On the Incompatibility of Artificial Intelligence Research with Traditional Patent Enforcement Rationale

Evin Tunador

August 2023

Abstract

This paper explores the intricate intersection of artificial intelligence (AI), intellectual property, and proprietary data, shedding light on the unique challenges and opportunities presented by the digital nature of AI. By analyzing the fundamental assumptions underlying the traditional patent system, the paper reveals how AI architectures and models both bend and break these assumptions, in stark contrast to physical goods. The analysis further delves into the economic characteristics of AI, including the non-exclusionary nature of digital goods and the distinct role of proprietary data in fostering innovation and competitive advantage. The paper also examines the potential benefits and pitfalls of an open-source paradigm for AI, highlighting the successes of open-source software and the alignment with digital goods. A nuanced exploration of proprietary data reveals its potential to act as a key driver of innovation, suggesting the need for careful consideration and potential regulation. The paper concludes with potential future directions, including the reevaluation of intellectual property laws, ethical considerations, collaborative innovation models, regulatory oversight, international harmonization, and environmental responsibility. Counterarguments and potential problems are also presented, underscoring the complexity of the issues and the need for a multifaceted approach. This comprehensive analysis offers valuable insights for policymakers, researchers, industry leaders, and the broader community, contributing to the ongoing discourse on the evolving landscape of AI, intellectual property, and societal advancement.

Contents

1 Introduction

As we step into the year 2023, the realm of artificial intelligence (AI) continues to evolve at an unprecedented pace. The strides made in AI over the past years have been remarkable, and this year promises to be no different. Deep learning, a subset of AI, has seen significant breakthroughs, enabling remarkable progress in image and speech recognition, natural language processing, and more. AI is making waves in healthcare with applications in medical imaging analysis, drug discovery, disease diagnosis, and personalized treatment plans. The autonomous vehicle industry is rapidly evolving, with AI playing a central role in enabling self-driving cars. Major automotive companies are investing heavily in AI-powered technologies to improve vehicle safety and navigation. Natural Language Processing (NLP) has reached new heights, enabling more sophisticated and context-aware conversations between humans and machines.[1]

The intersection of artificial intelligence (AI) and patents has ignited a complex and multifaceted debate, raising questions that challenge traditional legal and ethical frameworks. Two prominent issues have emerged at the forefront of this discourse. First, the question of whether AI systems can or should be credited as inventors has sparked discussions about the nature of creativity, authorship, and the role of machines in the inventive process.[2] This debate extends beyond mere legal formalities, probing the essence of invention and the boundaries between human and machine intelligence. Second, the rights of individuals who provide the original sources of data that AI systems train on have become a critical concern. As AI models increasingly rely on vast amounts of personal and proprietary data, questions about ownership, consent, privacy, and compensation have arisen.[3] These issues underscore the intricate interplay between technology, law, economics, and ethics, setting the stage for a profound exploration of AI's impact on intellectual property and societal norms.

Building on these foundational questions, a further inquiry emerges: should AI architectures, model applications, and specific models be treated the same as other inventions in the first place? This question unravels into several nuanced considerations. Namely, should architectures, representing the underlying design and structure of AI systems, even be patentable? When it comes to model applications, the potential to patent the very idea of applying an AI model for a specific use-case raises concerns about the scope and exclusivity of such intellectual property rights. Additionally, the notion of patenting a fully trained model's weights, encapsulating the specific learned knowledge of the system, introduces unprecedented challenges in defining ownership, novelty, and inventiveness. These questions not only challenge traditional patent law but also provoke a broader reflection on the nature of innovation in the digital age, where intangible assets, replicable designs, and shared knowledge redefine the landscape of invention and creativity.

2 Background - Patents

The concept of patent protection has its roots in the very foundation of the United States, reflecting a commitment to fostering innovation and progress. The U.S. Constitution itself provides the legal basis for patent rights, with Article I, Section 8, Clause 8 empowering Congress to "promote the Progress of Science

---

1. "The State of AI in 2023: What We Can Expect," August 9, 2023, https://identicalcloud.com/blog/the-state-of-ai-in-2023/

2. Ana Ramalho, "Patentability of AI-generated inventions: is a reform of the patent system needed?," *Available at SSRN 3168703*, 2018,

Shlomit Yanisky-Ravid and Xiaoqiong Jackie Liu, "When artificial intelligence systems produce inventions: the 3A era and an alternative model for patent law," 2017,

3. Frank Pasquale, *The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information* (Harvard University Press, 2015)

Tal Z Zarsky, "Transparent predictions," *U. Ill. L. Rev.*, 2013, 1503

Linnet Taylor, Luciano Floridi, and Bart Van der Sloot, *Group privacy: New challenges of data technologies*, vol. 126 (Springer, 2016)

