

The transcendent unity of art, function and utility

“The unity of art, function and utility is similar to the organic constitution of a body.”

Part one

The basis for the unity of Art, Function and Utility

The best possible recognition for the most useful, productive and/or efficient inventions (*especially in the case where innovating concepts are stimulating commerce*) is that which is already granted to written texts.

There has been a tendency ~ only within the last few centuries ~ to place the so-called noble arts: literature, music and other *“fine arts”* on a pedestal. This was not the case among former communities, where the blacksmith was considered, both rightly and wrongly, to be more important than an artist/painter: rightly so, because the tools he produced were essential for work, hence survival and wrongly so, because there is little difference between man and beast if a man's sole motivation is to find food and shelter. But to contemptuously dismiss the quality of a blacksmith's utilitarian works while praising the artist's quest for pure beauty, is the height of nonsense.

Indeed, without the first, the second could not exist, and without the second, the first could never hope to evolve and grow. Most of the time, however, the two are one and the same, as the most beautiful tool also happens to be the most useful one for the task at hand.

Though this may seem strange at first glance, the artistic approach is the best way to come to a truer understanding of a given utilitarian function. As proven by progress in the fields of aerodynamics and ergonomics, such understanding is achieved by simply assessing which particular forms are best suited to a given object.

One finds this notion of understanding utilitarian function through art in the disciplines of *manual* and *applied arts*, *arts and crafts* and *graphic arts*. Similarly, creating a bridge which not only provides safe crossing but also has great aesthetic value, requires many different competences such as artistic design, intricate calculations, in-depth knowledge of the properties of materials not to mention the acrobatic proclivities of the builders...

Likewise, the art of producing a simple easy-chair involves numerous creative capabilities, ranging from the functional i.e. engineering, to the aesthetic. Thus one must always *follow rules of art*, even when one performs a task that seems strictly *technical and utilitarian*.

From a functional as well as a utilitarian and aesthetic standpoint (*the three actually forming an non-dissociable whole*), art is therefore always present. Following his creative consciousness, the artist will perform a pure dance-arabesque, paint an individual's facial

features, play a violin's swift passage or create the expressive form of a sentence, while a similarly inspired craftsman will forge a scythe, create a piece of furniture, sow a field or invent a totally new object, for tomorrow's common (*or select*) use. Thus, since the dawn of man, mankind has evolved through natural order. This is reflected in the moral rules, designs and artistic rules from which mankind created its laws; likewise, mankind is naturally inspired to make objects and things that are essential for civilization.

"Forming the essence of imagination's vital unity, creative intuition combines a workman's intelligence and generative instinct, and achieves perfection through genius. Knowledge and ability being thus identified, one must conclude that the act of creating requires more than the mere realization of an idea's content..." (translated from Encyclopædia Universalis, vol. 5, page 67, ed. 1971).

Indeed, one must prove that the notion of beauty and the process by which it is attained are united in their original complexity. In this perspective, that which man has tried to artificially separate, namely, moral and material interests, are in fact implicit in the same work, thus forming an indivisible *"binity"*.

In reality, this situation has created an ongoing conflict between inventor and financier (*or industrialist*), which has grown obsolete, since it is more suited to the days of absolute monarchy, when material power truly and unquestionably ruled moral values. A new approach, which extends the application of copyright to inventors and others, (*i.e. beyond only writers and artists*) may in fact revitalize our economies. Otherwise, businesses worldwide will have to rely on the present *uniform* globalization of their structures to achieve future growth.

If such *uniform* globalization of the business/commercial structures actually came to prevail, what would happen? How would we progress? From where will our guiding light emerge? Instead of using the same identical objects, it is quite conceivable that by unleashing the power of human imagination, one can create a system that encourages individuals and enterprises alike to continually advance the state of mankind. Such a system could form the seed for future economic growth, thereby saving us from the present form of *uniform globalization*.

The only way to liberate creative energy is to free it, especially from material constraints. It is time once again to shake-up a world that seems to irrevocably drift towards a stagnant materialism. In order to solve this present problem, one must analyse the reasons that justify the unity of **art** (the application of various regulated means or techniques that serve to materialise a **creation**: a *new work*), **function** (an active process inherent in an **invention**: *the technical development and fine tuning of the creation*) and **utility** (the inherent ability of the invention to satisfy human needs, which can only be manifested through **innovation**: *successful commercialisation of invention*). Art, function and utility therefore cannot logically be dissociated. Any dissociation is therefore based on imaginary principles or otherwise fantasist theories.

