SRYAHWA PUBLICATIONS

Journal of Law and Judicial System
ISSN: 2637-5893 | Volume 8, Issue 1, 2025
https://doi.org/10.22259/2637-5893.0801001

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Innovation Over Protection - Competitive Advantage in the French Fashion Industry

Hab. Dr. Marlena Jankowska[1], Hab. Dr. Mirosław Pawełczyk[2], Prof. Dr. José Geraldo Romanello Bueno[3]

[1]*Assoc. Prof., Director of the Center for Design, Fashion and Advertisement Law at the University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland.*
[2]*Assoc. Prof., Director of the Research Center for Public Competition Law and Sectoral Regulations at the University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland.*
[3]*Mackenzie Presbyterian University in São Paulo, Brazil; Member of the Center for Design, Fashion and Advertisement Law at the University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland.*

Received: 05 May 2025 Accepted: 19 May 2025 Published: 20 May 2025

Corresponding Author: Hab. Dr. Marlena Jankowska, Assoc. Prof., Director of the Center for Design, Fashion and Advertisement Law at the University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland.

Abstract

The French fashion industry—spanning from 19th-century haute couture to contemporary practices—has thrived on relentless innovation despite only modest formal intellectual property (IP) protection for fashion design. This article explores how legal frameworks historically afforded limited protection to fashion creations, and why fashion has nonetheless sustained competitive advantage through innovation. We begin by examining the historical establishment of intellectual property law and its incomplete coverage of fashion design, highlighting the *piracy paradox* whereby copying fails to stifle (and may even spur) creativity. We then discuss the development of innovation theory, including the Oslo Manual's typology of product, process, marketing, and organizational innovation, and relate these concepts (as well as architectural, disruptive, incremental, and radical innovation) to the fashion sector. Next, we trace the legal and institutional evolution of France's fashion industry—from Charles Frederick Worth and the 1868 founding of the Chambre Syndicale de la Couture Parisienne, through the 20th-century efforts to combat design piracy, to the modern Fédération de la Haute Couture et de la Mode. Using strategic management lenses (Porter's competitive advantage theories, Barney's resource-based view, Teece's dynamic capabilities and appropriability framework), we analyze how French fashion houses leverage innovation in lieu of strong IP: through continuous creative renewal, process and business-model breakthroughs, branding, and reputational capital (Porter, 1990; Porter, 1998; Barney, 1991). Detailed case studies of key innovators (Worth's haute couture establishment, Zara's fast fashion revolution, and Iris van Herpen's tech-driven couture) illustrate how different forms of innovation have conferred sustained competitive advantages while legal protections remained limited. We find that French fashion's dominance has been maintained by turning creativity, speed, and brand prestige into effective substitutes for formal IP rights. In closing, we emphasize how legal gaps in design protection have been filled by strategic innovation, clever organizational practices, and the cultivation of intangible assets, thereby offering insights for creative industries at large.

1. Introduction

Paris has long been regarded as the world's fashion capital, from the gilded salons of Second Empire haute couture to the runways of today (Nystrom 1928; Grumbach, & de Baudry, 2001). French fashion houses have led global style and generated tremendous economic value (Barthes, 1967). Yet paradoxically, the core creative output of fashion—apparel designs—has

Citation: Hab. Dr. Marlena Jankowska, Hab. Dr. Mirosław Pawełczyk, Prof. Dr. José Geraldo Romanello Bueno. Innovation Over Protection-Competitive Advantage in the French Fashion Industry. Journal of Law and Judicial System. 2025;8(1):1-24.

traditionally enjoyed weak formal protection under intellectual property (IP) law (Raustiala & Sprigman, 2006). Unlike music, literature, or inventions, fashion designs for much of modern history fell outside the strongest IP regimes. Copycats could legally reproduce couture garments with impunity in many jurisdictions, a situation seemingly at odds with standard IP theory, which assumes that strong exclusivity is needed to incentivize innovation (Raustiala & Sprigman, 2006). This raises a central question: **how has the French fashion industry sustained innovation and competitive advantage in a low-IP environment?**

Scholars have described this counterintuitive phenomenon as a *low-IP equilibrium* in which fashion's rapid innovation cycle continues undeterred by copying. Raustiala and Sprigman famously dubbed it the *piracy paradox* – the idea that rampant copying in fashion does not destroy, and may even stimulate, creativity and sales (Raustiala & Sprigman, 2006). While other creative industries lobby for ever-stronger IP, the fashion world historically tolerated copying as a fact of life. Indeed, the industry's relative quiescence on pushing for design copyrights or patents stands in stark contrast to the aggressive anti-piracy efforts seen in music or film. At the same time, legal scholars like Hemphill and Suk have argued that the lack of protection distorts innovation incentives—pushing designers toward status-driven branding over purely creative expression—and call for *narrow* design protections to curb outright knockoffs (Hemphill & Gersen, 2009). This article situates itself in this debate, examining the historical and strategic dynamics that allowed French fashion to flourish through innovation with only limited formal IP shields.

We adopt an interdisciplinary approach, drawing on legal history, innovation theory, and strategic management. Part I provides background on the evolution of intellectual property law and why its traditional contours did not fully accommodate fashion design. We review how early French law treated fashion (e.g. the 1793 law of artistic property) and the industry's efforts to secure legal protections for designs. We also introduce the Oslo Manual and related innovation frameworks to clarify what we mean by "innovation" in fashion—encompassing not just new products, but process innovations, marketing and organizational innovations, and degrees of novelty (incremental to radical). Part II examines the development of France's fashion institutions (such as the Chambre Syndicale and the Fédération de la Haute Couture) (Koutsopoulou, 2017) and how they fostered an ecosystem of creativity and self-regulation in lieu of robust IP law. Part III applies strategic theories to explain how French fashion firms have converted innovation into sustained competitive advantage. Concepts like Porter's differentiation and clusters, Barney's resource-based view (with brand and know-how as VRIN resources), and Teece's notions of complementary assets and dynamic capabilities are used to analyze fashion's success factors. We illustrate these ideas in Part IV through case studies spanning 150 years: **Charles Frederick Worth**, an Englishman in Paris who in the 1800s effectively *invented* haute couture with business-model and marketing innovations; **Zara**, the Spanish fast-fashion retailer (a modern industry disrupter relevant to French fashion as a comparator) that competes via process innovation rather than design IP; and **Iris van Herpen**, a Dutch couturier showing in Paris whose technologically avant-garde creations exemplify radical innovation in design. Through these cases, we see concrete examples of how innovation – whether in design, production, or branding – provides a competitive edge that legal monopolies have not. Finally, Part V discusses how French fashion's players mitigate IP gaps by leveraging alternative mechanisms: branding and trademarks, rapid product cycles, secrecy and lead-time advantages, and cultivation of reputational capital. We conclude that the French fashion industry's historical experience offers a compelling model of innovation-driven growth in a creative field where formal IP protection remains relatively weak. This has implications not only for fashion law and policy (such as current debates over design rights) but also for other creative industries navigating the balance between imitation and innovation.

2. Methodology

This study employs a qualitative, interdisciplinary methodology appropriate for a legal-academic inquiry into historical and strategic phenomena (Jankowska, 2023). We conducted a literature review of scholarly works in law (focusing on fashion law and IP), business strategy, innovation studies, fashion history, and cultural sociology. Dozens of academic articles, legal cases, historical texts, and industry reports were analyzed to trace the co-evolution of law, innovation, and competition in the fashion sector. In the legal-historical analysis, we consulted primary legal sources (statutes, cases) and secondary scholarship to understand how French intellectual property law developed with respect to fashion design (e.g. the 19th-century design registration laws, the 20th-century French IP Code provisions on fashion). For the innovation theory portion, we drew upon authoritative frameworks like the **OECD's Oslo Manual** for innovation definitions and typologies (Kamplimath, 2018), as well as seminal works on disruptive innovation, incremental vs. radical change, and other classifications. In applying strategic management theory, we referenced key conceptual works (Michael Porter on competitive advantage, Jay Barney on the resource-based view, David Teece on profiting from innovation and dynamic capabilities) and where possible, connected these theories to the fashion industry via existing case studies or examples.

Additionally, we undertook case study analyses of three fashion companies/designers (Worth, Zara, and van Herpen) chosen for their illustrative value across different eras and segments of the industry. Each case study synthesizes information from historical accounts, business analyses, and interviews or profiles (where available) to identify the specific innovations introduced and how those translated into sustained advantage. This multi-case approach allows a comparative perspective: e.g., contrasting a 19th-century haute couture house with a 21st-century fast fashion retailer highlights both differences and continuities in the role of innovation. By integrating these diverse methodologies—legal analysis, theoretical synthesis, and case studies—our aim is to produce a comprehensive understanding of the French fashion industry's innovation ecosystem. The findings are therefore interpretive and analytical, building an argument about innovation's primacy in fashion's competitive strategy, rather than empirical in the statistical sense. Nonetheless, the wide range of sources ensures that our conclusions are well-supported by existing knowledge across multiple disciplines.

3. The Historical Disconnect Between IP Law and Fashion Design

3.1 Evolution of Intellectual Property Law and Its Limits for Fashion

Modern intellectual property law took shape in the 18th and 19th centuries with the goal of incentivizing creativity and innovation by granting creators exclusive rights. Copyright protected authors and artists; patents protected inventors. Fashion, however, occupied an uncertain place in this scheme. Clothing designs were creative works, yet also utilitarian items of apparel, making them hard to fit into traditional IP categories. Early French law did extend legal recognition to designs in certain forms – indeed, France has one of the oldest traditions of design protection. As early as the 15th century, there were privileges for textile patterns (Reichman, 1983). The watershed *Decree of 19–24 July 1793* (during the French Revolution) established the concept of artistic property as a national right and extended legal protections to designs as *pure art* (Reichman, 1983; Jankowska et al., 2023; Jankowska et al., 2024). This 1793 law is often cited as the foundation of French copyright, and it theoretically could cover fashion sketches or ornamentation as works of art. In practice, however, applying copyright to garments was challenging—fashion designs were often seen as applied or industrial art, not "high" art worthy of protection (Pouillard, 2016; Jankowska et al., 2023; Jankowska et al., 2024). Throughout the 19th century, France and other nations experimented with design-specific statutes. France enacted a design law in 1806 and another in 1909 refining *sui generis* protections for industrial designs and applied arts (Reichman, 1983). These laws allowed creators to register designs (including clothing designs) for a form of design patent or copyright. Yet enforcement was limited and expensive, and fast-changing seasonal fashions did not lend themselves easily to the slow process of registration. By the late 1800s, copying of Paris couture by foreign dressmakers had become rampant, to the frustration of French couturiers. Legal treatises of the time catalogued numerous cases of couture piracy (Pouillard, 2016), but also indicate that case law was in its infancy and courts were only beginning to grapple with how to treat fashion under IP law (Lipovetsky, 2002).

Notably, French designers did find some protection by invoking general copyright principles. The French Intellectual Property Code (*Code de la Propriété Intellectuelle*), especially after the mid-20th century, came to recognize that "any creation can be protected by copyright provided it is original", regardless of medium (Codevelle & Dimidjian-Lecomte, 2021). In fact, modern French law explicitly lists "creations of the seasonal clothing and fashion industries" as eligible works (Article L.112-2(14) CPI) (The Fashion Law, 2025). This means that today, in theory, an original haute couture design or even a ready-to-wear garment design can instantly be protected under French copyright (without registration), enjoying full term protection (life of the author plus 70 years) (The Fashion Law, 2025; Koutsopoulou 2017; Jankowska et al., 2023; Jankowska et al., 2024). That protection is broader than the EU-wide design rights (which offer at most 3 years for unregistered designs) (The Fashion Law, 2025).. French courts have indeed upheld copyright claims for fashion designs in cases against fast-fashion retailers – for example, in *Vanessa Bruno v. Zara* (2012) and *Céline v. Zara* (2013), Paris courts found that even relatively simple dress and shirt designs met the originality threshold and held Zara liable for infringement (The Fashion Law, 2025). These cases show that France takes design copying seriously and can vindicate designers' rights, especially in the luxury sphere.