Brent Daniel Mittelstadt et al., "The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate," *Big Data & Society* 3, no. 2 (2016): 2053951716679679

Sandra Wachter, Brent Mittelstadt, and Luciano Floridi, "Why a right to explanation of automated decision-making does not exist in the general data protection regulation," *International Data Privacy Law* 7, no. 2 (2017): 76–99

and useful Arts" through the granting of exclusive rights to inventors.[4] This constitutional mandate was further articulated and implemented through a series of legislative acts, beginning with the Patent Act of 1790, followed by the Patent Act of 1793, which was notably drafted by Thomas Jefferson.[5]

The philosophical underpinnings of the American patent system can be traced back to the writings of key Founding Fathers. James Madison, in "The Federalist No. 43," argued for the importance of intellectual property rights as a means to encourage creativity and advancement.[6] Thomas Jefferson's correspondence and writings further elucidated the balance between public interest and individual rights, recognizing the societal benefits of protecting inventors while ensuring that knowledge remained accessible.[7]

The evolution of patent law in the U.S. has been marked by a series of landmark Supreme Court decisions. Cases such as Graham v. John Deere Co. (1966) and Diamond v. Chakrabarty (1980) have shaped the criteria for patentability, expanding the scope of what can be considered patentable subject matter and defining the standards for non-obviousness.[8] These decisions have played a crucial role in aligning the legal framework with technological advancements and the changing landscape of innovation.

The economic rationale for the patent system has also been a subject of extensive scholarly investigation. Fritz Machlup's seminal work, "The Economic Rationale for a Patent System" (1958), explores the complex interplay between exclusive rights and economic incentives, arguing that patents serve as a mechanism to stimulate investment in research and development.[9] This perspective has been further supported and nuanced by subsequent academic studies, reflecting an ongoing dialogue about the optimal balance between protection and collaboration in the pursuit of scientific progress.[10]

2.1 Fundamental Assumptions of the Patent system

1. **Scarcity and Exclusivity**: The patent system operates on the assumption of scarcity, where ideas and inventions are considered valuable and finite resources. By granting inventors exclusive rights to their creations for a limited time, the system aims to protect these resources from unauthorized use or duplication.[11] This exclusivity is intended to create a competitive advantage for the inventor, allowing them to capitalize on their innovation without immediate imitation by others.

2. **Incentive Structure**: Central to the patent system is the belief that individuals and organizations are motivated by economic incentives. By providing legal protection for inventions, the system encourages investment in research and development, fostering innovation and technological advancement.[12] The promise of potential profits serves as a driving force for creativity, with the patent acting as a reward for successful innovation.

3. **Balance between Public and Private Interests**: The patent system seeks to strike a balance be-

---

4. (U.S. Const., art. I, § 8, cl. 8.)

5. (Patent Act of 1790; Patent Act of 1793)

6. (Madison, 1788)

7. (Jefferson, various letters)

8. Graham v. John Deere Co., 3831, 17-18, 1966, 1.
   Diamond v. Chakrabarty, No. 79-136, 1980, 303.

9. Fritz Machlup, An economic review of the patent system, 15 (US Government Printing Office, 1958)

10. Robert P Merges and Richard R Nelson, "On the complex economics of patent scope," Columbia law review 90, no. 4 (1990): 839–916

Suzanne Scotchmer, "Standing on the shoulders of giants: cumulative research and the patent law," Journal of economic perspectives 5, no. 1 (1991): 29–41

Nancy T Gallini, "The economics of patents: Lessons from recent US patent reform," Journal of Economic Perspectives 16, no. 2 (2002): 131–154

Michael A Heller and Rebecca S Eisenberg, "Can patents deter innovation? The anticommons in biomedical research," Science 280, no. 5364 (1998): 698–701

Bronwyn H Hall and Rosemarie Ham Ziedonis, "The patent paradox revisited: an empirical study of patenting in the US semiconductor industry, 1979-1995," rand Journal of Economics, 2001, 101–128

Mark A Lemley, "Are universities patent trolls," Fordham Intell. Prop. Media & Ent. LJ 18 (2007): 611

James Bessen and Michael J Meurer, Patent failure: How judges, bureaucrats, and lawyers put innovators at risk (Princeton University Press, 2009)

11. Machlup, An economic review of the patent system

12. Machlup

tween private interests and public welfare. While inventors are granted exclusive rights, these rights are time-limited, allowing the invention to eventually enter the public domain (Jefferson, various letters). This ensures that knowledge and technology become accessible to society at large, promoting further innovation and growth. The system thus attempts to reconcile the need for individual protection with the broader societal benefits of shared knowledge.

