The Maker Movement: Copyright Law, Remix Culture, and 3D Printing

Matthew Rimmer, Queensland University of Technology

Available at: https://works.bepress.com/matthew_rimmer/274/
THE MAKER MOVEMENT: COPYRIGHT LAW, REMIX CULTURE AND 3D PRINTING

MATTHEW RIMMER

CONTENTS

I Introduction ........................................................................................................... 51
II Save Left Shark: Copyright Law, Internet Memes, and 3D Printing .... 55
III Michelangelo’s Statues ...................................................................................... 61
IV Marcel Duchamp’s Chess Set .......................................................................... 63
V Bring It On: Star Athletica v. Varsity Brands .................................................. 69
VI Game of Thrones: Copyright Law and Intermediary Liability ....................... 74
VII Copyright Law, Digital Locks, and 3D Printing ............................................. 77
VIII Conclusion ..................................................................................................... 80

I Introduction

3D printing is a process of making physical objects from three-dimensional digital models.¹ 3D printing is a form of additive manufacturing – rather than a traditional form of subtractive manufacturing. 3D printing is a disruptive technology, which promises to transform art and design, science and manufacturing, and the digital economy.

The Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, the Hon. Christopher Pyne, has highlighted the key role of 3D printing for manufacturing and material science in Australia: ‘Manufacturing remains a key driver in our economy, but as the industrial landscape changes, the sector needs to transition to more innovative and economically viable technology.’² Pyne stressed: ‘Emerging technologies such as metal 3D printing offer huge productivity gains and have the potential to turn Australia’s manufacturing industry on its head.’³ Likewise,

¹ BA (Hons), LLB (Hons) (ANU), PhD (UNSW). Professor of Intellectual Property and Innovation, Faculty of Law, Queensland University of Technology.
³ Ibid.
the Australian Labor Party’s Tim Watts and Jim Chalmers have discussed the role of 3D printing in respect of intellectual property, innovation, and trade.⁴

There have been a number of early cultural texts on the topic of 3D printing. Cory Doctorow’s 2009 fictional story Makers was significant in promoting the culture of the maker community.⁵ Chris Anderson’s 2012 non-fiction work Makers considered the history of the industrial revolution, the rise of 3D printing, and the long tail of things.⁶ His work also reflects upon the development of open licensing and open hardware, and the financing of maker businesses. This rather evangelical work helped inspire wider public interest in the field. In The Maker Movement Manifesto, Mark Hatch, the CEO of TechShop, provides a practical guide to the applications of 3D printing, and the development of communities of practice.⁷ He is particularly interested in the development of distributed and flexible manufacturing, and the acceleration of innovation. The engaging 2014 Lopez and Tweel documentary Print the Legend provided a portrait of the emergence of 3D printing start-up companies in the United States.⁸ In 2014, the Australian journalist and cultural critic Guy Rundle also undertook fieldwork in his study on 3D printing and robotics, visiting key hubs of 3D printing in the United States.⁹ In his work upon the robotics revolution, Martin Ford has explored the intersection between 3D printing and automation.¹⁰ Futurist Jeremy Rifkin has been interested in the intersections between 3D printing, the Internet of Things, and collaborative capitalism.¹¹ Likewise, Robin Chase has been concerned about how 3D printing fits into a larger model of the sharing economy.¹²

⁵ Cory Doctorow, Makers (Tom Doherty Associates, 2009).
⁸ Print the Legend (Directed by Luis Lopez and Clay Tweel, Audax Films, 2014).
¹² Robin Chase, Peers Inc.: How People and Platforms are Inventing the Collaborative Economy and Reinventing Capitalism (Headline Press, 2015).
In terms of legal writing in respect of 3D printing, a number of works have sought to address the relationship between intellectual property and 3D printing. As a public policy expert at Public Knowledge, and as a lawyer working for Shapeways, Michael Weinberg (2010, 2013) has written a number of significant treatises on intellectual property and 3D printing. In 2015, Professor Mark Lemley from Stanford Law School observes, ‘A world in which sophisticated 3D printers are widely available would change the economics of things in a fundamental way.’ Amongst other things, he says that 3D Printing provides challenges and opportunities for intellectual property in ‘an age without scarcity’. John Hornick has examined the topic of intellectual property and 3D printing from the perspective of a legal practitioner. From Australia, Dr Angela Daly has written on the socio-legal aspects of 3D printing in 2016. The World Intellectual Property Organization in 2015 has sought to investigate 3D printing as a breakthrough technology in terms of emerging developments in respect of intellectual property law, practice, and policy.

---


16 Ibid.


18 Angela Daly, Socio-Legal Aspects of the 3D Printing Revolution (Palgrave Pivot, 2016).

There has been much interest in how intellectual property law, policy, and practice will adapt to the emergence of 3D printing and the maker movement. Intellectual property lawyers will have to grapple with the impact of additive manufacturing upon a variety of forms of intellectual property – including copyright law, trade mark law, designs law, patent law, and trade secrets. The disruptive technology of 3D printing will both pose opportunities and challenges for legal practitioners and policy-makers.

Rather than try to survey this expanding field, this article considers a number of early conflicts and skirmishes in respect of copyright law and 3D printing. There has been significant interest in the impact of 3D printing on copyright law and the creative industries. There have been classic issues raised about copyright subsistence, and the overlap between copyright law and designs. There has also been a moral panic about 3D printing facilitating copyright infringement – like peer to peer networks such as Napster in the past. There has been a use of open licensing models such as Creative Commons licensing to facilitate the sharing of 3D printing files. Such battles highlight a conflict between the open culture of the Maker Movement, and the closed culture of copyright industries. In many ways, such conflicts touch upon classic issues involved in ‘information environmentalism’. Part II looks at the controversy over Left Shark. In particular, it examines the copyright claims of Katy Perry in respect of the Left Shark.

---


21 William Patry notes that intellectual property owners often seek to advance economic interests under the guise of false moral imperatives: ‘Conjuring up moral panics and folk devils occurs through metaphors casting the other side in an unfavourable light, in the case of copyright, by painting those who use works without permission as thieves, trespassers, pirates, or parasites’. William Patry, Moral Panics and the Copyright Wars (Oxford University Press, 2009).


Shark figure. Part III considers questions about scanning. Augustana College tried to assert copyright against a maker, Jerry Fisher, who was scanning statues of Michelangelo (although copyright had long since expired in such work). Part IV focuses upon copyright law, 3D printing and readymades. The Estate of Marcel Duchamp lodged a copyright protest over a 3D printed set of chess, based on the work of Marcel Duchamp. Part V examines the intervention of a number of 3D printing companies in a Supreme Court of the United States dispute in *Star Athletic v. Varsity Brands*. Part VI considers copyright law and intermediary liability. Part VII examines the operation of technological protection measures in the context of copyright law and 3D printing.

