From: Norman Latker
To: Richard Latker
Date: 11/20/03 3:29PM
Subject: Re: Richard

Richard
The questions you asked are all reasonable given that you are new to the area. I can respond to all of them and support them with documentation including Califano's stupid attempt, with Kennedy's assistance ,to control the introduction of new technology. We need to devise the best means for transmitting the documentation you think you need.
I do not want to attempt to respond to your questions in writing. Besides the onerous task of explaining the muddled policies I was confronted with,the explanation will predictably raise additional questions, Further, I do not type well or fast.
I would like to speak to you at length if you wish to proceed. That will give you the opportunity to to futher question me if you don't understand or like my responses. You need to also understand that before the Bayh-Dole body of law there was no uniform policy, just chaos. In 1971 I was the draftsman for the Patent Committee for the President's Procurement Commission which analysed in an objective manner the different classes of government policies for disposing of the rights to inventions generated with government funding. The report I drafted covering the classes of disposition recommended to The Commission, contractor ownership wihch the Commission endorsed as part of their report to the President. While the President (Nixon) did not act on the report it created an incentive for a legislative fix which I mentioned before. At any rate, the report which I have, could give you the background for the choices of policies being pursued before B-D.
This is the best I can do without speaking to you further.
Dad

>>> "Richard Latker" <pristine@netvigator.com> 11/19/03 06:35PM >>>
Dad:

I've only been able to go through the text; the graphics weren't scanned properly and do not appear.

I understand roughly the political progression now. How innovators were frustrated by the existing system in the 1960s is pretty clear, too. What isn't clear is how opponents of Bayh-Dole thought the system should work, and some aspects of how the system did work before Bahy-Doke.

For example, it isn't clear what happens when the government holds "ownership" rights. The concept of government ownership is clear; how it manifested (or was supposed to manifest) is not. Were innovators from federally funded institutions supposed to get their inventions patented, and then ascribe these rights to the government somehow? Were royalty/licence agreements always hammered out in which the government was paid off ? Or were such inventions expected to become public domain immediately, so everyone everywhere could utilise them? Use the Cohen-Beyer gene splicing patent as an example. Before the 1976 licensing agreement, what exactly was the status of this technology? Mssrs Cohen & Beyer had a patent, but were not permitted to market it without government permission? How can they have a patent, but not "own" the invention?

One statement in the presentation is a little hard to swallow: "(Califano) instituted in 1977 a 'reassessment' of the IPA policy which stopped further invention processing on the ground that the introduction of new technology

everyone everywhere could utilise them? Use the Cohen-Beyer gene splicing patent as an example. Before the 1976 licensing agreement, what exactly was the status of this technology? Mssrs Cohen & Beyer had a patent, but were not permitted to market it without government permission? How can they have a patent, but not "own" the invention?

One statement in the presentation is a little hard to swallow: "(Califano) instituted in 1977 a 'reassessment' of the IPA policy which stopped further invention processing on the ground that the introduction of new technology

into the marketplace was escalating the price of healthcare..."

Was this really how the rational for the suspension of IP processing at HEW described? How was it raising the cost of healthcare generally? Did Califano really argue that the development and introduction of new technology was a social evil?

I understand that Big Business was not an early supporter of the reforms, but I do not fully understand why. I can understand being opposed to new competitors entering the market with patented products. But why was the exsiting system preferrable, exactly? Under the old system if an invention with market potential was developed, was it:

a) Unlikely to affect competition, because IP rights were unclear and it never made it to market?

b) Likely to help all existing market players equally, because no new competitors given exclusive intellectual property protection?

c) Likely to help all existing market players equally, because it was Immediately made public domain?

Also, it is less clear why that by the time Bayh-Dole was passed, the political opposition was pretty much from the Left, not big business.

Bayh-Dole refers only to Universities, correct? Then you mention the executive order, which extended the new regime to "all other recipients of federal funding." And these are? Why then was the Federal Technology Transfer Act required later?

More questions as they arise. Have your secretary send the scanned files as graphics, not text, so I can see the slides.