4. **Enforceability and Legal Certainty**: The effectiveness of the patent system relies on the assumption that patents are enforceable and that the legal framework provides certainty and clarity. This includes well-defined criteria for patentability, clear procedures for obtaining and defending patents, and robust mechanisms for resolving disputes.[13] Without these elements, the system's ability to incentivize innovation and protect inventors would be undermined.

5. **Technological Neutrality**: Historically, the patent system has been based on the assumption that the principles of patentability apply uniformly across different fields of technology. Whether an invention is a mechanical device or a chemical compound, the same legal standards are presumed to apply.[14] This assumption of technological neutrality may be challenged by the unique characteristics of emerging fields such as AI and software, raising questions about the system's adaptability and relevance.

2.2 Background - AI

The field of artificial intelligence (AI) has its roots in the mid-20th century, with early pioneers exploring the idea of creating machines capable of mimicking human intelligence. Initial efforts were focused on symbolic AI, where logic and rules were manually programmed to emulate reasoning.[15] However, the limitations of this approach became apparent, leading to the emergence of machine learning, where algorithms learn from data rather than being explicitly programmed.[16]

Deep learning, a specialized subset of machine learning, marked a significant turning point in the AI journey. Emerging in the 1980s and gaining prominence in the 2010s, deep learning leverages neural networks with multiple layers to automatically learn complex patterns from large datasets.[17] Unlike earlier AI methods, deep learning's ability to learn from data allowed for breakthroughs in tasks such as image recognition, natural language processing, and more.[18] This shift from hand-crafted rules to data-driven learning represented a profound transformation in the field.

Within the broad spectrum of AI and deep learning, distinctions began to emerge between different components and applications. The underlying structures, known as architectures, provided the foundational blueprints for AI systems, while specific implementations, trained on particular datasets, gave rise to unique models tailored to specific tasks.[19] The interplay between these elements, along with the evolving landscape of data, algorithms, and computational power, has shaped the dynamic and multifaceted field of AI that continues to push the boundaries of technology, innovation, and human understanding.[20]

2.3 Definitions and Differences:

AI, deep learning, AI architectures, and AI models are interrelated concepts, each with distinct meanings and roles. AI is the broad field encompassing various techniques, including deep learning, which focuses

13. *Graham v. John Deere Co.*
    KSR Intern. Co. v. Teleflex Inc., No. 04-1350, 2007, 398
14. *Diamond v. Chakrabarty*
15. Stuart J Russell, *Artificial intelligence a modern approach* (Pearson Education, Inc., 2010).
16. Pamela McCorduck and Cli Cfe, *Machines who think: A personal inquiry into the history and prospects of artificial intelligence* (CRC Press, 2004).
17. Yann LeCun, Yoshua Bengio, and Geoffrey Hinton, "Deep learning," *nature* 521, no. 7553 (2015): 436–444.
    Ian Goodfellow, Yoshua Bengio, and Aaron Courville, *Deep learning* (MIT press, 2016).
18. Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E Hinton, "Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks," *Advances in neural information processing systems* 25 (2012).
19. Goodfellow, Bengio, and Courville, *Deep learning*
20. Michael I Jordan and Tom M Mitchell, "Machine learning: Trends, perspectives, and prospects," *Science* 349, no. 6245 (2015): 255–260.

on multi-layered neural networks. AI architectures provide the structural design for AI systems, while AI models are the specific implementations trained to perform tasks.[21] Understanding these definitions and differences is essential for navigating the complex landscape of AI and its applications in various domains, including intellectual property, innovation, and societal advancement.

1. **Artificial Intelligence (AI)**:

   - **Definition**: AI refers to the simulation of human intelligence in machines that are programmed to think, learn, and perform tasks like a human. It encompasses a broad range of technologies and methods, including machine learning, natural language processing, robotics, and more.[22]
   - **Difference**: AI is the overarching field that includes various subfields and techniques, including deep learning, AI architectures, and AI models.

2. **Deep Learning**:

   - **Definition**: Deep learning is a specialized subset of machine learning that involves neural networks with three or more layers.[23] These deep networks attempt to simulate the human brain to "learn" from large amounts of data, allowing the system to automatically improve at tasks such as speech recognition, image classification, and natural language understanding.[24]
   - **Difference**: While AI encompasses various methods and approaches, deep learning specifically refers to multi-layered neural networks. It's a part of AI but focuses on a particular type of learning algorithm.

3. **AI Architectures**:

   - **Definition**: AI architectures refer to the underlying structure and design of an AI system. This includes the arrangement of algorithms, data flow, interfaces, and the interaction between different components. Common AI architectures include feedforward neural networks, convolutional neural networks (CNNs), and recurrent neural networks (RNNs).[25]
   - **Difference**: AI architectures define the blueprint or framework for building AI models. They provide the structure, while AI models are the specific implementations that have been trained on data.

