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I. Introduction
p. 26  Innovation is first and foremost a collective social endeavour, a collaborative process in which the firm, especially the small firm, depends on the expertise of a wider social constituency than is often imagined (workforce, suppliers, customers, technical institutes, training bodies, etc.). In the regional agglomerations that the authors focus upon in this paper, it is clear that firms have benefited from not having to shoulder the entire costs and burdens of innovation. These costs and burdens have been spread throughout the region, in the shape of buyer – supplier networks, technology transfer agencies, trade associations and training consortia etc. These intermediary forms of self–organization, which inhabit the middle ground between “states” and “markets”, are especially important in regions dominated by small and medium – sized enterprises (SMEs) because,generally speaking, such firms tend to be handicapped by being both small and lonely.

II. Dirigiste Approaches
p. 27  Clasically French in origin, modelled on Perroux’ (1950) concept of the growth pole or technopole, usually associated with a France dirigiste tradition, is becomening increasingly detached from centralist determination even in France. However, much the more interesting large – scale local and regional innovation projects are being developed in Germany.

p. 28  There, learning about the failures of old – style technopoles has led to a wave of relatively large – scale innovation initiatives. Not only is public – private partnership cemented in the formal constitution of such ventures but, for example in Aachen, start – up firms only continue to receive rental subsidies when graduating
from the laboratory atmosphere of the science park to the production atmosphere of the technology park, if they sign an agreement with a local “godfather” firm. Godfathers advise start-ups on business practice, keep them well-networked locally, and are intended to enable economic benefits to be retained in the locality. It is this kind of technopole that now carries more weight.

III. Grassroots Approaches

Where dirigisme is absent, a “soft infrastructure” of innovation support may emerge from the efforts of local, grassroots organization, perhaps municipal, perhaps private, possibly both.

p. 29 The key point about such grassroots methods of innovation support, especially but not exclusively in the Italian case, is that they have outlived their usefulness.

IV. The Network Paradigm

The regional system of innovation which many regions would most like to emulate is that of Baden – Wuerttemberg in Germany. This Land, created only in 1952, has consistently been one of the Federal Republic’s top economic performers in the past two decades. Its strength in innovation is built on “redundancy” in that many different institutions support it, including large and small enterprises, and one or two could be lost without the whole system suffering unduly. But because innovation is so well-embedded institutionally, scarcely any firm, however small, in need of innovation services, need be unable to access them locally.

p. 30 Next come the nine Universities, then follow the more applied research institutions such as the 14 Fraunhofer Institutes and the 64 other public non-University centres, ranging from international, through FRG, to industrial cooperative institutes. Most of this upper and middle part of the hierarchy deals with government and larger-scale industry. At the smaller end of the industrial hierarchy, the main actors are the technology transfer arms of Baden – Wuerttemberg’s 13 Chambers of Industry and Commerce, private consultants (who will also contract to large firms) and, unique to the Land, the Steinbeis Foundation. The last-named is a network of over 100 technology transfer centres, mostly based in Baden – Wuerttemberg’s 39
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Fachhochschulen (polytechnics) for the services of which the SMEs make a contract with the transfer centre, 7% of the value of which goes to the Foundation. Thus, the Steinbeis Foundation is 95% self – funding.

This is clearly a rich and well – provided innovation system which acts as such. There are complementarities between institutions as well as competition. This mirrors the industrial scene where much of the dominant engineering industry is vertically disintegrated but functionally highly integrated\(^3\).

p. 31 Lessons can be learned and applied as appropriate. One of these is that “networking” can fruitfully be practised. A second is that, as in the French or Italian cases, collaborative solutions are often necessary to enable firms to continue innovating the better to compete. The third is that public – private partnership is more robust than state or market approaches to innovation.

V. Conclusions

In brief, the authors have shown that the spatial dimension, in the form of the innovation milieu is an essential part of the innovation infrastructure of the successful economic region.

A collaborative ethic is seen to be in the ascendant, not only between firms seeking to enhance innovative potential, but between the public and private spheres as well. Tying much fof this together is a sometimes barely comprehended modus operandi referred to as “networking”. Innovation is increasingly a collaborative, leaning process. The evidence the authors have advanced suggest innovation is strongest where the networks linking the “soft infrastructure” of institutional support for business are most robust.

References


\(^3\) Ενδιαφέρουσα η ιδέα της διάσπασης της κάθετης ολοκλήρωσης και της επίτευξης λειτουργικής ολοκλήρωσης, η οποία γίνεται ανάμεσα σε περισσότερες επιχειρήσεις.