However, despite these legal provisions, significant *practical gaps* remain. First, not every garment will qualify as *original* in the eyes of a court – many fashion designs borrow trends and have only subtle uniqueness, making outcomes uncertain. Second, enforcement internationally is difficult; a French couturier might stop a local Paris knockoff, but copies in other countries (like the United States, where utilitarian aspects of clothing are categorically denied copyright) may face no legal barrier. Third, the fashion cycle is so rapid that by the time a lawsuit concludes, the market has moved on. As a result, historically the onus fell on designers to protect themselves through their own strategies rather than rely on legal remedies. In the United States, the *status quo* has been even less protective: U.S. copyright law explicitly excludes "useful articles" like clothing from protection unless they contain separable artwork (e.g. a graphic print) (Jankowska, 2023). Various attempts were made to introduce a narrow fashion design copyright in the U.S. (so-called Design Piracy Prohibition Acts), but none passed. European law, by contrast, introduced unregistered Community Design rights in 2002, giving designers across the EU (including France) an automatic 3-year protection for new designs (Barzanò & Zanardo, 2019). This was a recognition by policymakers that industries like fashion needed some protection that was fast and easy to obtain. The unregistered design right has been used by some European designers to go after blatant knockoffs (its short duration tailored to fashion's quick turnover). Still, the fact remains that beyond these limited measures, most fashion design elements (cuts, silhouettes, concepts) can be freely copied once they are on the market. Trademark law protects brand names and logos—but not the cut of a dress. Patent law is seldom applicable, except for truly novel functional features (e.g., a new type of fabric or wearable technology).

3.2 Fashion's "Piracy Paradox". Innovation Under Weak IP

The mismatch between fashion's creative output and formal IP protection led scholars to observe that fashion is part of copyright's *negative space* – an area of creativity that thrives largely *outside* IP law. In their influential 2006 article, Kal Raustiala and Christopher Sprigman asked why the fashion industry remains "mostly unprotected – and economically successful", defying the orthodox IP argument that copying kills innovation. They concluded that the fashion world operates in a **low-IP equilibrium** in which copying does *not* suppress innovation and may in fact promote it. This *piracy paradox* rests on two key dynamics in fashion: *induced obsolescence* and *anchoring* (Raustiala & Sprigman, 2006). *Induced obsolescence* refers to the idea that the very act of widespread copying of a trend helps to render it "out of fashion" by making it too common, thereby spurring fashion leaders to create the next new trend. In other words, when a couture style is knocked off and floods the mass market, the prestige of the original is diminished and status-seeking consumers move on to something fresh—driving the perpetual cycle of seasonal change. *Anchoring* refers to the role of high-end designs as anchors for trends: a couture design gives aesthetic direction that others follow, creating a cascading effect that actually amplifies the influence of the original design. Both phenomena suggest that a certain level of copying is not only tolerated but woven into fashion's modus operandi. As Raustiala & Sprigman put it, "copying functions as an important element of… the industry's swift cycle of innovation", perhaps even a "necessary predicate" for it (Raustiala & Sprigman, 2006). The rapid turnover in styles ensures that fashion firms continue to invest in new designs despite copies, because last season's look becomes valueless to trendsetting consumers once it proliferates.

Of course, not everyone agrees that this equilibrium is optimal. Some legal analysts argue that the lack of design protection *does* skew the kinds of innovation we get. C. Scott Hemphill and Jeannie Suk, for instance, acknowledge fashion's creativity but contend that the current legal regime (protecting trademarks but not designs) "distorts innovation in fashion away from [expressive design] and toward status and luxury aspects" (Hemphill & Gersen, 2009; Ott, 2018). In their view, because designers know their specific dress design can be copied, they put more emphasis on building brand cachet, logos, and other inimitable status symbols (which *are* protectable, via trademark or trade dress). This arguably shifts innovation towards marketing and branding (making bags with recognizable logos, signature looks tied to a brand identity) and away from pure design experimentation.

Hemphill and Suk advocate for a limited protection against close copies to preserve the incentive for creative design innovation while still allowing the trend diffusion and *remix* culture that drives fashion cycles (Hemphill & Gersen, 2009). Their stance highlights a tension: is the fashion industry creatively rich *because* of weak IP (as the piracy paradox implies), or does it innovate *in spite of* weak IP, by relying on alternative safeguards?

3.3 French Industry Self-Regulation and Early Enforcement Efforts

Well before modern design laws or scholarly debates, the French fashion industry took matters into its own hands. Paris couturiers in the late 19th and early 20th centuries formed collective institutions to combat piracy and preserve their creative leadership (Richardson & Thomas, 2012). The **Chambre Syndicale de la Couture Parisienne**, founded in 1868, was in part a response to design copying and a means to lobby for legal recognition (Pouillard, 2016). By the interwar period (1920s–30s), the Chambre Syndicale's agenda was dominated by intellectual property concerns. Archival research by Véronique Pouillard shows that "the protection of intellectual property rights (IPRs) was, along with stabilization of the workforce, the most pressing [issue] on the Chambre's agenda during the interwar period" (Pouillard, 2016). In 1921, the Chambre Syndicale created an internal **Service of Defense against the Copying of Models** (*Service de Défense contre la copie des modèles*) (Pouillard, 2016). This committee pooled resources to pursue copyists and sought to "federate enterprises in the fight against copying" on the logic that collective action would be more effective (Pouillard, 2016). That same year, legendary couturière **Madeleine Vionnet** took a bold public stand against piracy (Jankowska et al., 2023). With her lawyer Louis Dangel, Vionnet began suing known copyists and even helped establish the **Association pour la Protection des Arts Plastiques et Appliqués** (Association for the Protection of the Applied and Plastic Arts) (Pouillard, 2016). This association welcomed not just fashion houses but other design industries (textile weavers, embroiderers) and launched press campaigns highlighting the problem of design theft (Pouillard, 2016). Notably, the association found ways to use existing laws—invoking the 1793 artistic property law—to conduct raids against counterfeiters. Under an old provision, couturiers could ask the police to seize pirated garments as evidence, which Vionnet's association did, and they successfully pushed to have such cases treated as criminal matters (fr. *en correctionnelle*) rather than mere commercial disputes (Pouillard, 2016). These efforts bore fruit: during the interwar years, "piracy of couture was incrementally criminalized in France", lawsuits by designers multiplied, and penalties for counterfeiters increased (Pouillard, 2016; Koutsopoulou 2017; (Richardson & Thomas, 2012). By the 1930s, proposed new legislation to strengthen design protection was being drafted with input from fashion leaders (e.g. Armand Trouyet, Vionnet's managing director, who had a legal background). In short, decades before any formal "fashion law" existed, French couture houses were actively shaping a de facto IP regime through private regulation and pushing the boundaries of general laws to cover their creations (Richardson & Thomas, 2012; Jankowska et al., 2023; Jankowska et al., 2024).

Despite these advances, complete legal protection remained out of reach. Some couturiers grew cynical about the law's efficacy and instead doubled down on innovation speed as defense. A striking example is designer **Marcel Rochas**, who in the 1930s eschewed reliance on lawsuits and "adopted a very modern method: the fast-paced renewal of his collections" (Pouillard, 2016). Rather than expending energy in court, Rochas aimed to *stay a step ahead* of copyists by constantly introducing new designs—essentially the same strategy that the fashion industry at large follows today. This anecdote reinforces a key theme: innovation itself became the fashion industry's shield. If a design would be knocked off inevitably, best to render the copycats moot by the arrival of the next trend.

Thus, historically, French fashion operated in a landscape of *limited formal IP* but *robust informal mechanisms*. Strong industry associations, a culture of secrecy before debuting collections, and norms of attributing leadership to Paris originals all helped mitigate the free-for-all of copying (Nystrom, 1928). At the same time, the openness of designs to copying meant that French fashion had to continuously reinvent itself to maintain its aura of exclusivity and creativity (Barthes, 1967). As we shall see, this imperative to innovate continuously is deeply ingrained in the industry's structure and strategies.

3.4 Innovation Typologies and the Oslo Manual. Innovation Theory and Fashion

To analyze how innovation drives competitive advantage in French fashion, it is useful to clarify what "innovation" encompasses. The term can conjure images of scientific breakthroughs or Silicon Valley tech, but innovation broadly means any novel idea or practice successfully implemented to create value. The **Oslo Manual**, first published by the OECD in 1992, was created precisely to define and measure innovation across industries and countries (OECD, 2018). It provides a systematic typology of innovation that extends beyond R&D labs. According to the Oslo Manual (2005 edition), there are four broad types of innovation: **product, process, marketing,** and **organizational** innovation (Kamplimath, 2018). All four have clear analogs in the fashion industry:

3.4.1 Product Innovation

"A good or service that is new or significantly improved" in its characteristics or intended uses (Kamplimath, 2018; OECD, 2018). In fashion, a product innovation might be a new style of garment or accessory – for example, the introduction of the **"New Look" by Christian Dior in 1947** (featuring dramatically cinched waists and full skirts) was a radical product innovation in women's apparel silhouette after WWII rationing. Product innovation in fashion need not involve new materials (though it can, such as the first use of synthetic fabrics like nylon in couture), but rather new designs, cuts, or aesthetic features that set a trend. Even small design changes can count as product innovations if they significantly alter the consumer experience or define a new trend (e.g. introducing the mini-skirt in the 1960s was a major fashion product innovation credited to designers like Mary Quant and André Courrèges).

3.4.2 Process Innovation

"A new or significantly improved production or delivery method" (Kamplimath, 2018; OECD, 2018). In fashion, process innovations have been transformative. A prime example is **fast fashion** production pioneered by companies like Zara. Traditional fashion production had long lead times (often 4–12 months from design to retail delivery), but Zara innovated a process to go "from idea to appearance in store in 15 days", which is *twelve times faster* than the old model (Gallaugher, 2008). This involved just-in-time manufacturing, vertical integration of the supply chain, use of digital design systems, and rapid logistics. Another process innovation in fashion history was the introduction of the **sewing machine** in the mid-19th century, which dramatically sped up garment making (Worth himself embraced machine-sewn techniques) (Joseph, 2014). More recent process innovations include **3D printing of garments** (as used by Iris van Herpen for intricate designs) and the use of AI for demand forecasting. Process innovations typically aim at reducing cost, increasing speed, or improving quality consistency in how fashion is produced and delivered.

3.4.3 Marketing Innovation

"A new marketing method involving significant changes in product design or packaging, product placement, promotion or pricing" (Kamplimath, 2018; OECD, 2018). Fashion is as much about marketing as making clothes. The **fashion show** itself was a marketing innovation—Charles Worth was the first to use live models and put on organized showings of seasonal collections for clients, which was revolutionary in the 1860s (Joseph, 2014; Evans 2013). Today, fashion marketing innovations include leveraging social media influencers, immersive digital runway shows (like virtual reality presentations), and novel retail concepts (pop-up shops, "see now, buy now" runway-to-retail in days). Even the practice of *branding* designers' names on tags (pioneered by Worth *who was also the first to use labels on his clothes* (Fondation Napoléon) is a marketing innovation that helped establish brand identity and customer loyalty. Luxury fashion houses have innovated pricing and product-line strategies too—for instance, launching "diffusion" lines or collaborations (e.g., H&M's collaborations with high-end designers) to reach new markets without diluting the core brand.

