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A key, but underexplored, aspect of the “circulation/control dilemma” is the use of patented products by the State itself. In these circumstances, the State both grants the right and has a specific interest in its exploitation. Some work has been done on the Crown use provisions, however, there has been very little work on the treatment of patents over military equipment. This paper will contrast the role of “military patents” in the early modern period with the nineteenth-century legislative provisions relating to them in order to explore the shifts in the understanding of the State inherent in the two forms of the patent system.

As examples, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, there were several patents over saltpetre, sulphur and lead prior to the passing of the Statute of Monopolies 1624 and the Statute itself included an exemption for such patents (s. 10). Given the non-innovative nature of these products, the patents were, therefore, to maintain supply, and quality, rather than promoting innovation. Further, the grants were to the inner circle of the Crown (including a 1618 patent for sword-blades to Prince Charles’ Secretary). The 1883 Act, on the other hand, allows for the assignment of the benefit of inventions over instruments or munitions of war to
the War Department – with a number of provisions around the secrecy of such inventions – thus showing a more modern understanding of the relationship between patentees and the State.

The shift from exceptions to assignments demonstrates a change in the nature of the State. Both modes de-emphasised circulation – but the modes of control were different. This analysis, based on Foucault’s understanding of the shifts in governance, builds on the understanding that the early modern State was both limited and centralised, whereas the nineteenth-century one relied upon expertise-informed outputs of independent economic agents. This change is telling for our understanding of the development of the patent system in terms of the parallel development of the forms of governance.
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