### II Save Left Shark: Copyright Law, Internet Memes, and 3D Printing

The 2015 Super Bowl has sparked a public controversy over copyright law, Internet Memes, and 3D printing.25

In 2015, the pop singer Katy Perry performed at the half-time entertainment during the Super Bowl. She presented a suite of hit songs— including ‘Roar’, ‘Dark Horse’, ‘I Kissed a Girl’ (with Lenny Kravitz), ‘Teenage Dream’, ‘California Gurls’, and an Missy Elliott medley: ‘Get Ur Freak On’, ‘Work It’, ‘Lose Control’, and ‘Firework’.26 Her performance was upstaged by one of her backup dancers, Bryan Gaw—who was wearing a shark costume. While the Right Shark performed the choreography as scripted, the Left Shark improvised, and performed somewhat differently. The character of Left Shark was the subject of popular acclaim amongst the broadcasting audience, and

---


LeftShark became an Internet Meme. This response to Left Shark was unanticipated, even by the directors of the Super Bowl Show.\(^{27}\)

Political artist and maker Fernando Sosa has developed a distinctive reputation as a ‘Political Sculptor’, selling his 3d-printed figurines on Shapeways.\(^{28}\) He has a long history of engaging in parody and satire of a wide range of forms of popular culture. Sosa decided to create a 3D figurine, ‘Left Shark’, in the wake of the Super Bowl.\(^{29}\)

On the 3\(^{rd}\) February 2015, Katy Perry’s lawyers sent a letter to the 3D printing site Shapeways, complaining about the Left Shark Design. The lawyers warned: ‘Our client recently has learned that you have been involved in the manufacture, sale, marketing and distribution of merchandise featuring a shark sculpture which embodies and uses the IP, and that you have displayed this product on your website, www.shapeways.com, in connection with such sale and distribution.’\(^{30}\) The lawyers denied that there had been any permission granted to use Left Shark: ‘As you are undoubtedly aware, our ‘client never consented to your use of its copyrighted work and IP, nor did our client consent to the sale of the infringing product.’\(^{31}\)

The lawyers insisted that there had been an infringement of copyright vested in Left Shark: ‘Your unauthorized display and sale of this product infringes our client’s exclusive rights in numerous ways, including, but not limited to, infringement of our client’s exclusive rights to reproduce, display, and distribute its copyrighted images under the United States Copyright Act as set forth in 17 U.S.C. §106.’\(^{32}\) The lawyers threatened legal action to recover

---

damages: ‘Your infringing conduct entitles our client to significant legal relief against you, which may include actual damages, statutory damages, and punitive damages, as well as immediate and permanent injunctive relief.’33 The letter was most peculiar, though, because it was not formatted as a take down notice in the form prescribed by the Digital Millennium Copyright Act 1998 (US).34

The 3D Printing hub, Shapeways, was disturbed by the notice from Katy Perry’s letters:

It’s a shame because we love our community and always want to be able to support their designs. That’s part of the reason why our work with Hasbro is so fun! It’s allowing fans to create products truly inspired by the things they personally enjoy. We know these things can happen when you have a lot of user-generated content, but hopefully more brands (and celebrities!) will take note and want to work together with fans to create amazing products!

Shapeways’ lawyer, Michael Weinberg, was ultimately sceptical of the copyright claims made by Katy Perry’s lawyers.36 In the end, Shapeways reinstated the design for the Left Shark by Fernando Sosa.

In response, Fernando Sosa launched a campaign to defend himself against the legal charges. Professor Christopher Sprigman from New York University – the co-author of The Knockoff Economy37 – has provided robust legal representation for Fernando Sosa in the dispute.38 The legal academic noted: ‘Mr. Sosa is not especially eager to be fighting over copyright, but the legal merits of your claim seem very weak.’39 He questioned whether it was sensible to bring a legal action in respect of a viral internet meme.

33 Ibid.
39 Ibid.
First, Sprigman asked Katy Perry’s lawyers, ‘Can you tell me why you believe the costume of a shark that you claim Katy Perry owns is copyrightable?’ He observed: 'As you likely know, federal courts and the United States Copyright Office have made clear that costumes are generally not copyrightable'. Sprigman asked for a justification for copyright subsistence in respect of the Left Shark costume: 'Please tell me why you think the Left Shark costume should be treated differently'.

Second, Sprigman questioned Katy Perry’s the basis for her claim of copyright ownership in respect of the Left Shark costume: ‘What is the basis for your claim that Katy Perry, and not some other person, owns the copyright?’ He queried the basis of the claim of authorship: ‘Did Katy Perry design the Left Shark costume?’ He observed: ‘We ask about ownership not least because Katy Perry herself suggested that she didn’t have control over the content of her halftime show, but rather the NFL did.’ Sprigman cited an interview by Katy Perry with Elle magazine, in which she said: ‘With the NFL, I have to be accountable to several levels of red tape.’ Moreover, Katy Perry commented: ‘So I am no longer the boss; I have to relinquish that control.’ Sprigman suggested: ‘At the very least, Katy Perry’s own account raises questions about what, if anything, she owns. If she wasn’t the boss of her halftime show, she’s also unlikely to be the copyright owner.’

Sprigman suggested that Katy Perry’s lawyers should drop the action altogether: ‘My client wants to get back to his business, and he (and I’d wager pretty much everyone else) would be grateful if you’d just back off. Going ahead with these very dubious copyright claims will not benefit Katy Perry’. He suggested that, if Katy Perry wanted to continue with the lawsuit, she should answer the legal questions: ‘But if you’re determined to press on, please do respond to my legal questions, and we can try to work it out from there.’

40 Ibid.
41 Ibid.
42 Ibid.
43 Ibid.
44 Ibid.
45 Ibid.
46 Ibid.
47 Ibid.
48 Ibid.
49 Ibid.
50 Ibid.
Fernando Sosa remains undaunted by the conflict. He is offering a wide range of versions of Left Shark on his Political Sculptor site. As well as a traditional ‘Left Shark’, Sosa also has a ‘Drunk Shark’, a ‘Pink Drunk Shark’, a ‘Customised Left Shark’, a ‘Cease and Desist Left Shark’, a ‘Left Sharknado’, ‘Come at me Bro – Left Shark’, and ‘Left Shark Lawyer’, with a moustache. Sosa is obviously keen to exercise his rights and freedoms under the broad and flexible defence of fair use, and the First Amendment.

There has been much uncertainty about the status of copyright protection in respect of fashion in the United States. The Copyright Office has given guidance on the Registrability of Costume Designs. Famously, in a 1991 policy decision, Ralph Oman, the Register of Copyrights, said: ‘Costumes, by their very nature, exist at the boundary between works of imagination and works of utility.’ The Register of Copyrights said: ‘Portions of some costumes will be registrable under the separability test, and others will be unregistrable in all respects.’ 3D Printing has increasingly focused upon the field of fashion.