3.4.4 Organizational Innovation

"A new organizational method in business practices, workplace organization or external relations" (Kamplimath, 2018; OECD, 2018). In fashion, one could point to the formation of **fashion conglomerates** as an organizational innovation. The creation of LVMH Moët Hennessy–Louis Vuitton in 1987, merging multiple luxury brands under one corporate group, was innovative in how it organized brands to share resources and global distribution while maintaining distinct creative identities (Ott, 2018). It gave luxury houses stronger footing to compete internationally and invest in innovation. Another example is the **establishment of formal fashion councils and schedules** (e.g., the official Paris Fashion Week calendar coordinated by the Fédération de la Haute Couture et de la Mode). By organizing how and when collections are shown and creating collective platforms for promotion, the French industry innovated the institution of seasonal fashion "weeks" that now exist in cities worldwide. Internally, many fashion firms have adopted new organizational practices like co-design with customers, agile design teams, or interdisciplinary collaborations (fashion designers working directly with technologists or artists within the firm). These count as organizational innovations when they depart from traditional hierarchies of couture ateliers.

3.5 Other Categories of Innovation

In addition to these four Oslo Manual categories, innovation literature provides other useful lenses:

3.5.1 Incremental vs. Radical Innovation

Incremental innovations are minor improvements or tweaks to existing products/processes, while radical innovations are fundamental changes that depart from what came before. Fashion has plenty of incremental innovation – each season, designers make small adjustments (a new color palette, a slightly modified silhouette) building on prior trends. *Radical fashion innovation*, by contrast, might be something like the first time trousers were introduced for women's mainstream fashion (a significant break from convention), or Iris van Herpen's 3D-printed dresses which had no precedent in traditional hand-sewn couture. One study defines radical fashions as those that "represent a clear break from the old designs, as opposed to incremental fashions, which are an extension or evolution of the old designs" (Zhang & Di Benedetto, 2010). Interestingly, in fashion, many radical designs initially appear only on runways or in avant-garde shows and may *never enter the market at all*, existing more as artistic statements (Zhang & Di Benedetto, 2010). But some radical innovations do diffuse – e.g., **punk style** in the 1970s was a radical street innovation that eventually influenced mainstream fashion. The French couture tradition often embraces radical, artistic fashions (which may end up in museums) alongside more wearable incremental changes. Successful fashion houses manage a balance: they introduce enough novelty to be exciting (sometimes even *radical fashion* as pure spectacle), while also offering incremental updates that consumers will actually buy. The continuous interplay of incremental and occasional radical change keeps fashion moving forward.

3.5.2 Architectural Innovation

As defined by Henderson and Clark (1990), architectural innovation involves reconfiguring existing components in new ways, without necessarily making radical changes to the components themselves. In a fashion context, we might interpret this as combining familiar elements of garments in an unconventional structure. For example, a designer might take well-known garment pieces (lapels, sleeves, pockets) but arrange proportions or construction in a novel architecture that surprises – such as Comme des Garçons creating a coat that is deconstructed and reassembled in asymmetric ways. French haute couture has historically been a site of such architectural play (think of structural innovations by designers like Pierre Cardin or Thierry Mugler, who took traditional tailoring and gave it futuristic structures). Architectural innovation often catches established competitors off-guard because it changes the *relationship* between parts of a design more than the parts themselves; couture designers excel at this by introducing new silhouettes through creative pattern-cutting and draping.

3.5.3 Disruptive Innovation

Popularized by Clayton Christensen, disruptive innovation refers to a new approach that starts by serving a low-end or emerging market and eventually upends existing players. **Fast fashion** can be viewed as a disruptive innovation relative to the traditional designer fashion business. Companies like Zara and H&M entered the market with cheap, trendy clothing appealing to cost-sensitive, younger consumers—segments that luxury brands did not serve. Over time, their model of ultra-fast, demand-driven production changed consumer expectations across the board ("new styles every week") and pressured even higher-end fashion to adjust (many luxury brands have had to increase the number of collections or capsule drops per year). The incumbent haute couture and luxury RTW brands were not *disrupted* out of existence (they occupy a different tier), but the middle of the market and traditional department stores were heavily disrupted by fast fashion's rise. Another possible disruption on the horizon is **digital fashion** (virtual garments for avatars) which could eventually change how physical fashion is consumed, though that remains nascent. In France, couture remained an elite niche, but *prêt-à-porter* (ready-to-wear) designers had to adapt in the face of disruptive fast-fashion trends by emphasizing what fast fashion cannot imitate as well: higher quality, heritage, and truly distinctive design. It is notable that some French brands actually partnered with fast-fashion via collaborations (like Karl Lagerfeld and later Jean-Paul Gaultier designing limited lines for H&M) – essentially co-opting the disruption as a marketing innovation.

3.5.4 Open and Collaborative Innovation

While not explicitly in the user's list, modern innovation theory also stresses open innovation (sharing and co-creating with outside partners) and user-driven innovation. Fashion has elements of this too: luxury brands now engage with streetwear designers (e.g., Louis Vuitton collaborating with Supreme) which is a form of open, cross-industry innovation (and indeed, bringing streetwear aesthetics into luxury was a major innovation of the 2010s). French brands have increasingly embraced collaborations (e.g., Dior with artist Kaws, or Gucci with The North Face) – these marketing/creative collaborations can be seen as new ways to innovate by recombining brand DNAs.

In summary, the Oslo Manual's broad categories help us see that **innovation in fashion is multifaceted**. It's not only about designing a new dress (product innovation); it can be innovating how that dress is made (process), how it's sold or presented (marketing), or how the fashion house is structured to create it (organizational). French fashion has been a pioneer on all these fronts at different times. Understanding these innovation typologies provides a framework for our later discussion on how they confer competitive advantage and substitute for formal IP. For instance, if copyists appropriate a French designer's *product* innovation (the design itself), the house often compensates by excelling in *process* innovation (getting the next design out faster) or *marketing* innovation (strengthening the brand so that consumers still prefer the original). Before delving into strategy theory, we will first look at how France's fashion institutions evolved, since they often set the stage for innovation to happen.

4. Evolution of France's Fashion Industry Institutions. From Haute Couture Syndicate to Global Fashion Capital

The dominance of French fashion did not happen by accident; it was built through institutions and deliberate efforts that fostered both innovation and exclusivity. Key among these was the development of **haute couture** as a regulated industry centered in Paris.

4.1 The Birth of Haute Couture and Charles Worth's Innovations

Modern French fashion's institutional foundations are commonly traced to **Charles Frederick Worth** (1825–1895), often called "the father of haute couture". An Englishman who established his fashion house in Paris in 1858, Worth revolutionized dressmaking from a local craft into an internationally influential art-business. His innovations laid the template for haute couture houses and gave Paris a competitive edge for decades. Worth's contributions include:

4.2 Establishing the Couture House Model

Prior to Worth, dressmakers often created custom clothing in a somewhat ad hoc manner, and aristocratic clients might dictate styles. Worth turned his *maison* (house) into a creative enterprise where *he* dictated fashion. He prepared seasonal collections of designs which he showed on **live models** to clients—Worth "was the first to replace fashion dolls with live models" for showing garments (Evans, 2013). This was essentially the first fashion show. Clients would select designs and have them tailor-made to their measurements. This model of seasonal presentation followed by client orders became a standard for couture. It introduced a new *rhythm* to the fashion business (spring/summer and fall/winter collections), which structured the cycle of innovation.

4.3 Aggressive Self-Promotion and Brand Creation

Worth understood the power of his name as a brand. He was reportedly the first designer to **sew branded labels into his clothing**, guaranteeing that those in the know could identify a genuine "Worth" gown. In an era before trademark law was robust, this was a form of IP – the reputation attached to the label deterred some imitation and ensured that Worth got credit for his creations. His fame spread beyond court circles as his name was trumpeted in fashion magazines by the 1870s. Worth's high-profile clientele (Empress Eugénie, wife of Napoleon III, was a patron) and strategic use of media gave Paris fashion unprecedented prestige. In effect, he transformed the *person* of the designer into a celebrity and arbiter of taste. As one historian, George Walden, noted, "Worth dictated fashion in France a century and a half before Galliano"– highlighting that he wielded influence over styles much as star designers do today (Milliner-Waddell, 2017).

4.4 New Distribution Techniques and Global Reach

Perhaps surprisingly, Worth was also innovative in *distribution and business strategy*. He realized that serving only individual elite clients in Paris limited his reach, so he found ways to profit from selling his designs abroad. As early as 1855, Worth "agreed to sell some of his most original 'models' to foreign buyers with the right to distribute them commercially wherever they wanted" (Fondation Napoléon). In other words, he licensed or sold replicas of his designs to department stores and dressmakers in other countries. By the mid-1860s, Worth creations were found across Europe and had "reached the American market" (Fondation Napoléon). This was an innovative response to inevitable copying: if foreign dressmakers were going to imitate Paris fashions anyway, Worth figured out how to supply them directly (for a fee), thus commercializing his innovation beyond the Paris elite. He famously said, "My business is not only to execute but especially to invent. My invention is the secret of my success. I don't want people to invent for themselves; if they did I should lose half my trade" (Fondation Napoléon). This quote encapsulates his strategy: keep the inventive lead, and rather than have others create their own versions, feed them your designs (capturing value from being the innovator). It's an early articulation of what we might today call an **appropriability strategy** – using lead-time and licensing as ways to profit from innovation in a low-IP regime. Worth was essentially leveraging his *complementary assets* (his design reputation and Parisian workshops) to dominate fashion distribution, a logic consistent with Teece's later theories (which we will discuss in the strategy section).

4.5 Exclusivity and High Quality

Worth's atelier set unmatched standards of quality in fabrics and construction. He had "lavish fabrics and trimmings" and paid great "attention to fit". Clients came to Paris to obtain the *authentic* article. By uniting exceptional craft with innovative design, Worth ensured that copies (usually of cheaper make) did not diminish the desire for his originals among those who could afford them. This combination of creativity and quality established the enduring *value proposition* of haute couture: the allure of owning a fashion innovation in its highest form.

4.6 Institutional Leadership

Worth also played a role in the broader organization of the industry. In 1868, fashion houses in Paris formed the aforementioned Chambre Syndicale. Worth was a founding member and early president of this guild of couturiers (Pouillard, 2016). The Chambre Syndicale set rules for members (e.g., collection showing dates, number of models, etc.) and helped defend against design piracy. Having a collective body enhanced Paris's ability to maintain leadership and coordinate on issues like setting calendars that foreign buyers would attend. It also allowed for group lobbying for legal protections. Worth's influence thus extended to shaping the *institutional environment* that nurtured innovation by protecting member interests and promoting Paris fashion as a whole.

By the time of Worth's death in 1895, the *House of Worth* was a huge enterprise (employing 1,200 people and serving royalty and wealthy clients worldwide). More importantly, he established **Paris** as the apex of fashion innovation—a status that French institutions carefully guarded into the 20th century. Worth's heirs and other couturiers continued the tradition, and Paris remained the place where new fashions debuted first, with a *trickle-down* effect to the rest of the world. This trickle-down pattern was even theorized by sociologist **Georg Simmel**, who in 1904 observed that "fashion is a form of imitation and so of social equalization, but, paradoxically, in changing incessantly it differentiates one time from another and one social stratum from another" (Simmel, 1957). Simmel essentially described how elite fashions (originating in places like Paris) are imitated by broader society, causing the elite to move on to the next new thing—capturing the same cycle of imitation and differentiation that drives constant innovation (the same idea behind the piracy paradox, articulated decades before).

5. Mid-20th Century. Formalizing Haute Couture and Adapting to New Markets

Moving into the 20th century, particularly after World War I, the French fashion industry had to adapt to social changes and new competition (e.g., the rise of American sportswear designers, the emergence of haute couture in other countries). In response, French institutions evolved.

5.1 The Chambre Syndicale's Role Grows

During the interwar period, as noted, the Chambre Syndicale took strong actions on labor issues and IP. In 1937, its president Lucien Lelong rallied members to unite and redefine the profession of *couturier*, emphasizing that every house large or small is rooted in *creativity* (Pouillard, 2016). The organization helped weather the Great Depression by maintaining solidarity and shared standards. A fascinating detail: to guard against piracy, the Chambre Syndicale even controlled fashion show access—buyers were vetted, photographers sometimes banned, and clients had to present credentials. There were tales of "cameras hidden in handbags" and "unauthorized sketching" by spies, which the houses tried to thwart with guarded salons (Pouillard, 2016). Such anecdotes show the constant cat-and-mouse of protecting new designs long enough for them to reach legitimate buyers first.

