and tension, I have again been struck by how little the nature and justification of property concerns our authors, with the notable exception of John Christman, and how far the idea of patents and copyright as *property* seems either irrelevant to, or actively at odds with, the conception of rights which they seek to defend.

This might suggest that it is unnecessary to clarify what makes intellectual property a form of property – albeit one distinct from the property that we might have in material objects, animals, labour and relationships. Certainly, the quality and interest of the chapters here suggest that such clarification is often unnecessary. But it is also possible that there are puzzles in the theory and practice of intellectual property which we will not be able to solve without a better sense of the ways in which familiar forms of intellectual property are property, and of the advantages, as well as the limitations, of thinking about our interests in ideas this way. My hunch is that the puzzles thrown up by the different chapters suggest that

¹ See, for example, Stephen R. Munzer (ed.), *New Essays in the Legal and Political Theory of Property* (Cambridge University Press, 2001); Axel Gosseries, Alain Marciano and Alain Strouel (eds.), *Intellectual Property and Theories of Justice* (New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008); Charles Beitz, 'The Moral Rights of Creators of Artistic and Literary Works' *Journal of Political Philosophy* 13(3) (2005): 330–58, hereinafter 'The Moral Rights of Creators'; Thomas Pogge, 'The Health Impact Fund: Better Pharmaceutical Innovations at Much Lower Prices', in Thomas Pogge, Matthew Rimmer and Kim Rubenstein (eds.), *Incentives for Better Global Public Health: Patent Law and Access to Medicines* (Cambridge University Press, 2010); Allen Buchanan, Tony Cole and Robert O. Keohane, 'Justice in the Diffusion of Innovation' *Journal of Political Philosophy* 19(3) (2011): 306–32.

this, too, is a real possibility. But in order to tell whether it is or not, it will help to look at the chapters in this collection one by one.

Control rights and income rights in ideas

The collection starts with John Christman's 'Autonomy, social selves and intellectual property claims', a piece which builds on his prior work on autonomy, and on an egalitarian interpretation of property rights. In an important article in *Philosophy and Public Affairs*,² Christman argued that we can think of the bundle of rights that makes up full property ownership in terms of two different groups of rights: one set he called control rights, and the other income rights. The former include familiar property rights, such as the rights to use, destroy, acquire, alienate and exchange a property, whereas the latter include familiar property rights such as the right to profit financially from the use, acquisition, alienation and destruction of one's property.

Distinguishing control rights from income rights, Christman argued, gives us a way to think about our autonomy and equality interests in property, and to see how they might be reconciled, rather than pitted against each other, as is often the case. In particular, Christman argued, if we care about autonomy and equality, we will want to distinguish the moral and political importance of control rights from income rights, because there is no particular level of income from property which is necessary to our autonomy or equality with others, whereas we cannot think of ourselves as autonomous beings, or as the equal of others, if we are treated simply as objects, or are denied the ability to distinguish our treatment of objects based on our beliefs about what is useful, beautiful, valuable and meaningful. In his chapter for this collection, Christman examines whether this way of thinking about property illuminates the claims by indigenous peoples to intellectual property (IP) in traditional knowledge (TK) and, therefore, how far his understanding of the links between autonomy and control support the claims of people who have often been denied the status of property owners, and legal rights in their ideas and artefacts.

Accordingly, a major part of Christman's chapter concerns his conception of autonomy, and the ways in which it might explain the importance of control over cultural artefacts and knowledge by indigenous peoples. Importantly, Christman wants to challenge the idea that autonomy is a problematically individualist value, and therefore inimical to claims to

² John Christman, 'Distributive Justice and the Complex Structure of Ownership' *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 23(3) (1994): 225–50.