4. **AI Models**:

   - **Definition**: AI models refer to specific implementations of AI architectures that have been trained on data to perform a particular task. An AI model includes both the architecture and the learned parameters (weights) obtained through training on a dataset. Examples of AI models include a specific trained CNN for image recognition or an RNN for language translation.[26]
   - **Difference**: AI models are the tangible outcomes of applying an AI architecture to a specific problem using data. They represent the combination of architecture and learned knowledge to perform a task.

The remainder of this discussion will reference AI architectures and models within the context of deep learning rather than pertaining to all types of AI architectures and models. This means we will specifically be looking to analyze architectures designed to be trained with large amounts of data in order to become useful, and models that have gained their capabilities through being trained on large amounts of data.

21. Goodfellow, Bengio, and Courville, *Deep learning.*
22. Russell, *Artificial intelligence a modern approach.*
23. LeCun, Bengio, and Hinton, "Deep learning"
24. Krizhevsky, Sutskever, and Hinton, "Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks."
25. Goodfellow, Bengio, and Courville, *Deep learning.*
26. Goodfellow, Bengio, and Courville.

2.4 Specific Examples of Patented Architectures and Models

ToDo: Write this section

Architectures

Perceptron Algorithm: Frank Rosenblatt's perceptron algorithm was patented under U.S. Patent 3,287,649.

Adaptive Resonance Theory (ART) Networks: Adaptive Resonance Theory networks were patented by Stephen Grossberg and Gail Carpenter under various patents, including U.S. Patent 4,912,654.

ToDo: There are others in a folder in "AI PhD"

Models

ToDo: There are others in a folder in "AI PhD"

3 AI's interaction with these assumptions

AI architectures and models both bend and break the fundamental assumptions underlying the patent system, in contrast to traditional physical goods. While physical goods align with the principles of scarcity, exclusivity, incentives, balance of interests, enforceability, and technological neutrality, AI's intangible and replicable nature challenges these assumptions. This divergence underscores the need for a nuanced understanding and potentially a reevaluation of the patent system's applicability to AI, considering its unique economic characteristics and societal implications.

1. **Scarcity and Exclusivity:**

   - **Software Generally**: Similar to AI, software is not inherently scarce or exclusionary. Multiple users can simultaneously use a single piece of software without affecting its availability, bending the assumption of scarcity and exclusivity.

   - **Physical Goods**: Physical goods are inherently scarce and exclusionary. Once a physical item is used or consumed, it cannot be simultaneously used by another without duplication or reproduction.

   - **AI Architectures**: AI architectures, being the underlying structure and design of AI systems, are not inherently scarce. Once created, they can be replicated and used simultaneously by multiple entities. This bends the assumption of scarcity and exclusivity.

   - **AI Industry Use-Case Applications**: The idea of applying AI to specific industry use-cases can be replicated across various industries without limitation, further bending the traditional notions of scarcity and exclusivity.

   - **AI Models**: Similar to architectures, AI models (trained algorithms) can be copied and used simultaneously by many. This also bends the assumption of scarcity and exclusivity.

2. **Incentive Structure:**

   - **Software Generally**: The ability to copy and distribute software challenges traditional profit incentives but may foster collaboration and open-source development, bending the traditional incentive structure.

   - **Physical Goods**: The exclusivity of physical goods creates a clear incentive structure, where inventors and producers can profit from their creations.

   - **AI Architectures**: The non-exclusionary nature of AI architectures may reduce the direct profit incentive but can foster collaborative innovation. This bends the traditional incentive structure.

   - **AI Industry Use-Case Applications**: Patenting the application of AI to specific industries may create new incentives for innovation but also raises questions about accessibility and collaboration, bending the traditional incentive structure.

- **AI Models**: The ability to copy and share AI models may diminish the profit incentive for individual creators but can promote broader innovation and accessibility. This also bends the traditional incentive structure.

3. **Balance between Public and Private Interests:**

   - **Software Generally**: Open-source software promotes public access but may conflict with private interests in exclusivity, bending the balance between public and private interests.

   - **Physical Goods**: The patent system for physical goods strikes a balance by granting temporary exclusivity, followed by public access.

   - **AI Architectures**: The non-exclusionary nature of AI architectures inherently promotes public access but may challenge the private interest in exclusivity. This bends the assumption of balancing public and private interests.

   - **AI Industry Use-Case Applications**: The patenting of AI applications in specific industries may prioritize private interests over public access, potentially shifting the traditional balance.