A number of intellectual property experts provided support for the position of Christopher Sprigman and Fernando Sosa. Professor Rebecca Tushnet from Georgetown Law and the Organization for Transformative Works commented on the controversy:

A costume is a useful article, and useful articles aren’t copyrightable unless there are elements that are ‘separable’ from the useful article itself. For example, anything necessary for a human to fit in the costume (and dance, badly or well) would not be separable. Some costumes may be copyrighted, and I think it’s possible Left Shark could be one of them, but further factual development would be required.
She also noted that there could also be larger issues about the operation of copyright exceptions – like the defence of fair use: ‘Fair use might well be a significant issue, given the nature of the meme surrounding Left Shark.’56 In this context, a number of precedents in respect of copyright law, appropriation art, and fair use could be relevant.57

Parker Higgins, a researcher at the Electronic Frontier Foundation, commented: ‘I agree with Sprigman on this one: costumes are considered useful articles, so absent a separable design with a claim to it (like a print, usually) it doesn’t get copyright.’58

Overall, there are concerns as to whether Katy Perry is engaged in copyfraud – making copyright claims in respect of a public domain work.59 There have been a number of other controversies about copyright subsistence involving 3D printing.

In addition to the copyright conflicts over 3D printing Left Shark, there has also been much controversy in respect of 3D printing and trade mark law. Such matters have included debates over trade mark registration, trade mark licensing and trade mark infringement. In February 2015, Katy Perry’s lawyers filed for a trade mark application in respect of Left Shark.60 Trade mark applications were filed in respect of ‘Basking Shark’, ‘Drunk Shark’, ‘Right Shark’ and ‘Left Shark’, and various designs of a shark. In April 2015, United States Patent and Trademark Office examiner, David Collier, questioned the trade mark applications by Katy Perry.61 The examiner said that the Left Shark image ‘identifies only a particular character; it does not function as a service mark to

56 Ibid.
60 Killer Queen LLC, ‘Left Shark’, United States Trade Mark Application Serial Number 86526826, Filing Date, 6 February 2015.
identify and distinguish applicant’s services from those of others and to indicate
the source of applicant’s services. The trade mark examiner was somewhat
more sympathetic to the trade mark application in respect of the word mark for
‘Left Shark’. The examiner has sought to gain greater clarification over the
identity of the goods that are the subject of the trade mark application.

III Michelangelo’s Statues

Another important controversy involved an United States college seeking to
claim copyright over replicas of Michelangelo’s statues in a dispute over 3D
printing. Obviously, such works were in the public domain, and did not enjoy
any further copyright protection.

In this matter, Jerry Fisher sought to photograph two statues of David and
Moses based on the work of Michelangelo – one based in a city park and the
other on a college campus – and make 3D models. He then proceeded to post
his files on a range of social media sites, including Twitter, Google +, and
Thingiverse. Augustana College demanded that Jerry Fisher take down the files.
The college, associated with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United
States, was uncomfortable with the 3D printed models, and was also concerned
that the digital images could be used inappropriately. Peggy Kapusta, director
of online communications at Augustana College, maintained:

Mr. Fisher did not seek the permission of Augustana College nor the City of Sioux
Falls prior to pursuing the 3D reconstruction technology or before offering [the 3-D
model] to others. ... In October 2014, we reached out to Mr. Fisher to express our
concern over his actions in light of the fact that he did not seek permission from the
College, the City of Sioux Falls or the families of the artist and/or the Fawicks [the
family who donated the statue]. At this point, Mr. Fisher made the decision to un-
publish the 3D image file.

63 Ibid.
This seems to be a rather aggressive copyright claim to make in respect of work that was in the public domain.

Michael Weinberg – then at Public Knowledge – commented that the claim was ill-founded. He observed that copyright had long since expired in the work of Michelangelo:

Augustana College had no legal right or basis to threaten Fisher with the specter of infringement. There is no copyright protection for a sculpture that was created at the dawn of the 16th century by a sculptor who died 450 years ago. All of Michelangelo’s work is firmly in the public domain. If fact, copyright didn’t even exist during Michelangelo’s lifetime. From the moment he sculpted his Moses anyone could copy, remix, and build upon it for any reason, without having to ask permission. Of course, the sculpture in Sioux Falls is not Michelangelo’s original sculpture. The original Moses is still in Italy. The Sioux Falls sculptures are exact replicas made in the early 1970s - exact replicas, it seems appropriate to mention, that were made without permission of Michelangelo’s estate because the originals are not protected by copyright. There was no copyright on the original sculpture, and there is no copyright in the exact copies of the original sculpture.

Weinberg commented: ‘If Fisher were practicing his 3D scanning on original sculptures made in the early 1970s, the sculptures would likely still be protected by copyright.’ He observed: ‘Fortunately for Fisher and everyone else, the sculpture in question is not an original sculpture – it is a copy.’ He noted: ‘Just as scanning a 16th century map doesn’t give me a new copyright in the scan file, casting a copy of a 16th century sculpture doesn’t give me a new copyright in the cast.’

Michael Weinberg was disappointed that Augustana College refused to apologise for its false copyright claims. He observed: ‘When confronted with their copyfraud, the correct thing for Augustana to do would have been to


67 Ibid.

68 Ibid.

69 Ibid.

70 Ibid.

apologize and invite Mr. Fisher to repost his scans.’ Weinberg commented: ‘Instead, Augustana decided to suggest that anyone scanning their copy of Michelangelo’s Moses first needs to get permission from Augustana, the City of Sioux Falls, and the Fawicks.’ He emphasized: ‘That claim is wrong.’ Michael Weinberg chided the college: ‘It is also an embarrassment for Augustana College and, by extension Sioux Falls and the Fawicks.’

Ariel Bogle commented on the battle: ‘Creative possibilities aside, the legal challenges that will face the 3-D printing of artistic objects are just beginning to unfold.’

Much like the LeftShark case, Michelangelo’s statues raised larger questions about what was in the field of copyright law, and what was left in the public domain. The dispute highlights the need for stronger remedies and penalties in respect of cases of ‘copyfraud.’ As Dr Angela Daly has noted, there have been an increasing range of legal disputes over scanning technologies.

IV Marcel Duchamp’s Chess Set

There has been a long history of copyright conflicts over ready-mades, appropriation art, and mash-ups.

Marcel Duchamp is a major figure in international art. He is particularly famous for his ‘Readymades’ – ordinary manufactured objects, which the artist selected and modified as artistic works. His body of work has been an

72 Ibid.
73 Ibid.
74 Ibid.
75 Ibid.
78 Angela Daly, Socio-Legal Aspects of the 3D Printing Revolution (Palgrave Pivot, 2016).
inspiration for pop artists, appropriation artists, digital samplers, and mash-up artists through the ages. However, Marcel Duchamp’s estate has been quite a fierce guardian of the copyright vested in his works.