R---

----- Original Message -----
From: "Norman Latker" <NJL@browdyneimark.com>
To: <pristine@netvigator.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2003 1:05 AM
Subject: Richard

Richard
I'm sending the materials we discussed as an attachment.
As you go through it you will see answers to some of your questions. For instance, the first part of the paper touches on the frustration inventors felt about being unable to get their inventions to the marketplace which forced them to breach their obligations to the government. When Califano pulled the plug it stranded dozens of ownership determinations in the system which I identified for Dole and he used to introduce the Bill. Some were possible cancer cures. Indeed Califano's action and my firing were the flashpoint for the corrective legislation that we had been pursuing for years. I was constantly accused of breaching the Hatch act by the

As you go through it you will see answers to some of your questions. For instance, the first part of the paper touches on the frustration inventors felt about being unable to get their inventions to the marketplace which forced them to breach their obligations to the government. When Califano pulled the plug it stranded dozens of ownership determinations in the system which I identified for Dole and he used to introduce the Bill. Some were possible cancer cures. Indeed Califano's action and my firing were the flashpoint for the corrective legislation that we had been pursuing for years. I was constantly accused of breaching the Hatch act by the

opposition. At one point Rep. Dingel requested that the G.A.O. investigate my actions. I have their report in my files. All sorts of political/social maneouvering was undertaken from 1970 to1986 to gain passage of the body of law that makes tech. transfer possible. Here I must review my files to jog my memory.

I just spoke to John Barry who approved of our direction and recommended Raphael Sagalyn (www.sagalyn.com) who works on Wisc. Av. near us as our book agent.

Any comments ?

Dad

From: Norman Latker
To: Richard Latker
Date: 11/20/03 3:29PM
Subject: Re: Richard

Richard
The questions you asked are all reasonable given that you are new to the area. I can respond to all of them and support them with documentation including Califano's stupid attempt, with Kennedy's assistance ,to control the introduction of new technology. We need to devise the best means for transmitting the documentation you think you need.
I do not want to attempt to respond to your questions in writing. Besides the onerous task of explaining the muddled policies I was confronted with,the explanation will predictably raise additional questions, Further, I do not type well or fast.
I would like to speak to you at length if you wish to proceed. That will give you the opportunity to to futher question me if you don't understand or like my responses. You need to also understand that before the Bayh-Dole body of law there was no uniform policy, just chaos. In 1971 I was the draftsman for the Patent Committee for the President's Procurement Commission which analysed in an objective manner the different classes of government policies for disposing of the rights to inventions generated with government funding. The report I drafted covering the classes of disposition recommended to The Commission, contractor ownership wihch the Commission endorsed as part of their report to the President. While the President (Nixon) did not act on the report it created an incentive for a legislative fix which I mentioned before. At any rate, the report which I have, could give you the background for the choices of policies being pursued before B-D.
This is the best I can do without speaking to you further.
Dad

>>> "Richard Latker" <pristine@netvigator.com> 11/19/03 06:35PM >>>
Dad:

I've only been able to go through the text; the graphics weren't scanned properly and do not appear.

I understand roughly the political progression now. How innovators were frustrated by the existing system in the 1960s is pretty clear, too. What isn't clear is how opponents of Bayh-Dole thought the system should work, and some aspects of how the system did work before Bahy-Doke.

For example, it isn't clear what happens when the government holds "ownership" rights. The concept of government ownership is clear; how it manifested (or was supposed to manifest) is not. Were innovators from federally funded institutions supposed to get their inventions patented, and then ascribe these rights to the government somehow? Were royalty/licence agreements always hammered out in which the government was paid off ? Or were such inventions expected to become public domain immediately, so everyone everywhere could utilise them? Use the Cohen-Beyer gene splicing patent as an example. Before the 1976 licensing agreement, what exactly was the status of this technology? Mssrs Cohen & Beyer had a patent, but were not permitted to market it without government permission? How can they have a patent, but not "own" the invention?

One statement in the presentation is a little hard to swallow: "(Califano) instituted in 1977 a 'reassessment' of the IPA policy which stopped further invention processing on the ground that the introduction of new technology

everyone everywhere could utilise them? Use the Cohen-Beyer gene splicing patent as an example. Before the 1976 licensing agreement, what exactly was the status of this technology? Mssrs Cohen & Beyer had a patent, but were not permitted to market it without government permission? How can they have a patent, but not "own" the invention?