* * *

Part two

Why resort to a *Work of the Mind*?

Art, Function and Utility, three words that were arbitrarily dissociated by several authors of the laws governing Intellectual Property: three components of one whole, a single theme, a driving force behind human evolution. In a society based on an endless quest for justice, we must re-associate these words for the sake of our economic, social and political welfare.

According to several famous individuals (*sociologists and economists*), great humanists and jurists as well as outstanding philosophers ~ like Henri Bergson, for example ~ the unity of Art, Function and Utility seems so obvious that it is superfluous to question it.

In order to study this subject thoroughly and thus restore values that were expressly ignored, let us analyse these words from an etymological point of view so as to dispel any doubt about their literal meaning.

Art - noun ~ that comes from the Latin "*ars, artis*" meaning: *various applied techniques or procedures requiring a certain amount of skill serving a given purpose...*

Function - noun ~ that comes from the Latin "*functio*" (performance): *a mode of action or activity by which a thing fulfils its purpose, e.g. the normal contribution of a component as part of a given mechanism...* verb ~ operate, perform, work

Utility - noun ~ from the Latin word "*utilitas*", of what is useful from the Latin "*utilitis*"; the quality of or property of being useful; usefulness; its use may be beneficial (*to someone, to society*), fulfils a need.

Prima facie, these three definitions, once put together as a coherent theme (an indivisible "*trinity*"), should suffice to put the issue at rest... However, given their tendency to automatically separate the three words, the unflinching supporters of industrial monopolies will no doubt require a more elaborate explanation of the matter.

Indeed, how could there even exist *a mode of action or activity by which a thing fulfils its beneficial purpose* without it having been previously planned and without having applied a certain skill or "*technique*" that inevitably requires some form of training? Such training necessarily implies rules and more specifically, "Rules of the Art". This applies to every field of human activity e.g. science, handicrafts, services, trade or arts, whether one grows seeds, ferments wine, makes a wooden or metal part, fashions a mould, builds the body of a car, creates a recipe or a computer formula... Such rules of art are inevitably used to manifest *a mode of action or activity by which a thing fulfils its beneficial purpose*. Rules of art can only apply to specific acts and imply *mastered techniques* performed by a competent person.

Let us now see whether the word "*technical*" applies to art or whether it is foreign to its manifestation... This precision is relevant, all the more so since legal texts on

intellectual property insist that an invention is patentable only if it provides a technical solution to a technical problem.

Technical - adjective from the Greek *tekhnikos* of art, skillful, *fr. tekhnê* art, craft, skill; having special knowledge; used in or particular to a specific science, art, profession, craft, trade, etc.

Technique - noun:

1 - *the method or procedure or process (with reference to formal details) in rendering an artistic work or carrying out a scientific or mechanical operation; the manner in which technical details are treated or basic physical movements are used.*

2 - *The degree of expertness in applying this...*

Art and technique cannot be separated. Indeed, there are technical aspects associated with every art, and rules of art are inherent in every beneficial activity. If one sketches the idea for a new machine, is art not applied just because the object of the sketch has a useful function? Likewise, can such a sketch qualify as art only if it is a free-hand drawing? If an artist decides to use a compass and a setsquare instead of a brush, does his work automatically become technical and not artistic?

As we can see from this discussion, a patentable invention, just like anything resulting from a *Work of the Mind*, implies the use of art. It requires a certain amount of rational intelligence, sensitivity, memory, skill, knowledge, intuition and creativity (*i.e. mind*).

Likewise, a *Work of the Mind* requires a given amount of technique, which one must master prior to being able to create such an original expressive work. Such creations can be used to solve practical problems rather than merely pleasing the public or earning plaudits from critics, for example, to provide technical solutions to technical problems. Indeed, the first traces of organized society were laid when people started applying a *suitable technique*, the drawing, in order to hand down knowledge; improvements in this means of communication ultimately led to the mastery of writing; in short, these epochal achievements meet the basic criteria of a *Work of the Mind*... With all due respects to the unwavering supporters of monopoly, this proves that the owner of a *Work of the Mind*, *whether its application is useful or not, does not require monopolistic commercial rights provided by patent, since ownership of such works is universal, natural and can promptly be demonstrated before a court of law... This principle applies equally to invention, once the inventor has expressed his original and initial concept in a literary and artistic work (i.e. a Work of the Mind)*. Interestingly, similar functions are fulfilled, on the one hand by *Works of the Mind*, which may provide solutions to problems, whether *technical* or not, and on the other hand by patented products, which must provide *technical* solutions to *technical* problems; either can manifest an inventive activity... In a similar way to which written language evolved, the *technique of musical writing* allowed the art of sound to evolve from the ancient psalmody, transmitted orally, to the polyphonic orchestra transmitted in writing... but further examples should not be necessary.