5.2 1945 - Legal Recognition of "Haute Couture"

After WWII, the French government (recognizing fashion's cultural and economic value) took a remarkable step by legally defining *haute couture* as a protected appellation. In 1945, an ordinance established the designation of origin "Haute Couture" and regulated which houses could use it (Jankowska, 2023; FHCM, n.d.). Only companies approved by a commission (under the Ministry of Industry) and meeting certain criteria (e.g., hand-made garments, a minimum number of employees in workshops, presentation of collections of a certain size twice a year) can call themselves *haute couture* (Jankowska, 2023; FHCM, n.d.). This effectively created a state-sanctioned club of haute couture maisons. While this measure did not directly stop copying of designs, it preserved the *integrity of the label*. Being an officially recognized couture house became a mark of highest quality and authenticity. This **institutional innovation** helped France maintain an aura of exclusivity around its top fashion houses, which is itself a form of competitive advantage (no other country has an official definition of haute couture backed by law). It also tied the industry to the French state's support, acknowledging haute couture as a national heritage industry.

5.3 Diversification thorough Ready-to-Wear

By mid-century, haute couture was a small market (wealthy clients for custom clothes). Growth in fashion moved toward *ready-to-wear* (prêt-à-porter) – upscale clothing produced in standard sizes and sold in stores. Initially, couture houses were reluctant to do RTW (seeing it as less prestigious), but by the 1960s many adapted. In France, independent ready-to-wear designers (like Pierre Cardin, Yves Saint Laurent with his Rive Gauche line in 1966) innovated new styles that reached a broader audience. The French industry responded institutionally by creating new syndicates: in 1973, the **Chambre Syndicale du Prêt-à-Porter des Couturiers et des Créateurs de Mode** was founded for designers of luxury ready-to-wear (Jankowska, 2023; FHCM, n.d.). The same year, a **Chambre Syndicale de la Mode Masculine** for men's fashion was created. And an umbrella **Fédération Française de la Couture** was formed (which in 2017 was renamed the Fédération de la Haute Couture et de la Mode, FHCM) (Jankowska, 2023; FHCM, n.d.). This Federation today oversees all the Paris Fashion Weeks and industry initiatives. The Federation's formation brought haute couture and ready-to-wear together, reflecting an organizational innovation to integrate *creators* across categories and present a unified French fashion front. This allowed sharing of resources (e.g., joint promotion of Paris Fashion Week which features both couture and RTW shows) and ensured Paris remained relevant as styles democratized.

5.4 Education and Training

The Chambre Syndicale also established schools (e.g., Ecole de la Chambre Syndicale de Couture Parisienne) to train new generations in couture techniques (Pouillard, 2016). This investment in skills can be seen as an innovation in sustaining a knowledge base – essentially managing the creative *human capital* that is the lifeblood of fashion innovation. By professionalizing fashion education, the French industry helped institutionalize haute couture know-how that might otherwise have been lost.

Throughout these developments, the French fashion institutional ecosystem continued to emphasize *exclusivity balanced with innovation*. Haute couture was kept exclusive (by law and by extremely high craftsmanship), but the creative fruits were shared with the world via ready-to-wear, licensing (many couture houses licensed their designs to foreign manufacturers for diffusion lines or perfumes, etc.), and media. Paris maintained its status by being the place that generated ideas and set trends, even if much business came from selling those ideas in varied forms.

Crucially, these institutions provided **competitive advantage** for French fashion on a national cluster level. Using Michael Porter's terminology, one could say France's fashion cluster had strong "factor conditions" (skilled artisans, design talent), "demand conditions" (sophisticated local and international clients pushing for novelty), related and supporting industries (textiles in Lyon, media in Paris), and firm strategy shaped by intense rivalry and cooperation among *maisons*. Porter noted that "the extraordinary strength of the Italian leather fashion cluster" comes from linkages and synergies of clustered firms (Porter, 1998; Paris, 2010), and similarly the French couture cluster derived strength from having many competing yet collaborating houses in proximity.

For example, the rivalry between Chanel and Schiaparelli in the 1930s drove each to bold innovation, yet both benefited from Paris's overall reputation. The Chambre Syndicale managed this competitive cooperation deftly – ensuring some level of solidarity (e.g., all agree on show schedules) while each house strove to outshine the others creatively. This is akin to what Porter calls the **advantages of geographic clusters**: local rivalry spurs continuous improvement and innovation, but the cluster as a whole competes better globally (Porter, 1998).

By the late 20th century, French fashion had diversified further (French brands became key players in luxury accessories, fragrances, etc., often through innovation in brand extensions and global marketing). The rise of global luxury groups (like LVMH, Kering) changed the business landscape but still kept creative centers in Paris. The Fédération (FHCM) today ensures that Paris Fashion Weeks are marquee events, leveraging Paris's brand as a hub of innovation. The Federation describes haute couture as "a permanent gateway between a tradition for excellence in know-how and contemporaneity in creation… embodying today [the] cutting edge of innovation" (FHCM, n.d.). This statement nicely captures how the institution pitches French fashion: as a fusion of tradition and innovation (Paris, 2010).

Figure 1. *Mapping the Italian Leather Fashion Cluster (Porter, 1998).*

In sum, the French fashion industry's legal and institutional evolution created an environment where innovation could thrive and be monetized *despite* weak IP protection. Legal measures like the haute couture designation, industry norms via the Chambre Syndicale, and the cultivation of Paris as an essential brand all served to protect the value of French fashion creativity in indirect ways. These mechanisms substitute for direct IP rights by *raising barriers to entry (reputation, skill)* and *slowing erosion of value (through maintaining exclusivity)* long enough for French designers to reap rewards before imitation catches up. Now, having set the historical stage, we can delve into how innovation specifically translates to competitive advantage using strategic management theories.

6. Innovation as Competitive Advantage. Strategic Perspectives on French Fashion

Sustainable competitive advantage in an industry arises when firms have strategies or assets that allow them to consistently outperform rivals. In the context of French fashion, where formal *IP offers at best a weak shield*, firms have had to rely on other sources of advantage—primarily continuous innovation, strong branding, and agile strategy. We will examine this through several strategic lenses:

6.1 Porter's Competitive Strategy and the French Fashion Cluster

Michael Porter's work on competitive strategy and the competitive advantage of nations provides a useful macro-view. At the firm level, Porter's **generic strategies** framework posits that a company can achieve competitive advantage either through cost leadership or differentiation (or a focused variant of either) by offering unique value to customers (Font, 2020). French luxury fashion houses overwhelmingly compete on **differentiation**. They create value by offering unique, creative designs of high quality, with an image of exclusivity—justifying premium prices. This differentiation is innovation-driven: each season's new collection must be novel enough to make previous ones (and the copies) less relevant. Designers like *Coco Chanel* built enduring brands by consistently differentiating their style (Chanel's modern, simplified women's suits in the 1920s were a stark contrast to the ornate couture of earlier era – a differentiating innovation) (Teo, 2018). Differentiation in fashion is bolstered by *branding*, which French houses have mastered through storytelling, logos, icons (e.g., the Dior "Bar" jacket or Hermès "Birkin" bag become synonymous with a house). Porter notes that to sustain differentiation, a firm must have *unique attributes or capabilities* that competitors can't easily replicate. In fashion, these include the creative talent of designers, the brand heritage, and the craft skills – all areas where French couture houses traditionally excel. These could be considered *isolating mechanisms* that protect their advantage, akin to IP in effect if not in law.

On the national level, Porter's **Diamond model** explains how certain countries achieve competitive advantage in particular industries. France's fashion dominance fits the model well:

1. *Factor conditions* **-** Paris historically had the best *factors* for fashion – skilled artisans (embroidery, tailoring, millinery), creative designers attracted to a culturally rich capital, and access to quality textiles (like silk from Lyon). The French education system for arts and design and its cultural emphasis on aesthetic refinement created a talent pool.
2. *Demand conditions* **-** French domestic demand included a discerning aristocracy and bourgeoisie who valued fashion (Eugénie and other fashion-forward royals set a tone). Moreover, Paris became the arbiter for international demand – effectively, global elite demand was channeled through Paris. Demanding clients push innovation; a couturier had to impress sophisticated tastes to succeed in Paris.
3. *Related and supporting industries* **-** France had complementary industries – textile production (the Lyon silk industry), jewelry and accessory makers, fashion publishing (magazines like *Vogue* and *L'Officiel* had Paris bases). This cluster of related industries meant a couture house could collaborate with top textile designers or jewelry maisons to enhance their products (e.g., partnerships with jewelers for embroidery or with textile mills to create custom fabrics, an innovation chain).
4. *Firm strategy, structure, rivalry* **-** The rivalry among Paris couture houses was legendary – Chanel vs. Schiaparelli, Dior vs. Balenciaga and so on. This rivalry propelled each to innovate to stand out. Meanwhile, the structure (often family-owned or designer-led firms that prized creative autonomy) allowed rapid decision-making on creative matters. The presence of the Chambre Syndicale moderated rivalry with some cooperation on common interests (like anti-copying efforts, scheduling), achieving what Porter calls *cluster cooperation* in global competition.

One could add government support (the French government has often quietly supported fashion, e.g., by sponsoring fashion shows abroad or protecting designation of origin) as another factor (Evans, 2013). The combination of these elements made the **Paris fashion cluster** a self-reinforcing system where innovation was continuously generated and diffused. Even as competition rose from other locales (London, New York, Milan), Paris retained an edge by doubling down on differentiation and innovation at the high end. Porter's view that *"competitive advantage is earned through continuous innovation and constant improvement"* (Porter, 1990; Porter, 1998; Terziovski & Sohal, 2000) rings especially true for fashion. Every season is essentially a new competitive race; resting on past laurels is a sure way to lose relevance. French houses institutionalized this continuous innovation cycle, making it a core part of strategy rather than an occasional effort.

6.2 Resource-Based View (RBV). Intangible Assets and Creative Capabilities

Jay Barney's **resource-based view** (RBV) provides a micro-level lens on why certain firms sustain advantage. RBV says that a firm's unique resources and capabilities can yield sustained competitive advantage if they are *valuable, rare, inimitable,* and *non-substitutable* (the **VRIN criteria**). Let's consider what resources French fashion houses have cultivated:

1. *Brand Heritage and Reputation* **-** A luxury fashion brand name (Chanel, Dior, Hermès, etc.) is an extremely valuable resource. It embodies decades of prestige, associations with quality and style, and emotional appeal. These brands are rare (by definition, few firms have that heritage) and hard to imitate – you can't create a 100-year-old reputation overnight. A new competitor cannot buy or copy the aura of *Established 1947 Christian Dior – creator of the New Look*. This inimitability provides insulation. Customers often prefer the original brand to a copy even if the design is similar, because wearing the original carries status. That status is a *socially complex resource* not easily replicated. The French have been masters at building these luxury brands (Dior, 1957), which effectively turns the brand into an IP asset of its own kind (legally via trademark, but economically via reputation).
2. *Creative Talent and Design Aesthetic* **-** Top designers (the Chanels, Diors, Saint Laurents, etc.) and their design teams are key human resources. A specific creative vision or aesthetic signature can be a rare capability. For example, only Hermès has

the specific saddle-leather craftsmanship tradition that gives its leather goods a certain look and quality. Only a few houses have the ateliers capable of the most complex couture techniques (Lesage embroidery, etc., often exclusive to them). These creative and craft capabilities are *tacit knowledge* – built through years of practice – making them hard for competitors to imitate. They are valuable since they result in products that command high prices and customer loyalty. They are also relatively non-substitutable: technology can't fully substitute for an **artisan's skill** in making a couture gown, and hiring away an entire team intact is difficult (plus the style might not translate outside of the brand culture).

