

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/msg00216.html>

- *From:* royls@xxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Fri, 17 Mar 2006 18:00:19 GMT
-

On Fri, 17 Mar 2006 10:46:35 -0000, "Andy F." <never.mind@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Thu, 16 Mar 2006 14:09:30 -0000, "Andy F." <never.mind@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

<royls@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:4418e1af.7530316@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

On Thu, 16 Mar 2006 02:44:55 -0000, "Andy F." <never.mind@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

"nospam" <nospam@xxxxxxxx>
wrote in message
news:JKWdne-jtsfgYYjZnZ2dnUVZ_v2dnZ2d@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Andy F.
wrote:

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

Re: Where would we be without these important patents?

job.

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

Re: Where would we be without these important patents?

Re: Where would we be without these important patents?

Why any of it? Only because of your post hoc fallacy.

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?

The ratio of patent filings to published scientific papers.

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 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.

No, you are of course flat wrong. It's almost all.

In other cases, the imitators will have an advantage because they can learn from their competitors' mistakes and produce a better product.

Re: Where would we be without these important patents?

Re: Where would we be without these important patents?

No, that almost never happens, because the first producer has much better information about the product, customer problems, etc.

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.

It's not clear if there would or not, or even what counts as a "new product." There would be fewer useless products, but probably a greater variety of competing products based on genuinely useful inventions of demonstrated value.

Now have you got any reason to believe that the extra innovation caused by the patent system isn't worth having?

Yes, of course: it's focused on what is most patentable, not on what is most useful and promising. It's a case of crowding out, the same way pharmaceutical research is entirely focused on patentable formulations, and better, safer, cheaper and more effective but unpatentable treatments are not merely ignored but suppressed as a result.

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

Re: Where would we be without these important patents?

Re: Where would we be without these important patents?

property.
Assuming
exclusive
ownership
of
somebody
else
creation is
just plain
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.

No, of course it doesn't.

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

He's smart, prolific, and works on simple technologies.

Inventors usually agree to work for a salary because it gives
them a
regular

Re: Where would we be without these important patents?

Re: Where would we be without these important patents?

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.

And people do it just as willingly for unpatented as for patented products. Your arguments are garbage.

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.

And might well be more productive working to improve designs than trying to find a way of pocketing rents.

-- Roy L

.