   - **AI Models**: Similar to architectures, AI models challenge the traditional balance by promoting immediate public access, bending this assumption.

4. **Enforceability and Legal Certainty:**

   - **Software Generally**: Enforcing patents on software can be complex due to its intangible nature, potentially breaking the assumption of enforceability and legal certainty.

   - **Physical Goods**: Physical goods allow for clear enforceability of patents and legal rights.

   - **AI Architectures**: The intangible and replicable nature of AI architectures complicates enforceability and legal certainty, potentially breaking this assumption.

   - **AI Industry Use-Case Applications**: The patenting of AI applications for specific use-cases adds further complexity to enforcement, as determining infringement may be ambiguous, breaking this assumption.

   - **AI Models**: Enforceability is similarly complex for AI models, as identifying infringement can be challenging, breaking this assumption.

5. **Technological Neutrality:**

   - **Software Generally**: Software's diverse applications and technological complexities challenge the assumption of technological neutrality, potentially requiring specialized legal considerations, breaking this assumption.

   - **Physical Goods**: The patent system's principles apply uniformly across various physical technologies.

   - **AI Architectures**: The unique characteristics of AI architectures challenge the assumption of technological neutrality, as they may require specialized legal considerations, breaking this assumption.

   - **AI Industry Use-Case Applications**: The wide range of potential applications of AI across various industries further complicates the notion of technological neutrality, as different use-cases may require distinct legal approaches, breaking this assumption.

   - **AI Models**: AI models further challenge technological neutrality, as they encompass diverse applications and complexities that may not fit traditional patent criteria, breaking this assumption.

4 Advantages of an Open-Source Paradigm:

Open-source refers to a type of software licensing arrangement where the original source code is made freely available and may be redistributed and modified. Unlike proprietary software, where the source code is kept secret and controlled by individual developers or organizations, open-source software encourages collaboration, transparency, and community-driven development. Users of open-source software can access the underlying code, modify it to suit their needs, and share their modifications with others. This approach fosters a culture of collective innovation, allowing for rapid development, diverse contributions, and widespread dissemination. Popular examples of open-source software include the Linux operating system, the Apache HTTP Server, and the Python programming language. The principles of open-source have also been applied beyond software, influencing various fields such as open science, open data, and open educational resources.

The open-source paradigm for AI architectures offers significant advantages in fostering collaboration, accessibility, transparency, and competition. It aligns with the digital nature of AI, bending or breaking traditional assumptions underlying the patent system. While challenges exist, particularly in enforcement and traditional economic incentives, the successes of open-source software and AI models demonstrate the potential for this approach to drive innovation and societal benefit. By recognizing the unique characteristics of AI and the digital economy, an open-source paradigm can provide a robust alternative to traditional intellectual property protections, reflecting the evolving needs and opportunities of the AI era.

1. **Collaboration and Innovation**: Open-source encourages collaboration across organizations, researchers, and developers. This collective effort can accelerate innovation, as seen in successful open-source projects like Linux, Apache, and TensorFlow.

2. **Accessibility and Inclusivity**: By making AI architectures freely available, open-source democratizes access to cutting-edge technology. This inclusivity fosters a diverse community of contributors, enhancing creativity and problem-solving.

3. **Transparency and Trust**: Open-source promotes transparency, allowing for public scrutiny and validation of the code. This can build trust and ensure higher quality, as evidenced by the success of open-source AI models like BERT and GPT-2.

4. **Avoidance of Monopoly Power**: Unlike proprietary models, open-source prevents individual entities from monopolizing key technologies. This fosters competition and prevents the long-term monopoly power that proprietary data might otherwise enable.

5. **Alignment with Digital Nature**: Digital goods, including AI architectures, can be copied and shared without loss, unlike physical goods. Open-source aligns with this non-exclusionary nature, promoting widespread dissemination and use.

4.1 Economic Analysis of the Open-Source Paradigm within the Context of the Fundamental Assumptions Underlying the Patent System:

1. **Scarcity and Exclusivity**: Open-source bends this assumption by making AI architectures non-scarce and non-exclusive. This contrasts with physical goods, which are inherently limited.

2. **Incentive Structure**: While traditional incentives (e.g., profit from exclusivity) may be reduced, open-source fosters incentives for reputation, community recognition, and collective advancement. This can still drive innovation, as seen in the success of open-source software like Python.

3. **Balance between Public and Private Interests**: Open-source strongly emphasizes public interest by providing immediate access to all. This may challenge private interests in exclusivity but aligns with the digital nature of AI, where sharing does not diminish value.

4. **Enforceability and Legal Certainty**: Open-source licenses provide a legal framework, but enforcement can be challenging. The digital nature of AI complicates tracking and controlling usage, unlike physical goods.