Honesty is the best approach if one wants to convince supporters of patent that it is not applicable to inventors, but rather to industrialists and financiers... Putting the principles of a monopoly (*material interests*) above any moral consideration is the same as condoning dictatorship... **Under arbitrary rules, justice is for fools...**

Let us return to our discussion: The mastery of Art, Function and Utility. It is a complete process in itself, for which one is trained in order to *apply regulated techniques and procedures, which ultimately allow a mode of action or activity by which a thing fulfils its beneficial (useful) purpose ...* Indeed, without a written score, how could interpreters play a piece of music? **Mastery of any subject requires a preliminary and technical instruction.** Without mastery, there can be no written work. Without a written work, there can be no score. Without **copies**, and therefore without copyright for a score, there can be no orchestra. Without an orchestra, there can be no performance. Without performance by an orchestra, the work cannot be expressed... The same applies to the explanatory text of a computer program, to the rules of a game, to the description of a discovery, to a finding or to a new methodology, or to operating instructions, etc. One could hardly expect a professional to materialise a concept if the written text does not describe it adequately (*i.e. with proper literary technique*).

In order to provide a third party with the elements required for the production of a work or an innovation, one must **copy time and time again** the written texts of a writer, the drawings of a designer or the score of a composer; in other words, one must copy all or part of the Author's work, namely, the expression of the original idea which led to its creation... How can an orchestra play without scores? How can one fashion a mould without referencing a technical drawing? If a complex product is provided, it must come with directions for use! It is all the same thing... In order to impart knowledge, one needs documents that faithfully reproduce the initial *Work of the Mind* that was originally put into tangible form onto a physical medium (*e.g. ink to paper, sculpture, painting, magnetic tape, laser disc, etc.*).

Doubtless, the feature and a sense of value in a specific and *technical* discipline that one has mastered, such as writing, are *the elements of an organic structure* that enables the author to *apply specific techniques or procedures requiring a certain amount of skill* allowing him *to produce a work to be used for a given purpose in order to fulfil a need*.

Comment: The difference between a **literary text** and **gibberish** can be explained as that between the applied mastery of technique inherent in a set of specifically chosen words that make up a text that is grammatically correct and stylistically pleasing, and a rather confused set of words that are mostly incoherent and without aesthetic quality. There is a parallel difference between an **artistic drawing** and **scribble**. Note: however, the art of copying does not represent a *Work of the Mind*, even though it requires the same talents and criteria of excellence as any other art. **A true Work of the Mind, whether a literary text or an artistic design, must result from the Author's creative intuition.**

The legislator, in trying to break-up the unity of **Art** and **Function**, could not ultimately avoid the incoherence and abuse that results. Separating the **ornamental** from

the **utilitarian** is equally absurd with similar consequences. Nevertheless, as with most anomalies, they contain their own solution for those who care to look. Since it has been decreed that "**Fine Arts**" must be separated from the so-called utilitarian "**Applied Arts**", let us then carry this legalism to its own conclusion: keep them separated, but acknowledge the chronological and natural order in which they occur, the order in which they begin to exist.

Solution: When the originator of a new and commercially viable concept produces a creative work prior to inventing, in other words, if one starts by applying aforementioned technical, literary and artistic rules in order to put a concept into tangible form, then one becomes the Author of a *Work of the Mind* prior to becoming the inventor of a device or process.

To invent, one must "find or discover" the methodology, though previously unknown and by definition existing in absolute terms, that will allow him to materialize the product depicted in the initial work ~ the original tangible form of the concept.

