

Re: Where would we be without these important patents?

# Re: Where would we be without these important patents?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2006-03/msg00213.html>

---

- *From:* "Andy F." <[never.mind@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:never.mind@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Fri, 17 Mar 2006 10:46:35 -0000
- 

----- Original Message -----

From: <[royls@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:royls@xxxxxxxxxx)>

Newsgroups: sci.econ

Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2006 8:32 PM

Subject: Re: Where would we be without these important patents?

On Thu, 16 Mar 2006 14:09:30 -0000, "Andy F." <[never.mind@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:never.mind@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

<[royls@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:royls@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:4418e1af.7530316@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:4418e1af.7530316@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

On Thu, 16 Mar 2006 02:44:55 -0000, "Andy F." <[never.mind@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:never.mind@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

"nospam" <[nospam@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:nospam@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:JKWdne-jtsfgYYjZnZ2dnUVZ\\_v2dnZ2d@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:JKWdne-jtsfgYYjZnZ2dnUVZ_v2dnZ2d@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Andy F. wrote:

That would mean a lot of inventors would be out of a job.

From where you got this idea ? The scientists and engineers are

Re: Where would we be without these important patents?

Re: Where would we be without these important patents?

employed  
to  
design a product. The  
company will have the full  
right to use this  
designs.

But without exclusive use of the designs, the  
firm won't make enough  
profits  
to justify paying the inventors' wages.

Such claims are common, but false and ridiculous. Do you  
think no  
inventor was ever paid wages before there were patents?  
Give your  
head a shake.

Technological progress has been a lot faster since patents were  
introduced.

That is a blatant post hoc fallacy. So has population growth,  
literacy rates, democratic governance, life expectancy, etc. Do  
patents get all the credit for those, too?

No, they only get some of the credit.

In fact, the rate of  
progress in scientific discoveries that do not qualify for IP  
monopolies has been even greater than the progress in technology.

Any evidence for that claim?

It would be more profitable to wait  
until someone else invented a new product  
and then copy them.

No, that is also flat, outright wrong, because then you are  
behind the  
market. Whoever comes out with the product first has a  
chance to sell

Re: Where would we be without these important patents?

Re: Where would we be without these important patents?

to those who want the product most, and thus sell at a higher price.

Waiting until someone else has a successful product just gets you more intense competition, customers who do not want the product enough to buy it right away, and consequently a lower price.

That will be true for some products.

You misspelled, "almost all."

No, it's only some products. In other cases, the imitators will have an advantage because they can learn from their competitors' mistakes and produce a better product.

There's a short term advantage to being the first on the market. But that won't always be enough to justify the cost of developing a new product.

So? Some new products do not provide enough additional utility to be worth developing. Think Edsel, PCjr, New Coke, and all the patented drugs that later get banned when it turns out they kill people.

So you're admitting that there would be fewer new products without patents. Now have you got any reason to believe that the extra innovation caused by the patent system isn't worth having?

However, if during this work a invention, innovation, genial idea pops up this is the creation of the inventor and it must be his or her own property. Assuming exclusive ownership of somebody else creation is just plain

Re: Where would we be without these important patents?

Re: Where would we be without these important patents?

looting.

It's not looting. Patents only become the property of companies because the inventors agree to that.

In a sense. Inventors know they have little chance against corporate legal departments if they invent independently.

You're exaggerating about that. Dyson seems to be doing OK owning his own patents.

Oh, gosh, one guy! Guess that proves you're right, huh?

Give your head a shake.

It just proves that you're wrong. Unless you're going to explain what's special about Dyson. Why did he have a chance but other people don't?

Inventors usually agree to work for a salary because it gives them a regular income instead of having to wait for uncertain rewards in the future.

Nope. Flat wrong, as usual. They work for salaries because they know a fact that you refuse to know: that they invent because they like it, not because they anticipate being able to collect monopoly rents.

Dreaming up a new invention might be enjoyable. However, developing an invention into a marketable product involves a lot of hard work, which people aren't going to do unless they're getting paid.

If there were no patents, inventors would just be hired to work on the most promising lines of development, not only the most patentable ones.

Or they might not be hired as inventors at all.

Re: Where would we be without these important patents?

Re: Where would we be without these important patents?