There has also been an international fight over 3D printing Marcel Duchamp’s Chess Set.\(^{81}\) In response to a cease and desist order, the designers have returned with a second set of Duchamp-inspired 3D printed chess pieces.\(^{82}\)

Scott Kildall and Bryan Cera were inspired to create a chess set, which was a 3D printed version of Marcel Duchamp’s Chess Set, which had been pictured in photographs.\(^{83}\) The artists explained the nature of the project:

*Readymake: Duchamp Chess Set* is a 3D-printed chess set generated from an archival photograph of Marcel Duchamp’s own custom and hand-carved game. His original physical set no longer exists. We have resurrected the lost artifact by digitally recreating it, and then making the 3D files available for anyone to print.\(^{84}\)

The artists commented: ‘We were inspired by Marcel Duchamp’s readymade — an ordinary manufactured object that the artist selected and modified for exhibition — the readymake brings the concept of the appropriated object to the realm of the internet, exploring the web’s potential to re-frame information and data, and their reciprocal relationships to matter and ideas.’\(^{85}\) In their view, ‘Readymakes transform photographs of objects lost in time into shared 3D digital spaces to provide new forms and meanings.’\(^{86}\) They noted: ‘Just for the sake of clarity, what we call a “readymake” is a play on the phrase “readymade”.’\(^{87}\) The artists stressed: ‘It is ready-to-make, since it can be physically generated by a 3D printer.’\(^{88}\)

---


\(^{84}\) Ibid.

\(^{85}\) Ibid.

\(^{86}\) Ibid.

\(^{87}\) Ibid.

\(^{88}\) Ibid.
On the 17th September 2014, the Estate of Marcel Duchamp wrote to Thingiverse, Makerbot Industries, and Bryan Cera and Scott Kildall. The letter emphasized that ‘all the elements that make up the Chess set are original works, created between 1918 and 1919 by Marcel Duchamp.’ The lawyer argued that ‘the Chess set was not an objected diverted from its initial function in order to be presented as a work of art.’ Thus the lawyer insisted that ‘the Chess set belongs by no means to the “ready-made” works of Marcel Duchamp.’ Moreover, the lawyer maintained that the ‘original 36 wooden chess pieces still exist and were displayed several times in exhibitions.’ The lawyer insisted that ‘all the elements that make up the Chess set are original works by Marcel Duchamp’ and ‘these works remain subject to intellectual property rights.’

The lawyer observed that ‘elaboration of files allowing to generate 3D prints and molds of the Chess set constitutes an adaptation of the works of Marcel Duchamp, and thus should have been beforehand agreed to by the rights holder.’ The lawyer maintained that ‘reproduction of the elements of the Chess set is a counterfeit of the works of Marcel Duchamp.’ The lawyer insisted that ‘reproduction of the elements of the Chess set is a counterfeit of the works of Marcel Duchamp.’ The lawyer also maintained that ‘providing the aforementioned files to the general public, even on a non-profit basis, is also an infringement of the intellectual property rights owned by my clients.’ Furthermore, ‘under French law, infringement of any intellectual property rights may give rise to damages and is also likely to constitute a criminal offence.’

The creative artists sought legal advice from the Electronic Frontier Foundation and others. They were troubled by the complex jurisdictional issues involved in the case. The creative artists observed that there seven key

---

96 Ibid.
97 Ibid.
98 Ibid.
99 Ibid.
factors in the legal dispute. First, ‘Duchamp’s chess pieces were created in 1917-1918’ and ‘according to US copyright law, works published before 1923 are in the realm of “expired copyright”.’\textsuperscript{101} Second, ‘The chess pieces themselves were created in 1917-1918 while Duchamp was in Argentina.’\textsuperscript{102} Third, ‘According to French copyright law, copyrighted works are protected for 70 years after the author’s death.’\textsuperscript{103} Fourth, ‘Under French copyright law, you can be sued for damages and even serve jail time for copyright infringement.’\textsuperscript{104} Fifth, “The only known copy of the chess set is in a private collection. We were originally led to believe the set was ‘lost’ – as it hasn’t been seen, publicly, for decades.”\textsuperscript{105} Sixth, the artists recognised: ‘For the Estate to pursue us legally, the most common method would be to get a judgment in French court, then get a judgment in a United States court to enforce the judgement.’\textsuperscript{106} Seventh, the artists were concerned about the jurisdictional questions in the case. They noted: ‘As United States citizens, we are protected by U.S. copyright law’.\textsuperscript{107} However, they recognised: ‘But, since websites like Thingiverse are global, French copyright could apply.’\textsuperscript{108}

Ultimately, the creative artists agreed to remove the offending files:

We understand the Estate’s point-of-view – their duty, after all, is to preserve Duchamp’s legacy. Outside of an art context, a manufacturer could easily take the files and mass produce the set. Despite the fact we did put this under a Creative Commons license that stipulated that the chess set couldn’t be used for commercial purposes, we understand the concern. If we had chosen to stand our ground, we would have had various defenses at our disposal. One of them is that French law wouldn’t have applied since we are doing this from a U.S. server. But, the rules around this are uncertain. If we had been sued, we would have defended on two propositions: (1) our project would be protected under U.S. law; (2) notwithstanding this, under U.S. law, we have a robust and widely-recognized defense under the nature of Fair Use. We would make the argument that our original Duchamp Chess Pieces would have have added value to these objects. We would consider invoking Fair Use in this case. But, the failure of a

\textsuperscript{101} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{102} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{103} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{104} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{105} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{106} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{107} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{108} Ibid.
legal system is that it is difficult to employ these defenses unless you have the teeth to fight. And teeth cost a lot of money.\textsuperscript{109}

This discussion highlights some of the practical limitations involved in defending copyright exceptions.

Writing for \textit{The Atlantic}, Quinn Norton provided an account of the international fight over Marcel Duchamp’s Chess Set.\textsuperscript{110} She observed: ‘If entering this framework means printable physical objects are going to go into the same global legal morass as music and software have, we face interesting times indeed.’\textsuperscript{111}

In response to the legal conflict, Kildall and Cera came up with an innovative solution.\textsuperscript{112} The pair noted: ‘We thought about how to recoup the intent of this project without what we think will be a copyright infringement claim from the Duchamp Estate and realized one important aspect of the project, which would likely guarantee it as commentary is one of parody.’\textsuperscript{113} They observed: ‘Accordingly, we have created Chess with Mustaches, which is based on our original design, however, adds moustaches to each piece.’\textsuperscript{114} Kildall and Cera observed: ‘The pieces no longer looks like Duchamp’s originals, but instead improves upon the original set with each piece adorned with moustaches.’\textsuperscript{115}

Timothy Geigner observed of this humorous solution: ‘If you're not fully aware of Duchamp’s artwork, this solution is especially clever because the Duchamp estate would have a difficult time arguing that this is inappropriate, given Duchamp’s own artwork.’\textsuperscript{116} He laments, though, the use of copyright law by the estate in this dispute: ‘The Duchamp estate’s use of copyright to

\textsuperscript{109} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{111} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{113} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{114} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{115} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{116} Ibid.
disappear recreative files for a chess set once constructed is a bastardization of copyright's intent."