5. **Technological Neutrality**: Open-source promotes technological neutrality by making AI architectures accessible across various fields and applications. This fosters cross-disciplinary innovation and adaptability.

In summarizing the open-source paradigm's alignment with AI, it is essential to clarify that this analysis does not advocate for an outright adoption of open-source as the sole approach. Rather, it highlights that an open-source paradigm, with its inherent collaboration, transparency, and adaptability, serves as a sufficient minimum to approach a replacement for the traditional patent system in the context of AI. It bends or breaks the fundamental assumptions underlying patents, reflecting the unique characteristics of digital goods. However, while open-source may come close to providing an alternative, it is not the complete solution. In the forthcoming section, we will explore the final piece of the puzzle that could allow for a full replacement of the patent system in the AI domain: proprietary data. This critical aspect, coupled with open-source principles, may offer a nuanced and tailored approach to intellectual property in the age of artificial intelligence, balancing innovation, accessibility, and economic considerations.

5 Proprietary Data as a Substitute for Intellectual Property Protections:

The existence of proprietary data introduces a nuanced dimension to the discussion of intellectual property in AI. It challenges traditional notions of incentives, monopoly power, and product quality, suggesting that proprietary data itself may be a key driver of innovation and competitive advantage. The ability to patent AI architectures, while seemingly aligned with traditional intellectual property principles, may lead to unintended consequences, including sub-optimal products and reduced collaborative innovation. This analysis underscores the need for careful consideration of the unique characteristics of AI, including the role of proprietary data, in shaping intellectual property policies and practices that support innovation, competition, and societal benefit.

- **Distinct Advantage**: Organizations with access to unique and high-quality proprietary data can gain a significant advantage in training AI models. This data can be industry-specific, customer-oriented, or derived from unique processes, and it provides insights that are not available through public or generic data sources.

- **Encouraging Innovation**: The exclusive access to proprietary data can act as a sufficient incentive for innovation, even without traditional intellectual property protections. The ability to create more accurate and tailored models using this data can lead to competitive advantages, encouraging investment in research and development.

Monopoly Power through Proprietary Data and Open-Source Architectures:

- **Necessary Combination**: In many industries, the combination of proprietary data and open-source architectures is both necessary and sufficient to create monopoly power. The data provides the unique value, while open-source architectures offer the flexibility and accessibility to innovate.

- **Longevity of Monopoly Power**: Unlike patents, which typically last for 20 years, proprietary data can remain exclusive indefinitely, as long as it is kept confidential and protected. This can lead to sustained monopoly power, potentially exceeding the intended duration of traditional intellectual property protections.

Impact of Patenting AI Architectures:

- **Potential for Sub-Optimal Outcomes**: If AI architectures are patentable, corporations with valuable proprietary data may be forced to use sub-optimal open-source architectures if they do not own or cannot access the ideal patented architecture. This constraint can lead to lower quality products, as the best architecture for a specific application may be inaccessible.

- **Reduced Collaboration and Innovation**: The patenting of AI architectures may also hinder collaboration and shared innovation. If optimal architectures are patented and restricted, it may limit the ability of various players to contribute to and benefit from collective advancements in the field.

In the intricate landscape of AI, the interplay between proprietary data, open-source architectures, and the potential patenting of AI components presents a multifaceted challenge. This analysis has illuminated the distinct advantages and potential pitfalls of these elements, highlighting the need for a nuanced and balanced approach. The suggestion to place limits on proprietary data, aligning with traditional patent durations, offers a pathway towards a more equitable innovation ecosystem. As the field of AI continues to evolve, careful consideration of these factors is paramount in crafting policies and practices that foster innovation, competition, and societal benefit, while preserving the collaborative spirit and adaptability that characterize the digital age.

6 Limitations and Counterarguments

While the perspective outlayed in this paper emphasizes the unique characteristics of AI, the potential benefits of open-source paradigms, and the nuanced role of proprietary data, there are several counterarguments and potential problems that could be raised:

1. **Loss of Incentive for Individual Innovators**: The emphasis on open-source and collaborative innovation might diminish the profit incentives for individual inventors or small companies. Without the protection of patents, they may be less likely to invest in research and development.

2. **Challenges in Enforcing Open-Source Licenses**: While open-source promotes collaboration, enforcing open-source licenses can be complex and challenging. There may be disputes over attribution, compliance with license terms, and potential misuse of shared code.

3. **Privacy and Security Concerns with Proprietary Data**: The suggestion to release anonymized proprietary data after a certain period could raise privacy and security concerns. Anonymization may not be foolproof, and sensitive information could potentially be de-anonymized.

