Bell, Edison, Marconi, Tesla – these famed inventors had this in common

5 min read | 31 March 2026

Anton Hopen

Alexander Graham Bell's vision required mass production, cables and switchboards. Thomas Edison's lamp mattered at scale only once homes could be connected to generators. Patents did not create the underlying science, but they often gave backers a protected position from which they could justify the cost of finishing the job.

Patent history is often told as a parade of solitary geniuses, but the patent record shows something more complicated. In law, inventorship is claim-specific: joint inventors need not contribute equally, work together at the same time or contribute to every claim. Public memory asks a different question: who made the technology real? History therefore tends to attach a field to the person who supplied the last indispensable piece or the step that turned an idea – or a line of ideas – into a commercial reality.

Commercialisation blockbusters

That pattern does not diminish foundational research. Basic science, early prototypes and enabling discoveries build the scaffolding on which later inventors and investors climb. But commercialisation is expensive, risky and infrastructure heavy.

Here are some cases in point:

Flight
The history of flight illustrates the point. Before the Wright brothers' US Patent No 821,393, granted in 1906, the field already included patents by Reuben J Spalding, Otto Lilienthal and Octave Chanute. The aspiration to fly was not new. What the Wrights solved was control. They linked wing-warping with a movable rudder to address the turning instability that had frustrated earlier efforts. They did not invent the dream of human flight; they supplied the missing operational mechanism that made controlled, powered flight repeatable.

Light
The light bulb followed a similar path. Edison's US Patent No 223,898 for an electric lamp, granted in 1880, was preceded by patents from Henry Woodward, Sawyer and Man and Edison's own earlier improvement patent. Edison did not invent the concept of electric light. He became its public face because his design changes made the lamp reliable, safe and practical while the Menlo Park team also developed the surrounding system of switches, meters, wiring and power generation. He helped convert a promising experiment into a usable utility.

Telephone
Bell's telephone may be the clearest example because the lineage is visible in the title of the patent itself. Bell's US Patent No 174,465, granted in 1876, was not titled "telephone"; it was titled *Improvement in Telegraphy*. Before it came Morse's telegraph patent, Bell's own telegraph-related work and Elisha Gray's patents on transmitting sounds electrically. The telephone emerged from telegraphy, not from a vacuum. Bell is remembered because he carried that line across the final threshold from coded electrical signalling to commercially usable voice transmission.

Radio
Radio sharpens the lesson because public memory and patent law diverged. Before Guglielmo Marconi's US Patent No 763,772 for *Apparatus for Wireless Telegraphy*, granted in 1904, the field already included major contributions from Oliver Lodge, Nikola Tesla, John Stone and Marconi himself. In 1943, the US Supreme Court held invalid the claims in suit of Marconi's patent other than claim 16. Yet Marconi remains the cultural shorthand for radio because he became identified with successful wireless

enterprise. History attached the field to the actor nearest commercial success, even where the patent record was crowded and contested.

EVs

Electric vehicles show the same pattern in modern form. It is inaccurate to say that Elon Musk invented the electric car. EV technology long predates the auto maker Tesla and battery-pack engineering was being actively patented well before the current boom. What changed was the concentration of effort on the commercial bottleneck layer: pack assembly, battery mounting, liquid cooling and thermal-runaway mitigation. The decisive intellectual property was not the abstract idea of an electric car. It was the claim set that made the modern long-range EV safer, more manufacturable and more scalable.

Taken together, these examples point to the same conclusion: the highest-value patents often are not the earliest, broadest or most theoretical system patents in a field. More often, they are narrower claims on the last obstacle: a control method, a filament, a tuning architecture, a cooling loop, a safety mechanism or a packaging geometry. They govern the passage from bench to market, from prototype to product and from concept to company. That does not make foundational work less important; it makes it indispensable. But it does mean that the most commercially consequential patent may arrive later in the chronology and appear smaller in conceptual scope than the discoveries that made it possible.

Uncovering commercially decisive patents

For those managing invention, that suggests a more useful set of questions. The first is “What is novel”? The second – and often more commercially important – is “What obstacle disappeared because of this”? Did a result cross a threshold for stability, reproducibility, yield, safety, interoperability, latency or cost of goods? Did it make a device controllable, a material manufacturable, a therapy able to be dosed, a battery safe or a software architecture deployable? The commercially decisive patent often hides in that answer.

It also helps to think in ladders rather than disclosures. The first rung may be a foundational composition, method, algorithm or platform. Higher rungs may involve manufacturing, calibration, user control, data handling, systems integration or regulatory viability. Too many portfolios are built as though one early, broad filing will do all the work. History suggests otherwise. The stronger portfolio captures several rungs, especially the upper rungs closest to practical use.

Inventorship discipline matters here as well. Patent law does not award inventorship by authorship order, job title, lab seniority, public fame or managerial status. It asks who contributed to the conception of the claimed invention. Joint inventors need not contribute equally, and they need not contribute to every claim. The right questions are therefore concrete ones: who suggested the stabilising additive, the control loop, the cooling architecture, the interface sequence, the parameter window, the test method or the manufacturing step that made the system work? Those details decide inventorship and they are easily lost if the conversation begins only after publication, product launch or team turnover.

It is also worth treating “mere optimisation” with caution. Many inventions later viewed as finishing blows first looked incremental. Better filaments, linked control surfaces and battery cooling systems all sounded like engineering refinements until they became preconditions for market adoption. In software and systems work, the analogue may be a scheduling layer, a security mechanism, a deployment workflow or an integration architecture that turns a clever demonstration into a dependable product. The seemingly narrow patent may be the indispensable missing cog.

That is why basic science deserves patient, strategic stewardship. The first disclosure in a field may not be the one the world remembers and it may not command the greatest commercial leverage. But without it, nothing else happens. The better question for innovation leaders is not whether a discovery already looks like a finished business. It is whether it adds a rung on the ladder and whether someone can later claim – or partner to claim – the rung that turns the ladder into a bridge.

The patent system exists in significant part to support that final, expensive passage. History celebrates the last yard. Society benefits from the entire drive.

Anton Hopen

Shareholder
Trenam Law
ahopen@trenam.com