The creative addition of moustaches to the chess pieces will also give the 3D printing makers the ability to raise larger arguments about copyright exceptions. The defence of fair use extends to parody in the United States. Under French copyright law, an author cannot prevent parody, pastiche, and caricature, ‘taking into account the usage of the genre’. Australia has a specific fair dealing exception for parody and satire.

It is disturbing that the estate of Marcel Duchamp is so aggressively enforcing copyright – given that his appropriation art has been imitated by everyone from Andy Warhol to Ai Weiwei. Cory Doctorow was irate at the conflict: 'It's a common story, and one of copyright's worst contemporary failure-modes: descendants denying their ancestors' posterity, censoring living artists' work in the name of a long-dead one.'

The dispute over Marcel Duchamp’s chess set raises a number of important themes. The conflict highlights the long term of copyright protection. The dispute also raises issues about how to address 'lost' and 'orphan works'. The conflict also raises larger questions about the role of copyright estates in guarding the economic and moral interests of creative artists. There have previously been controversies over other copyright estates – like the Joyce Estate and the Beckett Estate. 'There are interesting questions about copyright subsistence in respect of ‘readymades’. The dispute also highlights issues of copyright infringement in respect of 3D printing and the Maker Movement. The operation of copyright exceptions also played an important role in terms of the creative artists’ response to the dispute. The case of Marcel Duchamp’s chess site also highlights how 3D printing raises larger questions in respect of jurisdiction, with the transmission of files across the Internet, through intermediaries such as the Thingiverse. The case study reinforces the thesis of

117 Ibid.
Dr Angela Daly that 3D printing will encounter significant barriers and obstacles, because of the comparative differences in the treatment of copyright law between the United States, the European Union, and other jurisdictions.121

V Bring It On: Star Athletica v. Varsity Brands

There has been much legal debate over copyright and cheerleading designs in the 2015 case of Varsity Brands, Inc. v. Star Athletic, LLC.122 The majority held that ‘because we believe that the graphic features of Varsity’s cheerleading-uniform designs are more like fabric design than dress design, we hold that they are protectable subject matter under the Copyright Act.’123 The majority observed: ‘We therefore enter summary judgment for Varsity solely on the issue of the protectability of Varsity’s designs as pictorial, graphic, or sculptural works. Because we conclude that Varsity is entitled to judgment on the issue of whether its designs are “pictorial, graphic, or sculptural works” and not uncopyrightable “useful articles,” there is no need to address whether expert testimony would be proper in this case to determine the copyrightability of a design, as Varsity requests’.124 The majority noted: ‘We express no opinion about whether Varsity’s designs are ineligible for copyright protection because they lack originality or any other reason.’125

In dissent, McKeague J observed that ‘it is apparent that either Congress or the Supreme Court (or both) must clarify copyright law with respect to garment design.’126 The judge noted that the ‘law in this area is a mess – and it has been for a long time.’127

In the case of Star Athletica v. Varsity Brands, a number of 3D printing companies have filed a brief to the Supreme Court of the United States to establish a test for determining conceptual separability under copyright law.128

121 Angela Daly, Socio-Legal Aspects of the 3D Printing Revolution (Palgrave Pivot, 2016).
123 Ibid.
124 Ibid.
125 Ibid.
126 Ibid.
127 Ibid.
The companies involved include Formlabs Inc., Matter and Form Inc., and Shapeways Inc. In many ways, this dispute focuses upon legal issues thrown up by the controversy over Left Shark. The submission noted: 'This case presents a clear conflict among the circuits on an important substantive matter of copyright law that justifies this Court's review'.

The submission comments:

The present circuit split surrounding conceptual separability doctrine will, if left unresolved, have effects reaching far beyond the apparel industry. The already large and rapidly expanding 3D printing industry is particularly sensitive to uncertainty about the copyright protection of designs and objects. 3D printing, also known as additive manufacturing, allows users to use digital files to produce tangible objects in a manner that is often faster and more efficient than conventional fabrication techniques. In some cases, 3D printing even enables the production of shapes and forms that would be impossible to create using less revolutionary methods. The 3D printing industry has had a democratizing effect on manufacturing, allowing individuals to customize designs for their own use and greatly lowering startup costs for new entrants in markets for the design and sale of a wide variety of objects.

The submission warns: "These advancements are threatened by the current fractured state of copyright law on objects combining functional and artistic elements." The 3D companies are concerned:

Uncertainty over the line between copyrightable and noncopyrightable works can lead to over-claiming and overcategorization of material as copyrightable, upsetting the balance struck by Congress between the interests of rights holders and the societal benefits from a vibrant public domain.

The 3D Printing companies complained that 'Circuit court decisions since the introduction of the idea of conceptual separability in the Copyright Act of 1976 have created a conflicting, convoluted body of law'. The industry groups despair: 'There now exist as many as ten separate methods for evaluating conceptual separability, and the circuits do not even agree on how to answer questions common to their different tests'. The 3D printing companies argue: "This split generates exactly the sort of legal uncertainty that disrupts the balance of copyright law". In their view, "The need to navigate the complex
legal regime created by the current circuit split threatens to chill innovation and creativity by, and impose significant costs on, individuals and small companies that lack in-house legal capabilities or resources for outside legal guidance’. The 3D Printing companies warned the adverse impact of the legal uncertainty in the field: ‘The current state of the law increases barriers to entry for market participants who stand to take greatest advantage of 3D printing.’ The 3D printing companies observed: ‘The confusion surrounding the conceptual separability doctrine will likely lead to elevated levels of litigation, and, where the law differs from circuit to circuit, affect both the reach of copyright holders’ rights and the size of markets available to manufacturers.’

First, in the body of the argument, the 3D printing companies maintained that a single, predictable test for copyright separability is critical not just for the apparel business but also for innovation industries such as 3D printing. The 3D printing industry maintained that ‘this case is about more than cheerleading uniforms’. The amicus brief noted that ‘3D printing is already a significant industry and is expanding exponentially’. In its view, ‘Continued confusion in this area of copyright law skews the balance between innovators and those claiming rights, hindering development in this growing field.’ Outlining developments in 3D printing and the maker movement, the companies observed:

Ultimately, using digital technologies to make physical objects greatly increases the types of physical objects that people can create, while vastly increasing the number of people who can create them. The increasing accessibility of 3D printing encourages more people to share, distribute, and sell their physical creations to the global audience of the Internet.

The 3D printing companies also highlighted the materials revolution: ‘The types of objects created by 3D printing are incredibly diverse, and users can work with a wide variety of materials, including precious metals, ceramic, or plastic.’

