Title: The Big Steal: Ideology, Interest, and the Undoing of Intellectual Property

Author(s) + Article info: Barnett, Jonathan M., *The Big Steal: Ideology, Interest, and the Undoing of Intellectual Property* (New York, 2024; Oxford Academic, 24 Oct. 2024)

Author of the summary: Name, title and institution: Cuka, Patrick, M.Sc., Economic Consultant at 4ip Council

SUMMARY			
Document Title	Barnett, Jonathan M., *The Big Steal: Ideology, Interest, and the Undoing of Intellectual Property* (New York, 2024; Oxford Academic, 24 Oct. 2024)		
Author	Patrick Cuka	**Date**	21.03.2025

Abstract:

The chapter explores the shifting landscape of U.S. patent law from the 1930s to the present, emphasizing its economic and political dimensions. It highlights how the 1980s marked a turning point with stronger patent protections, benefiting small firms in biotech and semiconductors. However, a backlash emerged, driven by academic and industry lobbying. It was argued that excessive patent protections stifled innovation. This critique gained traction despite empirical evidence suggesting that stronger patents encourage R&D investment and technological advancements. The chapter critiques the role of "stylized facts" (anecdotal claims presented as empirical truths) to weaken patent enforcement. The author argues that these claims serve ideological and economic interests rather than objective policy analysis. Large corporations and policymakers leveraged this narrative to promote weaker patent protections, benefiting from reduced litigation risks. The result has been a gradual rollback of strong patent protections, transforming the system into a quasi-compulsory licensing model.

Chapters in the Book:

Part 3- Unmaking Patent Law
Chapter 7- The Political Economy of Patent Law (p.153-163)

Summary

7. The Political Economy of Patent Law

From approximately the late 1930s through to the 1970s, courts and antitrust authorities were largely hostile to the enforcement of patents. This changed in the early 1980s when a sequence of legal changes revitalized the patent system, making patents valuable for monetizing R&D. This was largely attractive to smaller firms, especially in the biotech and semiconductor industries who benefited from the stronger patent system. However, little more than a decade later, a backlash emerged, led by academics, policymakers, and industry groups. The result has largely favored rhetoric and narrative over fact and analysis.

7.1. Regime Shift: The Reinvigoration of the U.S. Patent System

In the late 1970s, the United States found itself in a state of weak growth, slow productivity, and stalled innovation. In particular, national R&D intensity and per capita patent awards declined significantly between 1959 and 1979. During the postwar period, courts were generally unsympathetic towards patentees. Additionally, antitrust laws discouraged patent licensing and limited innovation incentives. However, this climate changed. In 1980, Congress enacted the Bayh-Dole Act. It enabled federally funded research institutions to patent and license innovations, thus boosting technology transfer. When Congress further strengthened patent protections by establishing the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit as the exclusive appellate court for patent litigation. Concurrently, the Supreme Court issued two landmark decisions in 1980 and 1981 that clarified the patentability of inventions in the biotechnology and software sectors. Within a few years, the patent system had expanded significantly in scope and strength. It was to the point that patents acquired practical relevance as a monetization vehicle in technology markets.

This shift in direction is illustrated by the Federal Circuit lowering the standard for granting preliminary injunctions in patent cases. Therefore, it made it easier for patentees to enforce their rights. In 1987, the court reaffirmed that patentees were almost always entitled to permanent injunctions after proving infringement. The reinvigorated presumption adopted by the Federal Circuit in favor of injunctive relief had concrete real-world effects. In 1986, the *Polaroid v Kodak* case demonstrated the power of patent enforcement. In the end, Kodak was forced to shut down its instant camera division and hundreds of jobs were lost. In 1990, Polaroid was awarded $909 million in damages. The lesson was clear: the once nearly dormant body of patent law had been revived. It had to be taken seriously by any potential litigation target, even a company as large as Kodak.

7.2. Effect on R&D, Patenting and Market Entry

The Federal Circuit's case-law shift increased the expected likelihood that a patent owner could secure an injunction against infringing users and be awarded large damages. Thus, stronger patent enforcement improved patent owners' bargaining power in licensing and settlements. The result was that more (biotech and software) firms were encouraged to adopt patent-based strategies for monetizing innovation. This is emphasized by the increase in patent applications, lawsuits, and U.S. R&D intensity from the mid-1980s onward. Looking at data, the period from 1970-2005 highlights the impact of key legal changes, including the Bayh-Dole Act and Federal Circuit establishment.