3. *Innovation Culture and Dynamic Capabilities*- Many French fashion firms have over time developed what Teece would call *dynamic capabilities* – the ability to constantly reconfigure and renew their resource base to address changing trends. For instance, the House of Dior has survived since 1947 by going through dramatic creative shifts (from Dior's own era to YSL, to Marc Bohan, Gianfranco Ferré, John Galliano, Raf Simons, and now Maria Grazia Chiuri – each bringing a new creative direction but the house adapting each time). This indicates an organizational ability to absorb new talent and reinvent while maintaining core brand identity – a dynamic capability of innovation. Such an organizational culture of creativity and adaptability is an intangible asset that competitors who are more rigid or who depend on one designer cannot match easily.

Using RBV terms, the French fashion houses rely heavily on **intangible assets** – brand (a form of intellectual capital), design expertise, savoir-faire (know-how). These are difficult for others to acquire or copy, meeting the VRIN criteria for sustained advantage. In absence of strong formal IP, these **firm-specific assets** become the *de facto barriers against competitors* free-riding. A counterfeit or copy might mimic the product, but it cannot mimic the authentic brand experience or quality. Thus, even though designs leak into the public domain quickly, the original firms retain a portion of the market that covets authenticity and highest quality – and that portion is profitable enough to sustain them (indeed, luxury margins are very high).

RBV also suggests that it's not just the resources themselves, but how they are **organized** and **combined**. French luxury conglomerates, for example, have learned to synergize resources across brands (marketing networks, retail spaces, etc.) without diluting the individual brand identities – a capability in managing a portfolio of luxury brands. That meta-capability has allowed them to scale globally. Smaller independent houses rely more on focused resources (a singular creative vision, etc.).

In RBV, the concept of *appropriability* of returns is important: one can have a great innovation, but if others appropriate the returns (due to imitation or bargaining power of buyers/suppliers), the firm doesn't benefit. French fashion houses historically used mechanisms like secrecy (not showing designs until right before season) and rapid launch to market to appropriate returns before copies. These can be seen as part of their resource/capability set – e.g., the capability to produce small batches very quickly in-house gives a timing advantage over high-street imitators. This overlaps with Teece's framework on complementary assets, which we address next.

6.3 Teece's Framework. Appropriability and Complementary Assets in Fashion

David Teece's 1986 work on *Profiting from Innovation* argues that having an innovation (e.g., a new product design) is not sufficient to profit; one must also own or access complementary assets needed to commercialize it, especially if the *appropriability regime* (i.e., IP protection) is weak (Teece, 1986; Ceccagnoli & Rothaermel, 2016). In a *weak appropriability regime* like fashion design (where it's easy to copy and legal barriers are low), the innovators who succeed are typically those who control complementary assets such as strong brands, retail distribution, manufacturing expertise, etc. (Teece, 1986; Ceccagnoli & Rothaermel, 2016; Kapferer & Valette-Florence, 2018). Teece's framework essentially describes exactly what happens in fashion: original designers without complementary assets often see others make the money from their ideas, whereas firms that have built complementary strengths capture the value.

For example, consider a young designer who creates a trend-setting dress design. If they lack complementary assets (capital, manufacturing, brand recognition), a fast-fashion chain could copy that design and sell thousands, reaping the financial reward. The original might get prestige but not profit. However, a house like Louis Vuitton or Chanel, which has enormous complementary assets (global stores, supply chain, marketing budget, brand loyalty), when it introduces a new design, it can flood its own boutiques worldwide and market it brilliantly, capturing the market before others can catch up. Even if copies appear, the house has made significant sales and reinforced its brand in the process. This is why big luxury firms tend to profit more from innovation than small independent designers – not necessarily because they are more creative, but because they have the *assets to scale and protect the innovation's value*. Teece would say that in fashion, the *design* is an intellectual asset, but the *appropriability* of that asset is low unless paired with other capabilities (Teece, 1986; Ceccagnoli & Rothaermel, 2016; Kapferer & Valette-Florence, 2018).

What complementary assets matter in fashion? Key ones include: **manufacturing capability** (to produce high-quality or high-volume as needed), **distribution network** (own stores in prime locations, or ability to get into the best retail channels globally), **marketing muscle**, and **brand equity**. Teece notes that when IP protection is weak, having specialized complementary assets is crucial to capture value (Teece, 1986; Ceccagnoli & Rothaermel, 2016). Fashion luxury brands illustrate this: they often vertically integrate production (Chanel famously buys up artisan workshops to secure its supply of high-quality components), they control distribution (own flagships in every major city), and pour resources into marketing and brand building. These are expensive and time-consuming assets to build, meaning a newcomer can't easily replicate them – giving incumbents a sustained advantage even if their designs are copied. Essentially, the *inimitability* of complementary assets (like an efficient supply chain or storied brand) makes them a source of sustainable advantage (Teece, 1986; Ceccagnoli & Rothaermel, 2016). Indeed, one analysis points out that such *specialized complementary assets… are valuable and difficult to imitate, and they can therefore be a source of sustainable competitive* advantage (Barney, 1991; Teece, 1986; Ceccagnoli & Rothaermel, 2016; Kapferer & Valette-Florence, 2018).

Zara again is a great example on the process side: its complementary asset is its super-responsive supply chain. A designer at Zara might not be any more talented than one at a competitor, but Zara's ability to manufacture quickly and distribute globally (a finely tuned logistics and IT system) is a complementary asset that allows Zara to capitalize on fashion ideas faster than competitors. When an appropriability regime is weak, speed can be the decisive factor – effectively a race condition. Zara built its entire strategy on being the fastest, thus *out-appropriating* slower fashion firms. This aligns with Teece's concept that "when the appropriability regime is weak, ownership of complementary assets determines who profits" (Teece, 1986; Ceccagnoli & Rothaermel, 2016). In Zara's case, it often profits from trends it didn't originate because it owns the complementary asset of rapid production and a chain of stores in every mall.

For French haute couture brands, complementary assets like brand and exclusive distribution also tie into creating a form of **monopoly power** that is unrelated to IP law. If you want an Hermes Birkin bag, you can only get it from Hermès – not because of a patent, but because of their controlled distribution and the strength of the brand which makes a substitute unacceptable to the target consumer. That exclusivity, managed through supply (limited production, waitlists) and brand narrative, is an appropriability mechanism: it keeps demand high and prevents others from usurping that particular niche (Kapferer & Valette-Florence, 2018).

To connect back to theory: Teece would classify fashion's appropriability regime historically as weak (designs not well-protected), so innovating firms needed either to integrate forward into production/marketing or ally with those who had such assets. Early couturiers like Worth integrated forward (opening branches, licensing to foreign stores) – a strategy Teece identifies for innovators in weak IP environments. Later, many couturiers allied with powerful backers or became part of larger groups that provided the manufacturing/marketing heft (e.g., when Gucci group acquired YSL, it provided the struggling YSL brand with stronger complementary assets to monetize its designs).

Another aspect is **dynamic capabilities**, introduced by Teece in 1997, which we touched on: "the firm's ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competences to address rapidly changing environments" (Teece, Pisano & Shuen, 1997). The fashion environment is the epitome of rapidly changing. Houses that survive for long periods exhibit dynamic capabilities – the ability to sense new trends, seize opportunities by developing new designs, and transform their operations to keep up (e.g., adopting e-commerce early, or switching creative directors to refresh brand image). For instance, *Burberry* (a British brand revitalized in the 2000s) succeeded by dynamically reinventing itself (digitizing marketing, targeting younger consumers) while some French brands like *Lanvin* saw decline when they failed to sustain dynamic innovation after their star designer left. The French *maisons* that have truly sustained competitive advantage (Chanel, Louis Vuitton, Dior) all have shown the capacity to evolve (Chanel went from Coco's tweeds to Karl Lagerfeld's creative twists for modern times without losing identity; LV went from a luggage maker to a full fashion brand by adding ready-to-wear and art collaborations) (Teo, 2018). This points to an important dynamic capability: *branding innovation* – keeping the brand relevant to new generations while leveraging its heritage (Kapferer & Valette-Florence, 2018).

Finally, one cannot ignore **reputational capital** as a strategic asset. In fashion, *reputation for creativity and quality is everything*. France's competitive advantage has been anchored in reputation: "Paris = quality fashion". Reputation is bolstered by soft power mechanisms (France promoting culture, fashion media based in Paris giving more coverage to Parisian design). It also serves as a trust mechanism for consumers (they trust a Chanel suit's quality and style without needing to inspect it in person, because of brand reputation). Reputational capital is self-reinforcing and hard for new entrants to build quickly, acting as a moat.

In summary, strategic theory confirms that *innovation is necessary but not sufficient* – it must be paired with resources and capabilities that allow a firm to appropriate the benefits. French fashion houses have done this by building *intangible assets (brands, design skills)* and *complementary capabilities (manufacturing, retail networks, media relationships)* which together form a *competitive advantage that rivals cannot easily copy*, even if they copy the individual designs. Next, we illustrate these concepts in action by examining specific case studies from different eras and segments of the fashion industry.

7. Case Studies: Innovation in Action

7.1 Case 1: Charles Frederick Worth – Founding Haute Couture through Business Model Innovation

As discussed earlier, Worth exemplifies how innovation, not IP law, built a lasting competitive advantage. In the 19th century, there was virtually no effective legal shield for his designs outside of Paris. Yet Worth managed to dominate and "beat the French at their own game" (as one obituary noted) through savvy innovation on multiple fronts ((Joseph, 2014; Jankowska et al., 2023; Jankowska et al., 2024). Let us break down his case:

1. *Product and Design Innovation* **-** Worth's designs were creative syntheses of historical inspiration and contemporary luxury. He introduced crinolines (hoop skirts) and later bustles in new ways (some sources even credit him with "inventing" the hoop skirt and bustle as fashion items). He freely borrowed elements from different eras (studying portraits in art museums for ideas), effectively innovating by recombining fashion "components" from the past into something novel for his time. His gowns were known for dramatic silhouettes and lavish embellishments, setting new trends that competitors had to follow. Because he was first to market each season with these novel styles, he set the terms of competition – others had to play catch up, copying him, which kept him one step ahead in prestige.
2. *Marketing and Branding Innovation* **-** Worth understood the value of *the designer's name*. By branding his garments with his label and publicizing himself, he created an early form of trademark. When Empress Eugénie asked Princess Metternich who made her dress, the answer "Worth" led to the Empress summoning Worth – illustrating that the name had cachet, it signified quality and style. Worth cultivated celebrity clients (like actress Sarah Bernhardt and soprano Nellie Melba) whose patronage further marketed his brand. His fashion shows (then called "presentations") on live models were themselves marketing events that drew international buyers to Paris. This was a new way to create buzz and desire, which no IP law could create but was highly effective to differentiate him.
3. *Process and Distribution Innovation* **-** Worth's decision to sell his designs abroad was a key competitive move. By providing authorized originals or patterns to foreign retailers, he essentially undercut unauthorized copyists and made money in markets he couldn't directly serve. It's reported that at the height of his success, he even produced some ready-made versions of successful designs to be sold in department stores in Paris, London, and New York at the end of the season. This shows he innovated in distribution channels, embracing the early department store retail model (which was itself an emerging innovation in the late 1800s). By doing so, he maintained control: rather than have department stores copy his styles, he partnered with them to sell his creations, ensuring he got credit and revenue. This foresight in channel management extended his competitive

advantage geographically. His exports became an *essential aspect of Worth's success*. In modern terms, he created a *franchise/licensing model* for haute couture, something many French houses would later do (in the 20th century, licensing of patterns, perfumes, etc., became a major income stream for couture houses).