---
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The submission was concerned about the prevailing uncertainty about the application of copyright law to 3D printing:

The application of copyright law to 3D printing is sometimes clear. 3D printed objects that are purely ornamental and nonfunctional, such as an exact replica of a sculpture or a complex jewelry design, are protectable by copyright; designs that are purely functional useful articles, such as a basic wrench or a replacement gear, are not. In intermediate cases, however, the application is uncertain. A significant percentage of 3D printed objects combine utilitarian and artistic elements in complex ways. These mixed use objects engage copyright in a more involved manner and require distinguishing between the copyrightable subject matter and the noncopyrightable utilitarian elements.145

The submission noted: ‘As the 3D printing industry expands, so will the number of copyright claims and disputes connected to physical objects that incorporate both creative and functional parts.’146 The 3D printing companies commented: ‘The aggregate impact of such choices is to undermine the carefully calibrated scope of copyright protection created by Congress’.147 They observed that ‘Ambiguity pushes the scope of copyright protection outward, unjustifiably stifling expression by bringing objects and elements ineligible for copyright protection within its reach’.148 The 3D printing companies warned that such an approach undermined the larger public policy objectives of copyright law: ‘The public ultimately is deprived of access to creativity and objects that should rightfully be in the public domain or be, at the most, be protected only by patent.’149

Second, the 3D printing companies observed that the current split surrounding conceptual separability is significant and chilling to innovation and creativity. The submission observed:

In the forty years since the enactment of the Copyright Act of 1976, courts have applied several conflicting tests for conceptual separability and generated irreconcilable differences in their interpretations of the statute. The current fractured state of circuit law regarding the separability of functional and artistic elements prevents individuals and companies engaged in the 3D printing industry from being able to accurately analyze the landscape of copyright protection. It also prevents responsible rights holders from properly exercising their rights and responsible
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designers from creating and innovating without interference from baseless but
difficult-to-assess claims. Uncertainty inhibits the natural exchange of ideas as 3D
printing becomes cramped by overreaching copyright protection. As this industry
expands, trying to navigate multiple, conflicting rules for conceptual separability will
chill innovation and creativity, increase litigation over copyrightability, disrupt the
nationwide marketplace for mixed-use objects, and impose the costs of these
inefficiencies on consumers.150

The submission lamented that there had been a failure to address
conceptual separability in a consistent and coherent way over the last 40 years.
The 3D Printing companies feared that ‘the fractured state of the law
surrounding conceptual separability is fundamentally at odds with
congressional intent in passing the Copyright Act of 1976 to create a “single
system of Federal statutory copyright.”’151

In conclusion, the 3D printing companies insisted: ‘The ability of users,
innovators, 3D printing companies, and copyright owners to rely on a single,
predictable test for conceptual separability is of great importance’.152 The
industry observed: ‘This case is the ideal vehicle for the Court to resolve the
damaging circuit split and provide that consistency and predictability’.153 The
industry pleaded with the Supreme Court of the United States:

This Court should grant certiorari to resolve the present circuit split and ensure that
the development of innovative technologies and industries such as 3D printing is not
hampered by the ongoing conflicts and confusion in conceptual separability doctrine.154

The Supreme Court of the United States granted leave in the dispute, and
heard oral arguments in 2016. A decision is due to be handed down in 2017.
John Hornick and Carlos Rosario Tue wondered whether increased copyright
lawsuits would be costly for consumers in the long-run: ‘We will be watching
closely to see if the Supreme Court decides to make a bright-line test to
determine whether an object is copyrightable when it possesses some
functionality.’155
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VI Game of Thrones: Copyright Law and Intermediary Liability

3D printing has also tested the limits of the safe harbours regime set up under the Digital Millennium Copyright Act 1998 (US).

There have, though, already been controversies over copyright law, intermediary liability, the MakerBot. In 2011, Thomas Valenty used a MakerBot to design figurines - a war mecha and a tank for use in the game Warhammer 40,000. He posted the files on Thingiverse, which allowed other fans to share the instructions for printing these 3D objects. Noting the files, the Games Workshop – the maker of Warhammer 40,000 – sent a take-down notice to Thingiverse under the Digital Millennium Copyright Act 1998 (US). Clive Thompson observed of the conflict: ‘Thingiverse removed the files, and Valenty suddenly became an unwilling combatant in the next digital war: the fight over copying physical objects.’ The creator argued that the takedown of the files was unjustified, observing: ‘The models are mine. I created them from scratch … This was “fan-art”.’ Valenty noted: ‘I believe the issue was with the distribution of the files that carry the likeness of their IP.’

This dispute between Thomas Valenty and the Games Workshop is a forerunner to future conflicts over copyright law, and 3D printing.

In addition to the controversy over LeftShark, Fernardo Sosa has also been involved in a copyright dispute in respect of a 3D-printed Iron Throne dock. He received a threatening letter from HBO, observing: ‘While we appreciate the enthusiasm for the Series that appears to have inspired your creation of this device, we are also concerned that your iron throne dock will infringe on HBO’s copyright in the Iron Throne.’

The HBO Vice President of Corporate Affairs Jeff Cusson maintained that a ‘pretty straightforward intellectual property infringement.’ HBO refused to allow for licensing of the Iron Throne by Sosa.

HBO refused to allow for licensing of the Iron Throne by Sosa:

---
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Your company is too small at this time to warrant a license with HBO. We are operating a multi-million dollar licensing program and we seek licensees who have established track records, sound financial footing, experience in licensing and the ability to mass produce product and deliver it to retailers reliably. Your company does not meet those criteria.

The 3D printed products you have showed me lack the polish that we look for in licensed merchandise. We work with several licensees who use 3D printing to prototype products and we have seen the limits of the technology. It’s our opinion that at this time, most 3D printed items that we see don’t have the high quality we look for in our licensed merchandise. While injection molding is certainly far more expensive from a tooling and set-up perspective, the resulting product meets our production criteria and our partners can produce huge quantities at affordable prices with a good economy of scale. 3D printing is certainly growing in leaps and bounds, but right now the results just aren’t good enough for us.163

Sosa was non-plussed by the dispute: ‘Fine, you don’t want us to work with your throne, we’ll make something cool, we’ll make something better.’164

There are larger pressures in respect of the regulation of intermediary liability – both for copyright law and other disciplines.165

In the United States, there has been a review process in respect of the regime of safe harbours, and take-down and notice schemes. In April 2016, leading 3D printing companies like Makerbot, Shapeways, and Stratasys, and crowdfunding entities like Kickstarter made a submission on the regime.166 The submission noted that ‘[Online Service Providers] are a critical platform for free speech and economy activity that empower individuals and small
businesses to easily post content and connect to a global audience.\textsuperscript{167} The online service providers explained some common concerns amongst the new digital economy:

OSPs key role in the online ecosystem derives in part from their mass accessibility. OSPs empower millions of users to create and publish content with a low barrier to entry. Before OSPs existed, people needed considerable resources to widely disseminate their content. Today, user generated-content reaches a global audience after simply accepting an OSP’s terms of use.