4. **Potential Stifling of Competition**: The combination of proprietary data and open-source architectures might still lead to monopolistic practices. Large corporations with vast proprietary data sets could dominate the market, stifling competition from smaller players.

5. **Difficulty in International Harmonization**: The call for international harmonization of intellectual property laws and data regulations might face significant political, legal, and cultural barriers. Different countries have varying interests, legal traditions, and approaches to regulation.

6. **Potential Environmental Impact of Data Release**: Releasing large amounts of proprietary data might have environmental implications, considering the energy required to store and process such data. This could conflict with goals for sustainable practices in AI development.

7. **Risk of Oversimplifying Complex Issues**: The perspective might be criticized for oversimplifying complex legal, economic, and technological issues. The relationships between intellectual property, innovation, competition, and societal benefit are multifaceted and may not be fully captured in the analysis.

8. **Potential Bias Towards Certain Economic Models**: The emphasis on open-source and collaboration might be seen as biased towards certain economic or philosophical models that prioritize community-driven development over individual entrepreneurship and market-driven innovation.

9. **Challenges in Implementing Proposed Regulations**: Implementing new regulations or modifying existing intellectual property laws to accommodate the unique characteristics of AI might be fraught with practical challenges, legal complexities, and potential unintended consequences.

10. **Ethical Considerations in Data Sharing Models**: While exploring innovative data sharing models is suggested, this might raise ethical considerations related to consent, ownership, and potential exploitation of data, especially if it involves personal or sensitive information.

These counterarguments and potential problems highlight the complexity of the issues at hand and the need for a careful, multifaceted approach to navigating the intersection of AI, intellectual property, and proprietary data. They underscore the importance of engaging diverse perspectives and conducting thorough analysis to ensure that policies and practices are well-informed, balanced, and responsive to the evolving landscape of AI.

7 Potential Future Directions:

1. **Reevaluation of Intellectual Property Laws**: As AI continues to challenge traditional assumptions underlying the patent system, there may be a need for a comprehensive reevaluation of intellectual property laws. Tailoring these laws to the unique characteristics of AI could foster innovation while maintaining fair competition.

2. **Ethical Considerations of Proprietary Data**: The handling and utilization of proprietary data raise ethical questions, especially concerning privacy and consent. Future directions may include the development of ethical guidelines and standards for the collection, use, and sharing of proprietary data.

3. **Collaborative Innovation Models**: The success of open-source software and AI models suggests potential for collaborative innovation models that balance private interests with public accessibility. Exploring new models that encourage collaboration without sacrificing competitive advantage could be a fruitful area of development.

4. **Regulatory Oversight of Monopoly Power**: The potential for sustained monopoly power through proprietary data warrants careful regulatory oversight. Future efforts may focus on creating mechanisms to prevent undue concentration of power, ensuring a competitive and dynamic market.

5. **International Harmonization**: AI's global reach calls for international harmonization of intellectual property laws and data regulations. Collaborative efforts between countries and international bodies could lead to more consistent and effective regulations, facilitating cross-border innovation and commerce.

6. **Education and Public Awareness**: As the landscape of AI and intellectual property evolves, there may be a growing need for education and public awareness. Engaging various stakeholders, including researchers, policymakers, industry leaders, and the general public, can foster informed decision-making and responsible innovation.

7. **Exploration of Data Sharing Models**: Considering the importance of proprietary data, exploring innovative data sharing models that protect privacy and intellectual property while enabling collaboration could be a promising direction. This might include frameworks for anonymized data sharing or collaborative research agreements.

8. **Monitoring Technological Advancements**: AI is a rapidly evolving field, and continuous monitoring of technological advancements is essential. Understanding emerging trends and technologies will inform adaptive policies and practices, ensuring that regulations remain relevant and effective.

By embracing these potential future directions, policymakers, researchers, and industry leaders can navigate the complex and evolving landscape of AI, intellectual property, and proprietary data. Thoughtful exploration of these areas offers a pathway towards a future that balances innovation, competition, collaboration, ethics, and societal benefit, reflecting the multifaceted nature of AI in the modern world.

8 Conclusion

The intersection of artificial intelligence (AI) and intellectual property (IP) presents a complex and multifaceted challenge, reflecting the unique characteristics of AI and the evolving landscape of innovation. This paper has explored the fundamental assumptions underlying the patent system, the economic nature of AI architectures and models, the role of proprietary data, and the potential of an open-source paradigm.

The analysis reveals that AI, both in its architectures and models, bends and breaks traditional assumptions of scarcity, exclusivity, incentives, balance of interests, enforceability, and technological neutrality. Unlike physical goods, AI's digital nature allows for simultaneous use and sharing, challenging conventional economic incentives and monopoly power dynamics.