Indeed, the legislator particularly seems to have overlooked several of important facts. He apparently fails to understand that one must plagiarize the expression of the author's original idea, described within a book, in order to materialize its product, and that the author of such a work can both create the work and also invent (i.e. research, develop and prototype) the device depicted in the work. Unfortunately, well-known examples set by Leonardo da Vinci, Walt Disney and Hergé have failed to encourage deeper reflection on the subject... As a further extension to this train of thought, the legislator failed to consider, in the case of writing his own life story, for example, that every editor has access to ghost-writers (*the "interlits" of the USD-System editions*), technical experts in writing. Such experts know how to put a person's character and story, in short, his inherent creativity and a description of his concept, into a literary and artistic form applying the rules of Art... Similar experts exist for the production of musical works and artistic (including technical) drawings.

Applying the USD-System methodology allows the originator of any concept to become the **Author of a Work of the Mind** and thus permanently enjoy ownership of an inalienable work, from which "**Copyright**" automatically results, which, in turn, should not to be confused with so-called "*protection*".

In such circumstances, one needs the Author's express authorization in order to produce or reproduce all or part of the expression of his work. This does not represent a monopoly of production, but rather the private property of its owner. As we have already discussed, the most legitimate owner on earth is the author of a Work of the Mind.

* * *

The granting of monopolies contradicts anti-trust laws and violates the basic principle of free enterprise. This is essentially why a title of monopolistic commercialisation granted by the state can only be temporary in nature.

* * *

Part three

Why ownership of a work is a priority

Despite the variations between the internal laws of different nations, it seems that every one has the right to copy all or part of a recognized monopoly (*patent or other*) or a Work of the Mind, as long as such copying is used for private purposes and is thus not commercial in nature...

Once the author has integrated some of the following elements within a book with a certified date of printing (*and for good measure, a copyright number in Canada*): a short biography leading to the initial inspiration for his original concept, a description of his concept, the instructions for its use, copies of his sketches, drawings or other graphics, photo's or other two-dimensional representations of his prototypes or sculptural or moulded constructions, he has officially validated his literary and/or artistic property and has a right of prior possession which he can use against third parties. **It is therefore imperative that the inventor compiles such a documented work in order to unquestionably establish himself as the owner of the concept.**

As long as the concept has ceased to be a mere idea and has become a creation (the result of human creativity), which one has put into tangible form as a Work of the Mind, the author's property is established, and whether his work is published or not its status remains the same.

Comment: *Given the particular criteria for its validation, namely, the mandatory disclosure of its (purely) technical description, the specific form of copyright typically applied to computer programs is more similar to patent than to the original form of copyright, therefore it too is a title and not a property. This type of copyright allows the inventor to have a monopoly, but by the same token, it also prevents him from enjoying the benefit of owning property. Why? Because, unlike a historical account, a purely technical description does not require a style and technique that are literary and grammatical, such as expressed in a novel, and therefore it does not result in a recognised natural intellectual property such as a novel.*

Without the concrete and permanent proof provided by a literary and artistic work, whether published or unpublished, court procedures related to a Copyright claim are bound to be lengthy, complicated, costly and without guaranty (*For example, the amount of time required for Professor Montagnier of the Pasteur Institute to prove that he and his team, rather than Professor Gallo, had discovered the AIDS virus.*)

Unless his idea has been put into tangible form as a literary or artistic Work of the Mind, the originator of an innovating idea who commercially exploits or otherwise commercialises his product cannot claim Copyright. Indeed, rights that result naturally and exclusively from a work cannot be proven by mere allegations... Without the historical content of his work, the self-declared originator cannot prove his authorship... In such a case, there is no Work of the Mind to plagiarize or counterfeit, and therefore the person who copies the idea cannot be guilty of plagiarism or counterfeit... (see the Tri-TEX case in annexe).

Unlike a title (*patent or other*), which is granted by sovereignty of State to the presumed author of an invention, copyright (*emanating naturally from a Work of the Mind*) is not, as we have repeated many times, a monopoly of production; the *Work of the Mind* being the author's natural property, copyright therefore reflects a legal private property. This also explains why the author of a work is not granted a monopoly of production or commercialisation on all or part of the concept that results from his expression.

Nevertheless, in copying all or part of the author's *Work of the Mind* for commercial purposes without authorization, one commits a double misdeed; prior to stealing its content, one has to “violate” a private property... Indeed, there can be neither violation nor theft unless one has first appropriated a true and an unquestionable **property**, which in turn no one can be arbitrarily denied according to basic law, the internal laws of most Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Unlike the owner of a *Work of the Mind*, the holder of a patent, design patent (*industrial design*) holds an economic monopoly granted "temporarily" by sovereignty of State, provided he pays annuities and strictly follows the juridical rules applicable to the industrial and commercial use of this title.