4. *Organizational Innovation* **-** Worth turned the craft of dressmaking into an organized business with significant scale. He employed hundreds in structured workshops. He trained his sons to succeed him, preserving continuity beyond his life. By elevating the status of the designer and structuring the couture house like a modern firm, he professionalized the industry. Competing dressmakers had to either grow and innovate similarly or fall by the wayside. In fact, the late 19th century saw many couture houses spring up in Paris, but those who couldn't match Worth's combination of innovation and business acumen did not thrive as he did.

Worth's competitive advantage proved sustainable at least through his sons' generation (the House of Worth flourished into the 1920s). It eventually faded mid-20th century as tastes changed, but by then Paris had many other innovators. The main takeaway is that Worth did not have patents on his dress designs – anyone could copy the shape – but he *still* was able to be the leading fashion businessman of his time. He achieved that through continuous creative output (always having the next big thing ready) and through building a brand and distribution network that others could not easily replicate at that time. In resource terms, his brand and reputation were inimitable; in Teece's terms, he had complementary manufacturing and distribution assets enabling him to profit from being first with new styles. His approach essentially prefigured what we today consider *best practice* for creative industries: be first to market, build a strong brand, control distribution, and monetize through various channels.

7.2 Case 2: Zara – Process Innovation and Fast Fashion (Modern Competitive Dynamics)

While not a French company, **Zara** (founded 1975 in Spain) serves as a critical modern case study of innovation-led advantage in fashion. It illustrates how innovation in business model and processes can overcome lack of IP, and it has directly impacted French and global fashion markets. Zara's model is often contrasted with the traditional designer fashion model, and its success forced even French luxury houses to adapt aspects of their strategy (for example, by accelerating their own supply chains for certain lines, or by emphasizing design distinctiveness to avoid easy copying). Key points in Zara's case:

1. *Disruptive Process Innovation (Fast Fashion)***-** Zara's core innovation was to drastically shorten the fashion cycle, going from design conception to in-store product in as little as two weeks (Gallaugher, 2008). They achieved lead times of 10-15 days for new designs, compared to 4-6 months for many competitors (Gallaugher, 2008). This time compression was made possible by heavy investment in IT, a unique organizational structure where design, production, and logistics are tightly integrated, and a contrarian choice to keep much of production in-house or nearby (in Europe) rather than outsourcing entirely to Asia. Zara essentially traded higher production cost for speed and responsiveness – an innovation in operational strategy that proved decisive. This agility meant Zara could catch emerging trends and put them on shelves while the trend was hot, selling at full price and minimizing markdowns. Traditional retailers who had longer cycles often guessed wrong on trends and ended up with unsold stock. Zara's success demonstrated that *process innovation can itself be a competitive advantage in fashion* even if the products are not original. Indeed, Zara *often does not innovate in product design* at all – it frequently takes inspiration from runway looks or street styles (which has earned it a reputation as a copier). But because no one can copyright general fashion trends, Zara faces little legal risk. Instead, Zara turned the tables: rather than designers benefiting from IP, Zara benefited from the *open flow of design ideas* and out-innovated others in process to capitalize on those ideas. It's the flip side of the piracy paradox – the copier innovated in process to outcompete slower originators.

2. *Data-Driven Design and Organizational Innovation:* Part of Zara's process edge comes from organizational innovation. Store managers are empowered to constantly feed sales and customer preference data back to headquarters in Spain, using hand-held devices and integrated POS systems (Gallaugher, 2008). Designers at Zara use this real-time data to tweak and refine designs or introduce new ones in mid-season. This tight feedback loop is an organizational practice that differs from the traditional top-down design approach. It effectively makes Zara's design

function partly *customer-co-created* – they produce what the data shows customers want at that moment. This is an innovation in the design process (a blend of market pull with quick design response). Most luxury houses historically operated on a creative director's vision pushing to the market (an artistic push system). Zara flipped it to a pull system, which in a way *democratized* innovation – making the consumer part of it. This organizational culture of rapid response and flexibility is hard to build (many firms have tried to emulate Zara with less success), so it's a capability that has proven hard to imitate in totality.

3. *Complementary Asset Focus:* Zara understood that its advantage would come from owning certain complementary assets: *a highly efficient logistics network*, *ownership of a large retail chain*, and *supply chain vertical integration*. It invested in a state-of-the-art distribution center ("The Cube" in La Coruña) and even uses chartered cargo flights to ship product quickly internationally (Gallaugher, 2008). Owning retail stores (rather than wholesale to third parties) meant Zara controlled the presentation, pricing, and could get instant sales feedback. This integration, while capital-intensive, created a virtuous cycle – more sales gave more data to improve product, etc. In strategic terms, Zara secured tight appropriability: by the time competitors copy one of its popular styles, Zara may have already moved on or saturated the demand. Fast fashion is often described as *fashion's race to the bottom*, but from an innovation view, it's a race to be the fastest to satisfy consumers' fashion wants. Zara built a machine that wins that race repeatedly.

Zara's rise pressured mid-market French fashion retailers and even luxury indirectly (by raising consumer expectations of newness). Some luxury brands responded by increasing the number of collections or doing "capsule drops" to keep buzz (effectively, adopting a *more Zara-like pace* within luxury, though not to the extreme of 2-week turnaround). Others emphasized that their quality and creativity cannot be mimicked by fast fashion – doubling down on differentiation and brand value (which is a classic response of differentiated players when low-cost disruptors appear). Zara in itself shows how **innovation can be a competitive advantage in the absence of IP**: none of what Zara does is protected by IP (other firms could in theory copy a fast supply chain, and indeed many have tried to implement similar systems). But Zara's lead and continuous improvement in this model have kept it ahead ("sustainable advantage" for decades now). It's a reminder that *not all competitive advantages come from proprietary technology or content; some come from finely tuned processes and organizational know-how*, which are often protected by their complexity and integration (difficult to replicate exactly). Zara's advantage is also sustained by scale now – it produces at volumes giving economies that new imitators can't immediately match.

For the French industry, Zara's case underscores the importance of *time-to-market* as part of the competitive game. While haute couture remains insulated (Zara doesn't compete there), French luxury brands pay attention to supply chain innovations too. Many have invested in streamlining their own production for ready-to-wear (though they will never churn styles as fast, they have tightened delivery schedules). Some have used fast-fashion tactics like limited runs and quick replenishment for trendy items. Yet, they have to balance this with the perception of luxury (too much ubiquity or chasing trends can hurt a luxury brand). Thus, the competitive dynamic between fast fashion and French luxury ends up reinforcing each side's distinctive advantages: fast fashion innovates in being quick and cheap, pushing luxury to highlight its slow craftsmanship, creativity, and lasting value – which are areas of differentiation.

7.3 Case 3: Iris van Herpen – Radical Design Innovation and Technological Fusion in Couture

Iris van Herpen provides a contemporary case of innovation at the high creative end of fashion. A Dutch designer who debuted her label in 2007 and has been an invited member of the Paris Haute Couture shows since 2011, van Herpen is renowned for pioneering the use of cutting-edge technology (like 3D printing, laser cutting, novel materials) in fashion. Her work illustrates how *radical product innovation* and *cross-disciplinary experimentation* can carve out a niche of competitive advantage in the fashion world that is less about market share and more about creative leadership and prestige (Paulicelli, 2009; Evered, 1992). Key aspects of van Herpen's case:

1. **Product/Artistic Innovation -** Van Herpen's couture designs are often described as "wearable art" or "wearable architecture." She creates dresses and ensembles that have never been seen before in fashion – e.g., dresses that mimic splash of water frozen in time, exoskeletal forms, dresses grown with magnetic ferrofluid patterns, etc. One of her landmark innovations was

sending the **first 3D-printed garment down the runway** (in collaboration with architect Daniel Widrig) (Google Arts & Culture, n.d.). This was a *radical innovation in process and product* – using a technology from outside fashion (additive manufacturing) to create forms impossible to achieve by hand alone. Many of her pieces also use *unconventional materials and techniques foreign to the fashion world* (Google Arts & Culture, n.d.), such as chemically treated acrylic, silicone, or even *laboratory-grown* materials. For example, her **"Crystallization" collection (2010)** featured elements made by heating and molding plexiglass to look like splashing water, something that had more in common with sculpture than dressmaking (Google Arts & Culture, n.d.). These creations are radical in the sense of breaking completely from traditional fabric-and-thread garment construction. They position van Herpen not just as a fashion designer but as an innovator at the intersection of fashion, science, and art.

2. **Innovation Typologies in Van Herpen's Work -** She embodies *architectural innovation* (reconfiguring fashion's building blocks– fabric, silhouette – in new architectures), *radical innovation* (clear breaks from past designs: no historical style looks like a van Herpen dress), and even *technological innovation* in a domain that's usually more aesthetic. She merges *"traditional craftsmanship with technological innovation"*, creating *"complex natural forms that appear to emerge from and overtake the body"* (Google Arts & Culture, n.d.). Her approach requires collaborating with experts in fields like 3D printing (she's worked with Belgium-based 3D printing company Materialise), architects, engineers, and even biologists. This is an **open innovation** style – she pulls knowledge from other domains into fashion. Such collaborations (e.g., with architect Philip Beesley or with dancer/choreographer for kinetic dresses) are an organizational innovation for a couture house, moving beyond the classic seamstress atelier model.

3. **Competitive Advantage Through Differentiation and Intellectual Capital -** In business terms, van Herpen operates in a niche—her works are sold to collectors and museums, and she does custom pieces for celebrities and exhibitions. She's not aiming for mass market or even broad luxury market, but her competitive advantage is her *reputation as an innovator*. In the rarefied world of haute couture, that reputation is extremely valuable. There are only a handful of designers globally doing what she does, making her *rare*. The complexity of her designs and integration of technology make her *inimitable* in the short run; others can't easily reproduce a 3D-printed dress without the know-how and partnerships she has. So even though she likely does not rely on formal IP (though perhaps some of her specific 3D printed patterns could be copyrighted artworks or patented methods), she protects her competitive position by being *far ahead on the innovation curve* and by the uniqueness of her aesthetic. Essentially, she has created her own sub-category of couture (tech-couture), where for now she is the clear leader.

4. **Use of IP vs. Speed to Market -** Interestingly, in her space, copying is less of an issue – fast fashion won't copy these extreme designs because they are not meant for mainstream wear and they're too complex/expensive to mass-produce. If anything, her challenge is the opposite: to turn conceptual art pieces into something that can be worn or monetized. She has started to apply some of her innovations to more wearable pieces (like a ready-to-wear line of shoes or dresses in simplified form). In those cases, she might face copying, but her brand is small and targeted at those who appreciate the artistry, not the trendiness alone. Her clientele likely values the authenticity and exclusivity (much as in traditional couture). Thus, her protections are the intangible ones: brand aura, and the fact that owning an Iris van Herpen original is like owning a piece of the future of fashion (for those who support innovation).

5. **Strategic Importance for France/Paris -** Though Dutch, van Herpen shows her collections in Paris and is embraced by the French fashion institutions (as an invited member of the Chambre Syndicale de Haute Couture). This highlights how French fashion stays at the forefront: they include such innovators in their ranks to keep Paris synonymous with cutting-edge creativity. It's a strategic move for the Paris couture scene to have someone like van Herpen, as it reinforces the idea that *Paris is where fashion's future is happening*, not just its past. The federation benefits from her innovation, and she benefits from the Paris platform and the couture label credibility. It's a symbiotic relationship wherein *innovation is nurtured by institutional support* for mutual advantage.

Van Herpen's case underscores that *design innovation can be a source of competitive advantage on its own*, especially at the high end where differentiation is valued above all. She may not be commercially "big" like Chanel or Zara, but she has influence (her techniques get noticed and even gradually adopted by others at simpler levels – e.g., other designers started experimenting with 3D printing or new materials seeing her success). In a sense, she also exemplifies the *piracy paradox* in a niche way: she shares some of her innovation (through collaborations and exhibitions) which others learn from, but she then moves on to the next frontier, staying ahead.