Proprietary data emerges as a critical factor, offering a distinct advantage in training models and potentially acting as a substitute for IP protections. This exclusive access to data can create sustained monopoly power, exceeding the intended duration of patents, and may even lead to sub-optimal outcomes if architectures are patentable.

The open-source paradigm offers a compelling alternative, aligning with the digital nature of AI and fostering collaboration, accessibility, transparency, and competition. The successes of open-source software and AI models demonstrate the viability of this approach, even as it challenges traditional IP principles.

Ultimately, the exploration of AI and patents underscores the need for a nuanced and adaptive approach to intellectual property in the age of AI. Recognizing the unique characteristics of AI, the value of proprietary data, and the potential of open-source collaboration, policymakers, researchers, and industry leaders must engage in thoughtful discourse and careful consideration. By doing so, we can shape a future where IP policies and practices support innovation, competition, and societal benefit, reflecting the complexities and opportunities of AI. The journey towards this future requires a willingness to question assumptions, embrace new paradigms, and navigate the intricate interplay between technology, economics, law, and ethics. It is a journey that promises to redefine our understanding of invention, creativity, and progress in the AI era.

References

Bessen, James, and Michael J Meurer. *Patent failure: How judges, bureaucrats, and lawyers put innovators at risk*. Princeton University Press, 2009.

Diamond v. Chakrabarty, No. 79-136, 1980.

Gallini, Nancy T. "The economics of patents: Lessons from recent US patent reform." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 16, no. 2 (2002): 131–154.

Goodfellow, Ian, Yoshua Bengio, and Aaron Courville. *Deep learning*. MIT press, 2016.

Graham v. John Deere Co., 3831, 17-18, 1966.

Hall, Bronwyn H, and Rosemarie Ham Ziedonis. "The patent paradox revisited: an empirical study of patenting in the US semiconductor industry, 1979-1995." *rand Journal of Economics*, 2001, 101–128.

Heller, Michael A, and Rebecca S Eisenberg. "Can patents deter innovation? The anticommons in biomedical research." *Science* 280, no. 5364 (1998): 698–701.

Jordan, Michael I, and Tom M Mitchell. "Machine learning: Trends, perspectives, and prospects." *Science* 349, no. 6245 (2015): 255–260.

Krizhevsky, Alex, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E Hinton. "Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks." *Advances in neural information processing systems* 25 (2012).

KSR Intern. Co. v. Teleflex Inc., No. 04-1350, 2007.

LeCun, Yann, Yoshua Bengio, and Geoffrey Hinton. "Deep learning." *nature* 521, no. 7553 (2015): 436–444.

Lemley, Mark A. "Are universities patent trolls." *Fordham Intell. Prop. Media & Ent. LJ* 18 (2007): 611.

Machlup, Fritz. *An economic review of the patent system*. 15. US Government Printing Office, 1958.

McCorduck, Pamela, and Cli Cfe. *Machines who think: A personal inquiry into the history and prospects of artificial intelligence*. CRC Press, 2004.

Merges, Robert P, and Richard R Nelson. "On the complex economics of patent scope." *Columbia law review* 90, no. 4 (1990): 839–916.

Mittelstadt, Brent Daniel, Patrick Allo, Mariarosaria Taddeo, Sandra Wachter, and Luciano Floridi. "The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate." *Big Data & Society* 3, no. 2 (2016): 2053951716679679.

Pasquale, Frank. *The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information*. Harvard University Press, 2015.

Ramalho, Ana. "Patentability of AI-generated inventions: is a reform of the patent system needed?" *Available at SSRN 3168703*, 2018.

Russell, Stuart J. *Artificial intelligence a modern approach*. Pearson Education, Inc., 2010.

Scotchmer, Suzanne. "Standing on the shoulders of giants: cumulative research and the patent law." *Journal of economic perspectives* 5, no. 1 (1991): 29–41.

Taylor, Linnet, Luciano Floridi, and Bart Van der Sloot. *Group privacy: New challenges of data technologies*. Vol. 126. Springer, 2016.

"The State of AI in 2023: What We Can Expect," August 9, 2023. https://identicalcloud.com/blog/the-state-of-ai-in-2023/.

Wachter, Sandra, Brent Mittelstadt, and Luciano Floridi. "Why a right to explanation of automated decision-making does not exist in the general data protection regulation." *International Data Privacy Law* 7, no. 2 (2017): 76–99.

Yanisky-Ravid, Shlomit, and Xiaoqiong Jackie Liu. "When artificial intelligence systems produce inventions: the 3A era and an alternative model for patent law," 2017.

Zarsky, Tal Z. "Transparent predictions." *U. Ill. L. Rev.*, 2013, 1503.