The window of patentability for new technology should be +/- 25 years.

That is, patents for new technologies should be subject to particularly stringent criteria for the first 50 years. The reason is that new applications for a new technology will be blindingly obvious for the top 5% of practitioners in a new field for at least a few decades.

I say this not as an idle bystander but as the applicant for Patent US20020067405 which has been cited recently by HP, Sony and Logitech, which I think of as the "Star Trek communicator patent".

Yes it sucks that this was denied to me for specious reasons though it had more legitimacy than 99% of the crappy patents granted to large corps for the last 10 years in the internet/ui space.

The point is that a patent in this new area is not as valid as a new dog ball thrower or a new spring or whathaveyou mechanical thingy which have had hundreds of years for intellects to innovate on.

So, for the first fifty years of a new technology (internet, 3d printing, genetics, etc) if the patent requires a phd degree to *understand* (not to formulate, eg public key encryption) then yeah, patent that thing. Otherwise, put it on the back burner.

You ripped me off for millions of dollars, (but I'm still rich),

Jim