The State, and not the Inventor, being the owner of this title (*as with a driver's permit*), its monopoly, just like a license contract, remains valid only if the holder continuously fulfils his legal obligations. Moreover, the validity of the title is delivered without guaranty from the Government, since the latter itself has no guaranty that the applicant is indeed the true author of the patented invention.

One may conclude that, depending on the given situation, the unauthorized use of this title represents counterfeit of a monopoly comparable or complementary to unfair competition and/or industrial espionage... At trial, one must necessarily evaluate not only the defendant's intentions, but also those of the titleholder, just in case the latter also failed to fulfil all or part of his legal obligations toward the State... This is only one reason why such proceedings can become both long and costly...

If the titleholder fails to fulfil his legal obligations, the copier can obtain ex officio a license to use the title by order of the court.

However, since the Author of a *Work of the Mind* enjoys a natural, inalienable and permanent property, he can never forfeit his rights nor can the court grant a license ex officio against him... ***Such a property depends neither on the granting of a monopoly nor on the disclosure of information, and is free of charge...*** Only in the case where he can prove prior ownership of the same work can a third party invalidate the property of an illegitimate author in court.

* * *

Part four

That which founds the legal value of owning a work

At this point in the present work it might be useful to remind the reader of the basic principles set out in the *"Prolegomena"*. Given the confused state of the subject Intellectual Property, any lack of attentiveness on the reader's part is quite understandable. Indeed in such matters it is common practice to perceive concepts only vaguely, and more specifically, misinterpret and misuse the ambiguous words *"protection"* and *"protect"* that unfortunately, for more than two centuries, have been applied as components of the legal and legislative jargon of Intellectual Property. Even though they are deemed to express the essence of law on the matter, these perversely ambiguous words serve no other purpose than to present a set of *"arbitrary"* juridical principles and their resulting legal texts as objective. **Clearly, this explains why these laws inevitably contradict each other, and why the jurisprudence based on such laws is far from consistent.**

Like every innovation ahead of its time, the *"Intellectual Passport C.B."*, by its very use, upsets habits, challenges the status quo, as well as private interests, ultimately altering the way in which invention is generally perceived as a phenomenon... For more than two centuries, this phenomenon has been denied its fundamental source ~ **the human ability to create...**

Patent and design patent (industrial designs) were conceived and are used in such a way that the inventor is denied the natural "paternal" rights of his creation (i.e. the copyright arising from the ownership of his work).

It is interesting to note that, whereas the laws governing titles of monopolistic production are incoherent to the point of violating both logic and ethics, copyright laws are almost perfect... Which explains why there is no need to reform the latter. Nor should one forget that an author of great talent first wrote the same copyright laws: Pierre A. C. de Beaumarchais (1732-1799.) Unfortunately, inventors were not so lucky.

Let us now examine a classic example: a problem that may be hard to grasp for an individual whose mind, though educated, is filled with the contradictions inherent in the present laws, and by contrast may in fact be totally clear to the mind of a regular Joe guided by common sense and unaccustomed to corporatist views.

Our example concerns the recipe. What applies to recipes also applies to any process or formula, whether secret or not, but with the nuances and in the new perspective provided by the *"Intellectual Passport C.B."*. According to the internal laws of the 141 nations that adhered to one of the two international Copyright Conventions on copyright, it is **the expression of the idea** and not the idea itself that is *"protected"*. Every one agrees on this point. But how do the Berne Convention and the Universal Convention on Copyright define **the expression of an idea**? ...They define it first of all as the production or reproduction of all or part of an idea once it has been put into tangible form; such as a Work of the Mind which provides its Author with a **natural and inalienable property**. Thanks to copyright, which results from this property, the owner

of such a Work has an exclusive right on the production or reproduction of all or part of his work (*i.e. on all or part of the expression of an idea*), for his lifetime plus fifty or seventy years after his death, depending on the internal laws of the given country.