One statement in the presentation is a little hard to swallow: "(Califano) instituted in 1977 a 'reassessment' of the IPA policy which stopped further invention processing on the ground that the introduction of new technology

into the marketplace was escalating the price of healthcare..."

Was this really how the rational for the suspension of IP processing at HEW described? How was it raising the cost of healthcare generally? Did Califano really argue that the development and introduction of new technology was a social evil?

I understand that Big Business was not an early supporter of the reforms, but I do not fully understand why. I can understand being opposed to new competitors entering the market with patented products. But why was the exsiting system preferrable, exactly? Under the old system if an invention with market potential was developed, was it:

a) Unlikely to affect competition, because IP rights were unclear and it never made it to market?

b) Likely to help all existing market players equally, because no new competitors given exclusive intellectual property protection?

c) Likely to help all existing market players equally, because it was Immediately made public domain?

Also, it is less clear why that by the time Bayh-Dole was passed, the political opposition was pretty much from the Left, not big business.

Bayh-Dole refers only to Universities, correct? Then you mention the executive order, which extended the new regime to "all other recipients of federal funding." And these are? Why then was the Federal Technology Transfer Act required later?

More questions as they arise. Have your secretary send the scanned files as graphics, not text, so I can see the slides.

R---

----- Original Message -----
From: "Norman Latker" <NJL@browdyneimark.com>
To: <pristine@netvigator.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2003 1:05 AM
Subject: Richard

Richard
I'm sending the materials we discussed as an attachment.
As you go through it you will see answers to some of your questions. For instance, the first part of the paper touches on the frustration inventors felt about being unable to get their inventions to the marketplace which forced them to breach their obligations to the government. When Califano pulled the plug it stranded dozens of ownership determinations in the system which I identified for Dole and he used to introduce the Bill. Some were possible cancer cures. Indeed Califano's action and my firing were the flashpoint for the corrective legislation that we had been pursuing for years. I was constantly accused of breaching the Hatch act by the

As you go through it you will see answers to some of your questions. For instance, the first part of the paper touches on the frustration inventors felt about being unable to get their inventions to the marketplace which forced them to breach their obligations to the government. When Califano pulled the plug it stranded dozens of ownership determinations in the system which I identified for Dole and he used to introduce the Bill. Some were possible cancer cures. Indeed Califano's action and my firing were the flashpoint for the corrective legislation that we had been pursuing for years. I was constantly accused of breaching the Hatch act by the

opposition. At one point Rep. Dingel requested that the G.A.O. investigate my actions. I have their report in my files. All sorts of political/social maneouvering was undertaken from 1970 to1986 to gain passage of the body of law that makes tech. transfer possible. Here I must review my files to jog my memory.

I just spoke to John Barry who approved of our direction and recommended Raphael Sagalyn (www.sagalyn.com) who works on Wisc. Av. near us as our book agent.

Any comments ?

Dad

From: "Richard Latker" <pristine@netvigator.com>
To: "Norman Latker" <NJL@browdyneimark.com>
Date: 11/19/03 6:35PM
Subject: Re: Richard

Dad:

I've only been able to go through the text; the graphics weren't scanned properly and do not appear.

I understand roughly the political progression now. How innovators were frustrated by the existing system in the 1960s is pretty clear, too. What isn't clear is how opponents of Bayh-Dole thought the system should work, and some aspects of how the system did work before Bahy-Doke.

For example, it isn't clear what happens when the government holds "ownership" rights. The concept of government ownership is clear; how it manifested (or was supposed to manifest) is not. Were innovators from federally funded institutions supposed to get their inventions patented, and then ascribe these rights to the government somehow? Were royalty/licence agreements always hammered out in which the government was paid off ? Or were such inventions expected to become public domain immediately, so everyone everywhere could utilise them? Use the Cohen-Beyer gene splicing patent as an example. Before the 1976 licensing agreement, what exactly was the status of this technology? Mssrs Cohen & Beyer had a patent, but were not permitted to market it without government permission? How can they have a patent, but not "own" the invention?