7.3. Origins of the "Patent Failure" Narrative

The increase in patent applications and business R&D intensity following the 1970s might have been viewed as welcome developments in terms of innovation policy. One could see it as proof that stronger patent rights encouraged innovation. Instead, a different interpretation of these events took hold. Many academics and industry groups argued that excessive patents and litigation stifled innovation rather than promoting it. Books like Innovation and Its Discontents (2004) and Against Intellectual Monopoly (2008) gained widespread attention, advocating against strong patent enforcement. By contrast, books that tend to favor an enforced patent system attracted far less attention. This meant that by the mid-to-late 2000s, experts asserted that the U.S. economy had been overwhelmed by patent issuance, litigation, and licensing.

Many critics claimed the Federal Circuit was influenced by the patent bar and businesses to create overly strong patent protections. This would in turn lead to monopoly rents, raise consumer prices, and slow innovation. For example, scholars like Dosi and Stiglitz argued that large corporations pressured the U.S. government to adopt a stricter patent regime. This is not true. In fact, contradictory to this claim, most Fortune 500 firms have historically pushed for weaker patent protections.

In general, evidence supporting claims of patent system "failure" in the 1980s is weak or ambiguous. It can be demonstrated by three "macro" trends in the U.S. innovation economy in the years following the shift toward a strong patent regime. First, the increase in patent applications in the early 1990s was accompanied by a significant increase in R&D intensity. That is consistent with the view that increased patent enforceability has induced R&D activity. Second, patent-intensive industries such as biotech and semiconductors have been especially successful in developing transformative innovations. Third, smaller firms have represented increasingly large shares of R&D expenditure as compared to the 1970s. This observation counters the claim that stronger patents hindered entry and competition. Yet, despite real-world evidence, patent-skeptical commentary by scholars and large platform technology firms influenced the Supreme Court rulings that weakened the strong patent system. In addition, Congress and antitrust regulators have taken actions aimed at limiting patent enforcement rather than protecting them.

7.4. The Political Power over the Stylized Fact

Many criticisms of the post-1980s patent system represent "stylized facts". In other words, these arguments may be theoretically plausible, but they are supported by a limited number of anecdotal reports. Such claims often emerge from a single event, followed by academic and policy discussions. Scientific progress, on the other hand, is often described as a cumulative process of incremental enlightenment in which carefully formulated hypotheses are tested against data. As will be shown, the stylized facts about the harmful effects of a strengthened patent system emerged from anecdotal events, not through thorough empirical studies. Yet, the claims were supported by academic publications, policy commentary, and industry advocacy without substantial inquiry into their validity. Crucially, these doubts about the effectiveness of the patent system gained acceptance quickly because they aligned with the economic interests of certain policy interest groups.

This is where the problem with stylized facts lies. They are both highly contestable as a factual matter, but also largely shielded from continuous testing in policymaking. This is public policymaking rooted in a combination of ideology and economic interest. It is a form of confirmation bias that has proven to be a critical tool in translating scholarly critiques. Academics and policymakers have relied upon the fact that the stylized facts converge with the policy preferences of ideologically motivated advocates of a weak IP regime. Furthermore, policies based on stylized facts are unlikely to conflict with policymakers' interests in accruing reputational capital. Absent a good-faith willingness to sacrifice political capital for a robust innovation ecosystem, any policymaker's rational strategy will be to support reducing patent protection.

7.5. Concluding Thoughts

As will be shown in the following two chapters, stylized facts favoring weak patents persist because they align with the interests of well-resourced advocacy groups which promote such policies. These groups, particularly in industries like pharmaceuticals, dominate political advocacy and influence policymaker preferences for weaker patents. Innovation-driven industries have seen an incremental rollback of the strong patent regime from the 1980s due to this advocacy. This shift has transformed the patent system from market-driven pricing to a quasi-compulsory licensing model determined by courts and agencies.