Through these case studies, we see a common thread: whether it's Worth, Zara, or van Herpen, **innovation acts as the engine of competitive success**. Worth combined product and marketing innovation to establish haute couture; Zara used process and organizational innovation to transform retail; van Herpen uses product and technological innovation to redefine couture. None of them relied on strong IP enforcement to secure their position. Instead, they capitalized on being first and being unique – and often on building complementary strengths (Worth's brand/distribution, Zara's supply chain, van Herpen's cross-disciplinary expertise and couture status) that make it hard for imitators to steal their thunder.

8. Discussion: how Branding, Strategy and Reputation Substitute for IP

Given the limited protection fashion designs receive under formal IP law, fashion firms (especially in France's competitive environment) have developed a toolbox of strategies to appropriate value from innovation and deter free riders. These strategies effectively create a *market-based or contract-based analog to IP rights*. Let's examine some of these mechanisms:

8.1 Strong Branding and Trademark Use

As repeatedly noted, a fashion brand itself is protectable (via trademark law for names, logos, and sometimes trade dress) and is a critical asset. French luxury houses have invested enormously in brand-building – crafting narratives of heritage, exclusivity, and style around their names. This creates **brand loyalty and recognition** that makes consumers prefer the authentic item to a copy. For instance, someone might buy a Chanel jacket not only for the design but because it's Chanel – a copy without the brand loses appeal. Trademarks, unlike design, *are* strongly protected by law (and luxury brands vigorously enforce them against counterfeiters). Thus, branding is a legal strategy too: by trademarking logos, monograms (e.g., Louis Vuitton's monogram canvas, which is trademarked and whose pattern is legally defended), and even specific product shapes or signatures as trade dress (Christian Louboutin trademarked the red sole on high heels, for example), companies carve out some proprietary space. These measures don't stop someone from copying the shape of a dress, but they stop them from presenting it as from the original brand. In effect, it forces copiers into the low-end market (cheap copies without the labels), preserving the high-end market for the brand – a separation that often exists as *original vs. knockoff* markets. Consumers who value the status and quality will still seek the original. So branding fills the gap by making the *source* of a design crucial to its value.

8.2 First-Mover Advantage and Fast Cycle Time

As discussed, being first to market with a new style and reaching customers before imitators is key. Couture houses historically unveiled new designs at tightly scheduled shows where invited press and buyers see them, then the house produces for clients. To shorten the window in which copies could emerge, modern designers often keep collections secret until the show (limiting press previews) and now increasingly deliver products to stores soon after the show (the "see now, buy now" trend some brands tried). Lead time is a classic appropriability tactic: if you can always be a step ahead, copyists are selling a look that's already passé for the fashion-forward set. This works especially well in the high-fashion segment where trendsetting consumers pride themselves on being early adopters (Lipovetsky, 2002). Essentially, it leverages the *induced obsolescence* dynamic: by the time copies hit, trend leaders have moved on. Luxury brands use this by pushing rapid creative turnover (multiple collections a year, special limited editions) – so imitators are always chasing a moving target. This is not a formal legal protection, but a competitive strategy reliant on organizational agility and constant innovation, which we've seen in case studies.

8.3 Reputational Capital and Exclusivity

French luxury thrives on the concept of exclusivity. By limiting supply (e.g., Hermès famously limits production of Birkin and Kelly bags creating waitlists), they maintain a sense that owning the product is special. If an item is exclusive and recognizable, even a perfect copy doesn't carry the same social value because anyone "in the know" can tell if you had to wait and pay for the real thing or not (often by subtleties of quality or simply by context). This is somewhat psychological IP – the idea that the original's provenance is valued by consumers. Reputational capital also means that the houses themselves have a voice; for example, if a fast-fashion chain copies a design, the designer might call them out in press, framing it as unethical or uncreative. Public sentiment often sides with the designer in such narratives (though legally nothing stops the chain). This can shame the copier or at least make them think twice if the PR cost is high (particularly if the copier also has brand aspirations). In recent times, social media has heightened this – independent designers calling out big companies for copying has led to backlash (e.g., the case of indie artist Tuesday Bassen accusing Zara of copying her designs, which went viral) (Puglise, 2016).

8.4 Legal Contracts and Industry Norms

The French couture industry historically used **contracts and norms** to guard designs. Clients purchasing couture often sign agreements that they won't allow the models (garments) to be copied by others. Couture houses also have internal rules for employees and suppliers to prevent leaks of sketches or samples. Today, non-disclosure agreements (NDAs) are standard – for example, a factory producing samples for a luxury brand likely signs an NDA not to share or reproduce the designs. While not foolproof, these legal contracts provide recourse if a partner steals a design. Additionally, norms such as the fashion calendar (where everyone debuts at similar times) are maintained to reduce unfair advantages (if one brand showed a month early, it could be copied by the time others show). The Federation's control of the calendar and entry into official fashion week ensures a level playing field among reputable houses and keeps the mystique before launch. Another norm: the media and buyers generally respect the authorship of designs – a reputable retailer wouldn't knowingly source a line-for-line copy from a less-known label if it's aware it's a copy of a famous design (because it could hurt their relationship with the original brand and their own reputation). Thus, soft enforcement via industry relationships often protects fashion innovation more than outsiders might assume.

8.5 Differentiating by Quality and Craftsmanship

Copyists typically copy the appearance but not the substance. Luxury French fashion often differentiates on quality of materials and construction. A high-street copy of an haute couture gown may capture the silhouette but will never replicate the hand-executed embroidery, custom-developed fabric, or perfect fit of the original. Discerning customers (and certainly the wealthy clientele) see those differences. By pushing craftsmanship to extremes, couture creates a *quality gap* that copies can't match at scale. This is akin to creating a separate product category – the original is not just a design, it's an experience and a piece of art. Copies become irrelevant to those who want the real deal. This strategy has a limit (it appeals to top tier only), but it preserves a segment where the brand is unassailable.

8.6 Litigation and Narrow Legal Wins

While broad fashion copyright is weak, designers do sometimes sue and win on specific grounds (usually either copyright if the design is highly original and in a country like France that allows that (The Fashion Law, 2025), or design patent/registration if they bothered to register it, or unfair competition/passing off if the copy is so close it confuses consumers). These wins are more exception than rule, but they send signals. Chanel, for example, has sued fast-fashion companies for knocking off its trademarked elements (like a jacket with very similar trade dress). Even if design per se isn't protected, if a copy too closely mimics the *get-up* and could dilute the brand, luxury companies will litigate. They also sue counterfeiters (criminally and civilly) to keep outright fakes off the market. Collectively, this legal activity doesn't stop copies of general styles, but it does *erect a fence* around certain boundaries – e.g., you can't put Chanel's exact logo buttons on your copy jacket without legal trouble, and you can't call it a "Chanel style" without trademark issues. Thus, copyists have to be more careful; their copies usually omit signature trademarked elements, which often are precisely what give the original its cachet (for instance, a copy of Dior's Saddle Bag might avoid the "Dior" logo charms and signature prints due to legal risk, thereby making it look more generic). In this way, legal enforcement of what *can* be protected (logos, patterns, etc.) indirectly protects part of the design's value.

8.7 Continuous Innovation as Defense

Ultimately, as we have stressed, the *most effective defense is perpetual offense* – keep innovating. French fashion houses release new collections at least semi-annually, with multiple themes and ideas. They don't rest on one design. This torrent of creativity makes it impractical for any one rival to keep up on all fronts. There is also a collective outcome: by the time others copy one season's hit, the luxury sector has collectively moved to a different aesthetic next season. It's like a moving staircase – the imitators chase the leaders, but the leaders are always moving upward. This dynamic ensures that the originators maintain a reputation as trendsetters (which is a competitive advantage itself, attracting media and top customers) even if they lose some mass-market sales to copies. The innovation race thus substitutes for legal exclusivity – it is a self-enforcing cycle because those who fail to innovate fall out of favor (and indeed, some brands that got complacent have seen declines, reinforcing to all that one must innovate or die in fashion).

8.8 Communities Building and Emotional Connection

Luxury brands also foster a sense of community or lifestyle around their products. For instance, Hermès hosts exclusive events for their VIP clients, Chanel has clubs and exhibition openings for brand aficionados. This creates customer loyalty that isn't easily broken by a copied design elsewhere. If you are part of the "Chanel world", buying a copy is not attractive; you want the authentic piece from the boutique for the full experience. Emotional branding and lifestyle marketing thereby insulate brands from the purely rational choice a consumer might make based on price or design alone. The fashion consumer often buys the story and aspiration as much as the garment, which copies cannot provide.

In aggregate, these strategies fill the role that IP law ideally serves – to allow creators to reap rewards from creativity – but do so through market and managerial means. French fashion companies have been particularly adept at this integrated approach: **design innovation + superb quality + branding + exclusivity = a value proposition** that withstands copying. The **costs** of these strategies (constant innovation, marketing, maintaining quality) are high, but those are built into the luxury business model (hence high product prices). Essentially, consumers pay a premium that funds the innovation and branding machine, which in turn keeps them wanting the originals. It's a viable equilibrium, as evidenced by the enduring success of French luxury brands which grow yearly despite legions of knockoffs.

This *fashion equilibrium* has some societal downsides and upsides: on one hand, it means original designs eventually trickle down so mass consumers can enjoy the style (a democratizing effect), albeit the originator only captured the top-tier value. On the other hand, it forces originators to perhaps over-produce newness and hype (some argue this leads to waste or fashion's unsustainable cycles). But it undeniably has kept fashion very dynamic and competitive.

9. Conclusion

The French fashion industry's journey from the **maison couture** of Charles Worth to the tech-infused creations of Iris van Herpen demonstrates a compelling narrative of innovation as the cornerstone of competitive advantage in an environment of weak formal IP protection. Historically, intellectual property laws did not fully anticipate or encompass the fast-moving, ephemeral creativity of fashion design. Yet rather than stagnating, French fashion turned this challenge into an impetus for creativity and strategic ingenuity.

We found that the French fashion sector developed a multifaceted innovation ecosystem to sustain its leadership: legally through *selective protections* (e.g., the haute couture label, trademarks), *institutionally* through organizations like the *Chambre Syndicale* that coordinated on issues like anti-piracy and quality standards, and *strategically* through *continuous innovation* in products, processes, and branding. The concept of the *piracy paradox* holds true in the sense that the absence of easy design monopolies meant French designers kept innovating relentlessly, which in turn kept fashion exciting and consumers engaged. Rather than relying on law to stop competitors, they relied on skill, speed, and brand power.

Our exploration of *innovation typologies* showed that French fashion houses excel not just in glamorous product innovation (new styles) but also in process innovations (from Worth's early distribution deals to modern supply chain mastery), marketing innovations (the very invention of fashion shows and luxury branding), and organizational innovations (establishing enduring institutions and conglomerates). We linked these to well-known innovation categories from the Oslo Manual and beyond, underscoring that fashion is a rich field for innovation study, even if it deals in cloth and image rather than silicon and code. By applying *strategic management theories*, we saw that French fashion's advantage comes from intangible assets and capabilities that are difficult to imitate: brand heritage (a VRIN resource), creative know-how, dynamic capabilities to sense and lead trends, and complementary assets like integrated production or retail that allow firms to capture value from their designs. These are the *moats* that protect French fashion firms in lieu of design patents or robust copyrights.

The **case studies** provided concrete illustrations. Charles Worth showed how a founder in a virtually IP-free context built a dominant fashion house by innovating in design, marketing, and global business strategy – creating a blueprint for haute couture as a business. Zara, a modern exemplar, highlighted that innovation in process can disrupt the industry, forcing all players (including French ones) to adjust; it also incidentally validates the idea that copying and innovation can coexist (Zara copies styles but innovates in retail experience, and now even luxury brands emulate some of Zara's nimbleness). Iris van Herpen's case reaffirmed that at the high end, pushing the boundaries of art and science in fashion yields a unique competitive niche, and Paris's ecosystem supports such trailblazers as part of its competitive renewal.