One statement in the presentation is a little hard to swallow: "(Califano) instituted in 1977 a 'reassessment' of the IPA policy which stopped further invention processing on the ground that the introduction of new technology into the marketplace was escalating the price of healthcare..."

Was this really how the rational for the suspension of IP processing at HEW described? How was it raising the cost of healthcare generally? Did Califano really argue that the development and introduction of new technology was a social evil?

I understand that Big Business was not an early supporter of the reforms, but I do not fully understand why. I can understand being opposed to new competitors entering the market with patented products. But why was the exsiting system preferrable, exactly? Under the old system if an invention with market potential was developed, was it:

a) Unlikely to affect competition, because IP rights were unclear and it never made it to market?

b) Likely to help all existing market players equally, because no new competitors given exclusive intellectual property protection?

c) Likely to help all existing market players equally, because it was Immediately made public domain?

Also, it is less clear why that by the time Bayh-Dole was passed, the

never made it to market?

b) Likely to help all existing market players equally, because no new competitors given exclusive intellectual property protection?

c) Likely to help all existing market players equally, because it was Immediately made public domain?

Also, it is less clear why that by the time Bayh-Dole was passed, the

political opposition was pretty much from the Left, not big business.

Bayh-Dole refers only to Universities, correct? Then you mention the executive order, which extended the new regime to "all other recipients of federal funding." And these are? Why then was the Federal Technology Transfer Act required later?

More questions as they arise. Have your secretary send the scanned files as graphics, not text, so I can see the slides.

R---

----- Original Message -----
From: "Norman Latker" <NJL@browdyneimark.com>
To: <pristine@netvigator.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2003 1:05 AM
Subject: Richard

Richard
I'm sending the materials we discussed as an attachment.
As you go through it you will see answers to some of your questions. For instance, the first part of the paper touches on the frustration inventors felt about being unable to get their inventions to the marketplace which forced them to breach their obligations to the government. When Califano pulled the plug it stranded dozens of ownership determinations in the system which I identified for Dole and he used to introduce the Bill. Some were possible cancer cures. Indeed Califano's action and my firing were the flashpoint for the corrective legislation that we had been pursuing for years. I was constantly accused of breaching the Hatch act by the opposition. At one point Rep. Dingel requested that the G.A.O. investigate my actions. I have their report in my files. All sorts of political/social maneouvering was undertaken from 1970 to1986 to gain passage of the body of law that makes tech. transfer possible. Here I must review my files to jog my memory.
I just spoke to John Barry who approved of our direction and recommended Raphael Sagalyn (www.sagalyn.com) who works on Wisc. Av. near us as our book agent.

Any comments ?
Dad

From: Zachary Vaughn
To: pristine@netvigator.com
Date: 11/20/03 2:19PM
Subject: Missing Slides from Document

Dear Richard:

Please find attached the three slides associated with the document that Mr. Latker sent to you the other day. They are encoded as TIFF images.

Sincerely,

Zach Vaughn

From: "Latker, Carole (NIH/NIGMS)" <LATKERC@nigms.nih.gov>
To: "'njl@browdyneimark.com'" <njl@browdyneimark.com>
Date: 11/14/03 1:31PM
Subject: FW: Stories

-----Original Message-----
From: Richard Latker [mailto:pristine2@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 13, 2003 9:19 PM
To: Latker, Carole (NIH/NIGMS)
Subject: Stories

Dad:

There are some things that only you can tell:

* Why did you care in the slightest about how intellectual property was managed at federally funded institutions? Did Birch Bayh (he's dead I think)

approach you with the heartbreaking story about his wife? Was there some wonder drug stuck in the system someplace undeveloped and unmarketed? Basically, you have to give some compelling reasons why you gave a shit about the whole thing.

* Did you break the law (Hatch Act) in producing the legislation? If so, what compelled you to do so?

* What kind of political/social maneouvering took place during the political

process, and how did it affect you?

* Did any erstwhile allies prove to be duplicitous scumbags?

* do you have any regrets on how Bayh-Dole has impacted trhe country?

R---

Get 10Mb extra storage for MSN Hotmail. Subscribe Now!
http://join.msn.com/?pgmarket=en-hk