Brought to you for 50% less.
Home delivery from $2.90 a week. Click here.
The New York Times

OPINION
WORLD
BUSINESS
FINANCE & ECONOMICS
SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY
PEOPLE
BOOKS & ARTS
MARKETS & DATA
DIVERSIONS

CITIES GUIDE
COUNTRY BRIEFINGS
Economist Intelligence Unit
onlinestore

RESEARCH TOOLS
Articles by subject
Backgrounders
Surveys
Style guide
Internet guide
Business database

PRINT EDITION



Full contents
Subscriptions

GLOBAL EXECUTIVE
Executive thinking, business education and more. Click here
A JOINT PROJECT WITH
Whitehead Mann

SHOP
Economist Shop
Books, diaries and more

OPINION

Innovation's golden goose

Dec 12th 2002
From The Economist print edition

Printable page
E-mail this
Discuss this

The reforms that unleashed American innovation in the 1980s, and were emulated widely around the world, are under attack at home

REMEMBER the technological malaise that befell America in the late 1970s? Japan was busy snuffing out Pittsburgh's steel mills, driving Detroit off the road, and beginning its assault on Silicon Valley. Only a decade later, things were very different. Japanese industry was in retreat. An exhausted Soviet empire threw in the towel. Europe sat up and started investing heavily in America. Why the sudden reversal of fortunes? Across America, there had been a flowering of innovation unlike anything seen before.

Possibly the most inspired piece of legislation to be enacted in America over the past half-century was the Bayh-Dole act of 1980. Together with amendments in 1984 and augmentation in 1986, this unlocked all the inventions and discoveries that had been made in laboratories throughout the United States with the help of taxpayers' money. More than anything, this single policy measure helped to reverse America's precipitous slide into industrial irrelevance.

Before Bayh-Dole, the fruits of research supported by government agencies had belonged strictly to the federal government. Nobody could exploit such research without tedious negotiations with the federal agency concerned. Worse, companies found it nigh impossible to acquire exclusive rights to a government-owned patent. And without that, few firms were willing to invest millions more of their own money to turn a raw research idea into a marketable product.

The result was that inventions and discoveries made in American universities, teaching hospitals, national laboratories and non-profit institutions sat in warehouses gathering dust. Of the 28,000 patents that the American government owned in 1980, fewer than 5% had been licensed to industry. Although taxpayers were footing the bill for 60% of all academic research, they were getting hardly anything in return.

The Bayh-Dole act did two big things at a stroke. It transferred ownership of an invention or discovery from the government agency that had helped to pay for it to the academic institution that had carried out the actual research. And it ensured that the researchers involved got a piece of the action.

Overnight, universities across America became hotbeds of innovation, as entrepreneurial professors took their inventions (and graduate students)

IN THIS QI
Innovatic goose
Brave ne farmace
Through
Symphor radio
Uncomm
Battle of
Images f world
Unretouc hand
A quart i
Shaken r
Dotty Ide
Gridlock superhig
The race biology
Move ov
Trapeze
The pow
Bespoke common
A drug o

RELATED
Unretouc hand
Dec 12th
Uncomm
Dec 12th
More ab
Intellect
Website

CLASSIFIEDS
Business education, recruitment, business and personal: click here

ABOUT US
Economist.com
The Economist
Global Agenda
Contact us
Advertising info

off campus to set up companies of their own. Since 1980, American universities have witnessed a tenfold increase in the patents they generate, spun off more than 2,200 firms to exploit research done in their labs, created 260,000 jobs in the process, and now contribute $40 billion annually to the American economy. Having seen the results, America's trading partners have been quick to follow suit. Odd, then, that the Bayh-Dole act should now be under such attack in America.

No free lunch

There has always been a fringe that felt it was immoral for the government to privatise the crown jewels of academic research. Why, they ask, should taxpayers be charged for goods based on inventions they have already paid for?

That is easily answered. Invention, as *TQ* has stressed before, is in many ways the easy bit. A dollar's worth of academic invention or discovery requires upwards of $10,000 of private capital to bring to market. Far from getting a free lunch, companies that license ideas from universities wind up paying over 99% of the innovation's final cost.

Then there is the American Bar Association, which has lobbied hard to get the government's "march-in" rights repealed. The government has kept (though rarely used) the right to withdraw a licence if a company fails to commercialise an invention within a reasonable period. This was to prevent companies from licensing academic know-how merely to block rival firms from doing so. The lawyers argue that the government could use its walk-in rights to bully pharmaceutical firms into lowering the price of certain drugs.

Whatever the merits of their case, suffice it to say that the sole purpose of the Bayh-Dole legislation was to provide incentives for academic researchers to exploit their ideas. The culture of competitiveness created in the process explains why America is, once again, pre-eminent in technology. A goose that lays such golden eggs needs nurturing, protecting and even cloning, not plucking for the pot. Readers who agree or disagree can share their own views at www.economist.com/forums/tq.

The Cour
Governm
provides
explanat
Bayh-Do

AD
HO
I EA
REV
FAS
Get th
Amer
Expre
with r
built i
EARI
DOU
POIN
Dru
Har
Gro
Gas
Clic
re
Terms and

ADVERTISEMENT



An Economist Group business

Copyright © The Economist Newspaper Limited 2002. All rights reserved.
Legal disclaimer | Privacy Policy | Terms & Conditions | Help