However, with this mass accessibility comes a potential conflict affecting the free flow of ideas, the dissemination of innovation, and small business-fueled economic growth. When OSPs are exposed to liability for the content generated by their users, it restricts the OSPs’ ability to support the freewheeling communities that have been the basis for so much economic, cultural, and political activity.\textsuperscript{168}

The 3D printing and crowdfunding companies observed that Congress has partially addressed the concerns through passing laws such as the online safe harbours of the \textit{Digital Millennium Copyright Act 1998} (US), and Section 230 of the \textit{Communications Decency Act}. The companies commented: ‘While the practical implementation and use of copyright safe harbors have raised a number of important questions, Commenters focus this comment on a specific development that is distorting the notice and takedown process designed by Congress.’\textsuperscript{169} The companies are worried by combination notices, which brought together copyright and trademark complaints: ‘The increasingly common practice of combining allegations of trademark infringement with Section 512 copyright infringement notices effectively transforms a notice and counter notice process into a notice and stay down process.’\textsuperscript{170}

The companies stressed the importance of safe harbors in respect of intellectual property law: ‘The Section 512 safe harbors allow Commenters to invest in improving and supporting their businesses without fear that a single infringing upload could result in debilitating copyright litigation.’\textsuperscript{171} The companies also warned that the ‘safe harbors also give users the opportunity to dispute claims by overly aggressive rightsholders.’\textsuperscript{172}
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The companies observed that ‘safe harbors help protect against over-enforcement by allowing users to push back against problematic takedown requests.’\textsuperscript{173} They commented that there were different perspectives between online service providers, and individuals. The companies noted:

Key to understanding the value of safe harbors is recognizing the differing viewpoints of OSPs and their users. OSPs – Commenters included – must consider the best interests of their entire user base when evaluating a request to take down an individual item. Within that rubric, it is often rational for OSPs to comply with a marginal, but colourable, request for any individual item to be taken down in order to protect the larger viability of the user base and avoid costly litigation.\textsuperscript{174}

The 3D printing companies and their associates said: ‘If OSPs had the security of safe harbor protections for non-copyright claims, OSPs could offer users the ability to push back against rightsholder claims.’\textsuperscript{175} The 3D printing and crowdfunding companies are taking proactive policy action in respect of the question of intermediary liability.

\section*{VII Copyright Law, Digital Locks, and 3D Printing}

There has also been much policy discussion over copyright law, technological protection measures, and 3D printing. Such conflicts have tested the creaky, anachronistic framework for exceptions to technological protection measures laid down under the \textit{Digital Millennium Copyright Act 1998} (US).

Public Knowledge and the Electronic Frontier Foundation have petitioned the United States Copyright Office at the Library of Congress to provide an exemption to the prohibition on the circumvention of copyright protection systems for access control technologies.\textsuperscript{176} The proponents sought an exemption for the users of 3D printers to engage in the use of non-manufacturer approved feedstock. The submission stressed:

The non-infringing use at issue is the access of programs designed to prevent the use of non-authorized feedstocks in 3D printers. As noted by the Sixth Circuit in \textit{Lexmark}
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International, Inc. v. Static Control Components, Inc., 387 F.3d 522 (2004), Congress did not intend for the DMCA to prevent consumers from using lawfully acquired consumer goods. The mere fact that copyright-protected programs are accessed in the use of a 3D printer or are used to verify feedstock in a 3D printer should not grant manufacturers the ability to control the use of those printers. While manufacturers are free to condition offers such as warranties on the use of approved feedstocks, as well as obtain patents on specific feedstocks, it is improper for them to rely on Section 1201 to prohibit users of 3D printers from using alternative feedstocks.177

Public Knowledge warned that 'Interoperability, innovation, and consumer value are all negatively impacted by manufacturer-imposed feedstock restrictions in 3D printers.'178 The group warned that 'Preventing unauthorized feedstocks undermines larger innovation in the 3D printing world.'179 In its view, 'Materials innovation is one of the engines driving the 3D printing industry forward.'180 Public Knowledge insisted: 'While many 3D printer manufacturers make important contributions to 3D printable materials, they are not the only ones'.181 The group noted: "Outsider" materials innovation, from the University of Washington’s recycled milk jug feedstock that created a 3D printed boat, to Rice University’s 3D printing of living tissues, should not be blocked by manufacturer-imposed limitations on printer use."182 Public Knowledge hoped: 'Opening the market to non-approved stocks helps increase consumer choice and value.'183 The group contended: 'Competitive feedstock manufacturers can offer users of 3D printers innovative new options.'184 Public Knowledge argued that the move would be beneficial for consumer rights and competition: 'Similarly, they can offer competitive options that drive down prices for existing feedstocks.'185

Stratasys asked the US Copyright Office to deny a proposal that would legalise jailbreaking 3d printers in order to use your own feedstock.186
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company argued that ‘the proposed exemption would technological mechanisms that have supported the rapid innovation and increased adoption of 3D printing technologies among new classes of customers.’ Stratasys also maintained that the proposed exemption would also ‘diminish the ability of 3D printing systems to serve as secure hubs for the distribution of proprietary software and designs and for the collection of critical performance and manufacturing information’.

The Intellectual Property Owners Association also opposed the creation of an exemption in technological protection measures for 3D printing, arguing: ‘Manufacturers have invested substantial research and development funds predicated on business models that allow them to recoup and continue such investments.’ They stressed: “Bringing breakthrough technologies to market requires investments in the entire ecosystem of a 3D printer, including hardware, software, and materials, over a long-term development cycle.” The Intellectual Property Owners Association feared: ‘Anticipated revenue from materials supports a reduction in the price of the initial printer and also supports the continued development of new and improved materials.’ The industry lobby group concluded: ‘Because the proposed exemption would undermine technological measures that facilitate technological improvements, protect valuable property distributed through or stored on 3D printers, and provide incentives for vital research and development, we respectfully request that the Librarian and Register deny the proposed exemption for 3D printers.’
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In the end, the United States Copyright Office granted a very limited exception in respect of copyright law, circumvention, technological protection measures and 3D printing.193

Disney has expressed the desire to develop an anti-copying device in respect of 3D printing.194

Cory Doctorow has railed against the impact of technological protection measures.195 As part of the Apollo 1201 initiative, he has united with the Electronic Frontier Foundation to call for the abolition of digital rights management systems and technological protection measures.196

Under President Barack Obama, the Trans-Pacific Partnership had promoted the expansive protection of technological protection measures across the Pacific Rim. However, the new United States President Donald Trump has vowed to withdraw the United States from the agreement altogether.

