

234. *Fortune*: War & Peace & the Pat. Sys., a good analysis of the merits of the system, with spec. attention to patent pooling and cross-licensing. 26:103-5 and 132-41 *passim*; August 1942, pp. 105, 132 here cited.

Borkin, J.: The Pat. Infringement Suit: Ordeal by Trial, 17 *Chicago Law Rev.* 634.

235. Kaempfert, W., well discussed the technological obstacles in standardization, vs. inv., in *Inv. by Wholesale*, *Forum* 70:2116-22, 1923, e.g. p. 2118.

237. Nevins, A., and Hill: *Ford*, *the Times*, 1954, p. 489.

Galbraith, J. K.: The Mystery of Henry Ford; *Atlantic* 102:41-7, March, 1958.

238. Cranebrook, A. V., in fin. sec., *Chicago Sun-Times*, Oct. 28, 1957.

242. Schumpeter, J.: *Capitalism, Socialism & Democracy*, 3d ed., 1950, quoted with other economists on p. 26 of Frost in the pres. ser., our N 22.

243. Woodward, Wm. R.: Reconsideration of the Pat. Sys., as a Problem of Adm. Law. *Harv. Law Rev.* 55:950-77, April 1942. Suggests *inter alia*, several classes of patents for inventions of different orders; summarized as No. 416 in Senate Study 14, N 415.

Crotti, A. F.: The German Gebrauchsmuster; *JPOS* 39:566-82, 1957.

Naumann, H.: Utility Model Pat. Protection; *JPOS* 40:800-14, 1958.

244. Ballard, Wm. R.: Pats., Progress & Prosperity; *NAM & JPOS* 36:93-121, 1954.

245. The Foundation is in Geo. Wash. U., Washington, D.C., and publishes the *Pat., Trademark & Copyright J.* Cf. our N 132.

246. Betham, Jeremy, 1748-1832, our N 187.

249. Nelson, R. R.: The Economics of Invention: a survey of the literature; *Jol. of Bus.*, 32: 101-27, 1959.

250. Frost, N 221, p. 41.

251. Three economists who have perceived it are Machlup N 177, pp. 40, 60, 61, and 77; Joan Robinson: *Accumulation of Capital*, p. 87, quoted by Machlup; and Kahn, N 168, p. 315, pointing out the illogic of restricting use of knowledge.

252. Edwards, C. D.: *Maintaining Competition*; requisites of a Government policy. 337 pp., 1949, p. 229,30.

253. See repts, of Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcom'ee on Pats., Trademarks & Copyrights, 1956, 7: *Econ. & Soc. Basis of the Pat. Sys.*: Pat. Abuse and a Plan for Its Control, by Victor Abramson; *Trial of Pat. Anti-trust Cases*, By Leonard Emmerglick; *Effect of Corporate Size, Concentration, & Mergers upon Indus. Research & Pat. Policies*, by Murray Friedman; *Technol. & Econ. Tests in Determining the Validity of Pats. & Their Use*, by W. Hamilton & Till; and various studies dealing with Compulsory License.

Stocking, G. W. & Watkins, M. W.: *Monopoly & Free Enterprise*, 1951, 596 pp., Chap. 14, Pats. & Monop., with Suggestions, pub. also in *Vanderbilt Law Rev.* 3:729-65, 1950.

254. Vaughan, F. L.: *The U.S. Pat. Sys.*, 1956, 368 pp., p. 265 citing the Oldfield Hearings of 1912, part 2, p. 32, for our ¶ 190.

255. Study No. 15, N 177, p. 7.

257. From the Rept. for fiscal 1961, the fees rec'd were divided according to whether they seemed to relate to pats. or to the other bus. of the office (design pats., etc.). Then of the total spent 90% was ascribed to Pats., by official advice.

258. The Pat. Office occupied 450,000 sq. ft. net, presumably 660,000 gross (incl. corridors etc.), which figures we reduce by 10% to exclude nonpatent activities. Taking the present cost of a Govt. building as a low \$12.50 per sq. ft. gross, deducting $\frac{1}{4}$ for depreciation and capitalizing at $3\frac{1}{2}\%$ per annum, we get \$5,900,000 as the value of the quarters used and \$20,000 as the yearly capital cost, without further depreciation. Taking the cost of operating such a building as \$1.40 per gross sq. ft., the yearly operating cost would be \$883,000; total costs \$903,000.

259. The cost of a case is from the Pat. Office, ftN 256, p. 68. U.S. Pat. Office: *Pat. Attorneys & Agts.*, 1961, approx. total of those living in the country.

260. Estimating from data in *Mgmt. Surv.*, N 15, its p. 141, that their average net income is \$15,000, and that their gross income would be 63% more, from the analogy of genl. lawyers responding to a U.S. Survey of Cur. Bus., M. Liebenberg: *Income of Lawyers in the Postwar Per.*, 1956.

261. Justice Dept., Adm. Office of the U. S. Courts: *Ann Rept.* for Fiscal 1956, pp. 61-301, containing Rept. of the Div. of Procedural Studies & Stat., pp. 107-71, and Rept. of a study conducted by the Adm. Office to determine the rela-