The French fashion industry's ability to *fill the legal gap with branding, strategy, and reputation* is perhaps its most significant competitive lesson. Facing persistent design piracy, French houses doubled down on *brand differentiation*, making the name and authentic product more valuable than any copy. They leveraged time – being first and being fast – to ensure they harvested the trend's profits before imitation set in. They nurtured an aura of exclusivity and prestige such that owning the original became a status symbol unattainable by wearing a copy. In essence, they shifted competition to arenas where they had the advantage: quality, creativity, image – none of which a knockoff could fully replicate. This strategic jiu-jitsu turned a potential weakness (no design IP) into a strength (faster cycle of new products, forging deeper bonds with consumers over brand and lifestyle).

Several *implications* emerge from this analysis. For policymakers, it suggests that industries can sometimes flourish with less IP protection if alternative incentives and mechanisms exist – though the French example is aided by the high margins of luxury fashion which not all sectors have. It also indicates that introducing or strengthening design IP (as Europe did with the unregistered design right) can help on the margins but may not dramatically alter the innovation equilibrium of fashion, which is culturally and competitively ingrained. For business strategists in creative fields, French fashion is a case study in how to build durable advantage through intangibles and continuous renewal. The resource-based and dynamic capability view demonstrated that cultivating unique brand stories and flexible innovation routines is essential when legal exclusivity is not guaranteed.

Culturally, the French fashion saga reinforces the idea of fashion as not just commercial apparel but as a *creative industry* akin to art, where innovation is the currency and the community polices copying through norms as much as through law. One might say that French fashion treated fashion design as a form of *cultural IP* – belonging to those who could continually produce the culture (collections) rather than those who might legally own a static design.

As we stand today, French fashion houses continue to dominate luxury rankings, and Paris remains a crucible of new trends (from haute couture experiments to high-street collaborations). They do so not because they prevented all copying – obviously, copies persist– but because they've stayed ahead in the innovation race and kept the desirability of their brands intact. The system isn't perfect (designers still sometimes feel ripped off by fast fashion; fast fashion faces critiques of sustainability and originality), but it has proven remarkably resilient.

In conclusion, *the French fashion industry illustrates that innovation can be its own form of protection*. By weaving innovation into every aspect of their business model, French fashion firms have lessened their reliance on formal IP law to appropriate returns from their creativity. The industry's competitive advantage has been sustained by a synergy of ceaseless creative renewal, strategic use of brand and exclusivity, and an institutional environment that prizes both tradition and avant-garde experimentation. This has allowed Paris to retain its crown as the global fashion capital, even in the face of copying, globalization, and technological change. Fashion in France thus offers a powerful example of how creative industries can thrive on the basis of innovation-driven strategy, writing their own rules of competition when the law falls short.

Funding

This research was funded in whole by the National Science Centre in Poland, grant "Brand Abuse: Brand as a New Personal Interest under the Polish Civil Code against an EU and US Backdrop", grant holder: Marlena Maria Jankowska-Augustyn, number: 2021/43/B/HS5/01156. For the purpose of Open Access, the author has applied a CC-BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript (AAM) version arising from this submission.

10. References

1. Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. Journal of Management, 17(1), 99-120.
2. Barthes, R. (1967). Système de la Mode. Éditions du Seuil, Paris.

3. Barzanò & Zanardo (Patent Department Vicenza) (2019, September 9). Unregistered Community Designs. Barzanò & Zanardo. https://barzano-zanardo.com/en/approfondimenti/unregistered-community-designs/
4. Ceccagnoli, Marco & Rothaermel, Frank T. (2016). Appropriability Strategies to Capture Value from Innovation. In: Thursby, M.C. (ed) Technological Innovation: Generating Economic Results (2nd Edition). Advances in the Study of Entrepreneurship, Innovation and Economic Growth, Vol. 26. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Leeds. https://doi.org/10.1108/S1048-473620160000026001
5. Dior, C. (1957). Dior by Dior: The autobiography of Christian Dior. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
6. Codevelle, Floriane & Dimidjian-Lecomte, Karina (2021, September). France. In: Law Over Borders Comparative Guide: Fashion Law. The Global Legal Post. https://www.globallegalpost.com/lawoverborders/fashion-law-2116409480/france-561604550
7. Evans, C. (2013). Mechanical Smile: Modernism and the First Fashion Shows in France and America, 1900–1929. Yale University Press, New Haven.
8. Evered, L. J. (1992). Folded Fashions: Symmetry in Clothing Design. The Arithmetic Teacher, 40(4), December 1992.
9. Fédération de la Haute Couture et de la Mode (n.d.). Notre histoire. https://www.fhcm.paris/fr/notre-histoire
10. Fondation Napoléon (n.d.). Charles Frederick Worth, the Empress Eugénie and the invention of Haute Couture. Napoleon.org. https://www.napoleon.org/en/history-of-the-two-empires/articles/charles-frederick-worth-the-empress-eugenie-and-the-invention-of-haute-couture/
11. Font, Paula (2020). Sustaining a Competitive Advantage in the Fashion Luxury Market: A case study of Emerging Fashion Brands. Thesis for One-Year Master, Textile Management, Mälardalen University. https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1474617/FULLTEXT01.pdf
12. Gallaugher, John M. (2008). Zara Case: Fast Fashion from Savvy Systems. gallaugher.com. https://www.gallaugher.com/Zara%20Case.pdf
13. Google Arts & Culture (n.d.). How Iris van Herpen Transformed Fashion. Google Arts & Culture. https://artsandculture.google.com/story/how-iris-van-herpen-transformed-fashion/MAVhbe0AS9KOLQ#
14. Grumbach, D., & de Baudry Asson, N. (2001, July). Paris, capitale de la mode? Revue des Deux Mondes.
15. Hemphill, C. S., & Gersen, J. S. (2009). The law, culture, and economics of fashion. Stanford Law Review, 61 (March 2009). SSRN. https://ssrn.com/abstract=1323487
16. Henderson, R. M. & Clark, K. B. (1990). Architectural Innovation: The Reconfiguration of Existing Product Technologies and the Failure of Established Firms. Administrative Science Quarterly, 35(1):9–30. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393549
17. Jankowska, Marlena (2023a). Intellectual Property Rights, Copynorm and the Fashion Industry: A Comparative Analysis. Milton: Taylor & Francis Group. https://www.routledge.com/Intellectual-Property-Rights-Copynorm-and-the-Fashion-Industry-A-Comparative-Analysis/Jankowska/p/book/9781032452265
18. Jankowska, M., Meghaichi-Mimouni, M., Romanello Bueno, J. G., & Pawełczyk, M. (2023). French Copyright Law and the Pursuit of Fashion Elegance: Lost Jewels of Haute Couture. University of Silesia in Katowice. https://opus.us.edu.pl/info/book/USL7501582e18664869a7877566b24cb8b3/
19. Jankowska, Marlena; Meghaichi-Mimouni, Miriam; Romanello Bueno, José Geraldo; Pawełczyk, Mirosław (2024). French copyright law and the pursuit of fashion elegance: Protection of fashion design. Katowice: Instytut Prawa Gospodarczego Sp. z o.o. https://www.google.com.au/books/edition/French_copyright_law_and_the_pursuitofrfsJEQAAQBAJ?hl=en&gbpv=1&dq=inauthor:%22Marlena+Jankowska%22&printsec=frontcover
20. Joseph, A. (2014). "A Wizard of Silks and Tulle": Charles Worth and the Queer Origins of Couture. Victorian Studies, 56(2), 252.
21. Kapferer, J.-N., & Valette-Florence, P. (2018). The Impact of Brand Penetration and Awareness on Luxury Brand Desirability: A Cross Country Analysis of the Relevance of the Rarity Principle. Journal of Business Research, 83. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2017.09.025
22. Kamplimath, Girish (2018, January 17). A New Way of Looking at Innovation. Exandor. https://exandor.com/process-innovation-oslo-manual/
23. Koutsopoulou, E. (2017). Haute Couture as a Work Protected by Copyright (Master's thesis). Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece.
24. Lipovetsky, G. (2002). The Empire of Fashion: Dressing Modern Democracy. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
25. Milliner-Waddell, Jenna (2017, September 25). A Brief History Of Fashion Week In Photos. Elle Decor. https://www.elledecor.com/life-culture/g12453914/history-of-fashion-week/

26. Nystrom, P. H. (1928). Economics of Fashion (p. 30). Ronald Press Company, New York.
27. OECD (2018). Oslo Manual 2018: Guidelines for collecting, reporting and using data on innovation (4th ed.). Paris: OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/2018/10/oslo-manual-2018_g1g9373b.html
28. Ott, D. (2018). How Consumers Relate to Luxury Brands in the 21st Century: The Changing Concept of Sacredness and Its Importance (Master's thesis). Université Paris Sciences et Lettres, Paris.
29. Paris, I. (2010). Fashion as a System: Changes in Demand as the Basis for the Establishment of the Italian Fashion System (1960–1970). Enterprise & Society, 11(3), 531.
30. Paulicelli, E. (2009). Fashion and Futurism: Performing Dress. Annali d'Italianistica, 27, A Century of Futurism: 1909–2009.
31. Porter, M. E. (1990). The Competitive Advantage of Nations. Free Press.
32. Porter, Michael E. (1998). Clusters and the New Economics of Competition. Harvard Business Review, 76(6): 77–90. https://hbr.org/1998/11/clusters-and-the-new-economics-of-competition
33. Pouillard, Véronique (2016). Managing fashion creativity: The history of the Chambre Syndicale de la Couture Parisienne during the interwar period. Investigaciones de Historia Económica – Economic History Research 12(2): 76–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ihe.2015.05.002
34. Puglise, Nicole (2016, July 21). Fashion brand Zara accused of copying LA artist's designs. The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/fashion/2016/jul/21/zara-accused-copying-artist-designs-fashion
35. Raustiala, K., & Sprigman, C. J. (2006). The piracy paradox: Innovation and intellectual property in fashion design[UCLA School of Law Research Paper No. 06-04; Virginia Law Review, 92, 1687–1777]. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.878401
36. Reichman, J. H. (1983). Design Protection in Domestic and Foreign Copyright Law: From the Berne Revision of 1948 to the Copyright Act of 1976. 32 Duke Law Journal 1143–1264.
37. Richardson, M., & Thomas, J. (2012). Fashioning Intellectual Property: Exhibition, Advertising and the Press. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
38. Simmel, Georg (1957). Fashion. American Journal of Sociology 62(6): 541–558. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2773129
39. Teece, David J. (1986). Profiting from Technological Innovation: Implications for Integration, Collaboration, Licensing and Public Policy. Research Policy 15: 285–305. https://doi.org/10.1016/0048-7333(86)90027-2
40. Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management. Strategic Management Journal, 18(7), 509–533. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3088148
41. Teo, M. (2018, October 23). How Coco Chanel Revolutionized Women's Fashion with Just a Jacket. Lifestyle Asia Blog. www.lifestyleasia.com/hk/style/fashion/how-coco-chanel-revolutionised-womens-fashion-with-just-a-jacket/
42. Terziovski, M. & Sohal, A. S. (2000). The adoption of continuous improvement and innovation strategies in Australian manufacturing firms. Technovation, 20, 539–550. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4972(99)00173-X
43. The Fashion Law (2025). France: Legal Protections for Fashion. TFL Media, Inc. https://www.thefashionlaw.com/resource-center/france-legal-protections-for-fashion/#:~:text=The%20current%20structure%20of%20French:contentReference[oaicite:0]{index=0}
44. Zhang, D. & Di Benedetto, A. C. (2010). Radical fashion and radical fashion innovation. Journal of Global Fashion Marketing 1(4): 195–205. https://research.tue.nl/en/publications/radical-fashion-and-radical-fashion-innovation