VIII Conclusion

This article has reviewed a number of recent skirmishes in respect of copyright law and 3D printing. The conflicts have raised fundamental issues common to ‘information environmentalism’ – in respect of ecology, ‘the commons’, public choice theory, and welfare economics.197 The dispute between Katy Perry and Fernando Sosa is symptomatic of the growing conflicts in respect of intellectual property law, and 3D printing in the United States. The dispute over LeftShark highlighted classic issues around copyright subsistence, copyright infringement, and copyright exceptions. The conflict over Michelangelo’s Statues was a strange assertion of copyright over public domain materials. This battle

highlights the problems of copyfraud in the context of 3D printing. The action by the estate of Marcel Duchamp over the creators of a chess set was a complex matter. The legal conflict raised larger questions about copyright term, copyright subsistence, copyright infringement, copyright exceptions, and Internet jurisdiction. The intervention by 3D printing companies in the Supreme Court of the United States on the question of separability is an important development. The intermediary liability regime established by the Digital Millennium Copyright Act 1998 (US) has been tested by the sharing of 3D printing files. There have also been policy rules developed in respect of copyright law, technological protection measures, and 3D printing. Such conflicts highlight a larger tension between private property owners and the open commons of the maker movement.

In addition to creative activities, 3D printing offers new opportunities for designers working in a range of creative industries – such as art, craft, design, fashion, architecture, and products for consumers. Significantly, 3D printing also poses fundamental challenges for designs law, as well as offering opportunities. For instance, the Designs Act 2003 (Cth) in Australia provides exclusive rights to owners of registered designs – which relate to ‘the overall appearance of the product resulting from one or more visual features of the product’ 198. A ‘visual feature, in relation to a product, includes the shape, configuration, pattern and ornamentation of the product.’ 199 3D printing of products may impinge upon registered designs related to the appearance of products. Simon Bradshaw, Adrian Bowyer, and Patrick Haufe have been hopeful that non-commercial 3D printing of designs would not infringe design rights: ‘Purely personal use of a 3D printer to make items will thus not infringe a registered design, so long as the purpose for which the item was made was genuinely non-commercial.’ 200 The spare parts exception will be the subject of much scrutiny in the age of 3D printing, making, and tinkering. The Advisory Council on Intellectual Property considered ‘the impact of new technologies on design protection’. 201 The Council concluded: ‘Consistent with the views of many stakeholders, ACIP considers that reform to address challenges posed by
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technologies such as 3D printing would be premature’. Nonetheless, 3D printing provides for opportunities to reform and reinvent designs law, so that it is better adapted to contemporary design.

3D printing could also pose significant issues in respect of trade mark law. Michael Weinberg of Public Knowledge notes: ‘If a 3D printer made a copy of an object and that copy included a trademark, the copy would infringe on the trademark.’ There has been much debate over trade marks in respect of shapes. Conceivably, 3D printing could pose particular issues in respect of potential infringement of shape trade marks – and other three-dimensional trade marks. For instance, Apple’s iconic products are protected, amongst other things, by shape trade marks. There could also be issues in respect of passing off and misleading and deceptive conduct – if there is confusion between products manufactured by 3D printing and the original models. Amanda Scardamaglia from Swinburne Law School provides an overview of some of the flashpoints in respect of 3D printing and trade mark law. She charted the tensions and conflicts in the field:

While there are some uses to which 3D printers can be put which may infringe the rights of trade mark owners, this is mostly at the perimeters. So although some commercial uses may impinge on the rights of trade mark owners, personal uses are less controversial. That is not to say that such uses are not objectionable to trade mark owners, who are concerned not just with consumer confusion but with the dilution of their brand and controlling all corners of their market.

Amanda Scardamaglia comments: ‘When it comes to the intersection of trade mark law and 3D printing, there is no reason to expect anything different. 3D printing therefore, is shaping up to be the next battleground for intellectual property law overreach, with trade mark law set to play a pivotal role.’ She observed that ‘if 3D printing does become our reality, a reality where consumers become makers, then trade mark owners will eventually have little choice but to embrace the new model of doing things.’

---
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In terms of patentable subject matter, 3D printing has a wide range of applications.\(^{208}\) The Supreme Court of the United States has sought to delimit the boundaries of eligible patentable subject matter in a string of cases – including *Bilski*, *Prometheus*, *Myriad*, and *Alice*.\(^{209}\) While some forms of 3D printing will be well within the boundaries of eligible patentable subject matter, particular 3D printing technologies in information technology, medicine, and biotechnology could be more contentious. Syzdek has suggested that there will be a gradual pattern of acceptance of 3D printing within the doctrines of patent law.\(^{210}\) There has been significant patent litigation in the United States International Trade Commission in respect of 3D printing. ClearCorrect and ClearCorrect Pakistan was engaging in 3D printing in respect of the production of orthodontic appliances known as aligners. Align Technology Inc. alleged that there had been an infringement by ClearCorrect of various claims of 7 different patents. In *Clearcorrect Operating LLC v. ITC.* (2015), the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit was of the view that the jurisdiction of the International Trade Commission did not extend to electronically transmitted digital data.\(^{211}\) There have been significant concerns about the operation of patent infringement laws.\(^{212}\) Australia’s patent laws, though, do have flexibilities for makers, tinkerers, and inventors.\(^{213}\) The statutory defence of experimental use should provide protection for a range of activities undertaken by the members of the maker movement.\(^{214}\)

There are also significant issues in respect of 3D printing, contract law, and confidential information. The World Intellectual Property Organization has highlighted tensions between industrial 3D printing and personal 3D Printing, and between an open source philosophy, and proprietary approaches: “The
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\(^{213}\) *Intellectual Property Laws Amendment (Raising the Bar) Act 2012* (Cth).

personal 3D printing ecosystem was built around the open sharing philosophy, while its industrial counterparts relied – and continue to rely – on proprietary knowledge and technologies to advance innovation.\textsuperscript{215} WIPO comments: ‘Any further innovation in this area may involve open-source codes which may then be incorporated into proprietary, closed, hardware.’\textsuperscript{216} Jarkko Moilanen, Angela Daly, Ramon Lobato, and Darcy Allen have undertaken empirical research into ‘Cultures of Sharing in 3D Printing.’\textsuperscript{217} Such a study has highlighted the ways in which Creative Commons have been adapted and applied to help support the sharing of files in the Thingiverse.

Discussing the impact of 3D printing, Professor Mark Lemley of Stanford Law School has warned that there will profound challenges to intellectual property law in a post-scarcity economy:

The Internet is a harbinger of things to come—of a raft of new technologies that offer the promise of separating creativity from production and distribution, and reducing the cost of all three. Those technologies challenge the basis for our IP system, and indeed the basis for our economy as a whole.\textsuperscript{218}

The 3D Printing community should play an active part in the policy debate over intellectual property law reform. Michael Weinberg has emphasized that ‘it is critical for today’s 3D printing community, tucked away in garages, hackerspaces, and labs, to keep a vigilant eye on these policy debates as they grow.’\textsuperscript{219} He recommended that ‘the community must work to educate policy makers and the public about the benefits of widespread access.’\textsuperscript{220}
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