This being said, what does the author of a recipe have in mind? To publish his work and sell his book to as many clients as possible and not to keep his secret... However, no matter how easy such a recipe is to follow, e.g. by reading part of the text, ***copying all or part of its content for commercial purposes still constitutes fraud...*** (*See the documents from Intellectual Property Office of each Nation, which warn the reader not to reproduce all or part of its official guidebooks for commercial purposes.*)

On the other hand, the author of an innovating technical process or marketable formula wishes first and foremost to preserve his secret as long as possible... Usually, for marketing purposes, such a secret is transferred to a third party by confidentiality and non-disclosure covenants... But in spite of this widespread and profitable practice, without proof of tangible anteriority, the holder has no guaranty that his secret is a ***"personal property"*** or that he unquestionably is the Author of its formulas... It is one thing to be an alleged holder, but quite another to be an author, since one must be able to prove it...

The "Intellectual Passport C.B." establishes the author of a work (the owner) and also allows for secrecy when remaining unpublished. Thanks to the **ownership** of his work, the true author can, unlike the unidentified author who holds a secret, transact his commercial rights to third parties by signing confidential or non-confidential contracts of license or assignment. If such contracts are confidential, third parties cannot obtain the formula (*recipe or process*) without reproducing the original work by illegal means, including criminal acts, unfair competition, industrial espionage, etc. **Such criminal offences inevitably leave a trail leading to the wrongdoer who can then more easily be prosecuted.**

A third party who finds (*invents*) the same formula cannot safely claim authorship. In order to prove in Court that one is indeed the true originator of a work, and therefore its creator, sole and unique author, and consequently, the **exclusive and natural owner** of its contents, one must create a literary or artistic Work of the Mind, thereby **putting the expression of one's original idea into tangible form prior to anyone else**, and have it duly registered (if this can be done without publishing, as in Canada) as well as having an exact date of printing and editing.

Even in today's corporate world, when copyrighted material is involved, companies cannot freely distribute among their employees, subcontractors, sales representatives or customers, documents such as instruction manuals or software without paying the due price to the author in accordance with the number of persons using it¹.

¹ According to 34.1 (1) of the Canadian Patent Act (as follows) "*Any person may file with the Commissioner prior art, consisting of patents, applications for patents open to public inspection and printed publications, that the person believes has a bearing on the patentability of any claim in an application for a patent.*"

In fact, how can one create a mould or make a given part without plagiarizing the author's drawings when he has included them in his "*Intellectual Passport C.B.*"? Similarly, how can one set-up a technical or commercial system or disclose operating instructions that are included in an "*Intellectual Passport C.B.*" without plagiarizing the author's texts? Moreover, if trade secrets are defined in an "*Intellectual Passport C.B.*", how could one acquire and thereafter copy them without the risk of reprisal?

By using the "*Intellectual Passport C.B.*", the author **unquestionably** becomes the **owner of his secrets**; in other words, he enjoys a "**personal property**" both tangible and seizable (*see the Tri-Tex case*) that can clearly be attributed to his efforts.

Leading experts worldwide on intellectual property agree that intellectual creations which do not meet the criteria of patent, design patent or industrial design, for example, a recipe, a method and a formula, are presently the most difficult to defend in court against copiers of all kind. The "*Intellectual Passport C.B.*", being efficient and versatile, alleviates the aforementioned difficulties by providing unquestionable proof of ownership. The future belongs to truly "*liberal*" concepts, which allow greater freedom of expression and a healthier lifestyle. In this new century, the most democratic and affordable systems, namely, those that are open to the largest number of people, will enjoy the greatest success.

* * *

With regards to the texts of the present publication

The authors of the present publication aim first and foremost to liberalize access to intellectual property by making it affordable to the general public and to distribute its benefits equitably among people, in consideration of their material or moral interests, in accordance with articles 1, 17, 22 and 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

This published work is the result of its authors' research and analysis as well as a logical and philosophical approach used to formulate the criteria for validating a Work of the Mind, based on principles established by the Berne Convention and the Universal Convention on Copyright.

In accordance with the policy of Intellectual Property institutes and offices worldwide to disclaim responsibility of their texts in official documents, the information contained in the present work is for guidance purpose only, and should not be quoted or interpreted as texts of law. All or part of the present work can become obsolete at any time, without prior notice. The legal basis for this work can be found in the laws governing patents, design patents (industrial designs and/or models), trademarks and copyright, the regulations related thereto as well as the judicial interpretation of such texts by tribunals.

* * *

**For further information on
the *Intellectual Passport CB*,
visit our website at www.univention.ca**