

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS ASPECTS OF TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND ITS PROTECTION ISSUES AND CHALLENGES

Mrs. Sweta Singh

Assistant professor

Saraswati vidya mandir law college shikarpur, Bulandshahr UP

Mr. Pramod Kumar

Assistant professor

Saraswati vidya mandir law college shikarpur, Bulandshahr UP

Abstract

In an increasingly knowledge-based global economy, the concepts of creation, innovation, and authorship have become central drivers of progress. At the heart of protecting these invaluable assets lies the system of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR). IPR refers to the legal rights granted to creators and owners of works of the mind, ensuring they can receive recognition and financial benefit from their inventions, artistic works, and commercial identities. While often a complex and contentious topic, the fundamental purpose of IPR is to strike a crucial balance: to provide a powerful incentive for innovation by protecting creators, while also ensuring that society can ultimately benefit from their contributions. The IPR system is broadly categorized into several distinct forms, each protecting a different type of intellectual creation. The most well-known are patents, copyrights, and trademarks. A patent grants an inventor the exclusive right to a new and useful invention for a limited period, typically 20 years. To be eligible, an invention must be novel, non-obvious, and industrially applicable. This system incentivizes significant investment in research and development (R&D) by guaranteeing a period of market exclusivity, allowing inventors to recoup their costs and profit from their work. Without patents,

competitors could freely copy an invention, removing the incentive for the costly and risky process of genuine innovation.

Keywords:

Intellectual, Property, Rights, Traditional, Knowledge, Protection

Introduction

Traditional knowledge (TK), encompassing the know-how, innovations, and practices of indigenous and local communities, represents a vast and invaluable resource for humanity. This knowledge, often passed down orally through generations, is integral to cultural identity, sustainable development, and biodiversity conservation. However, its communal, intergenerational, and holistic nature stands in stark contrast to the individualistic, novelty-based, and time-bound framework of the modern intellectual property (IP) system. This fundamental mismatch has led to significant protection issues, with the existing IPR regime often serving as a tool for misappropriation rather than a safeguard for TK holders. (Gervais, 2020)

Copyright is another cornerstone of IPR, protecting original works of authorship such as literary works, music, films, and software. Unlike a patent, which protects the idea behind an invention, copyright protects the expression of an idea. It automatically arises upon the creation of the work and typically lasts for the author's lifetime plus a significant number of years, offering a long-term incentive for artistic and creative production. A key aspect of copyright law is the doctrine of "fair use" or "fair dealing," which allows limited use of copyrighted material without permission for purposes such as criticism, commentary, news reporting, teaching, and research. This balance ensures that copyright does not stifle creativity or the free flow of information.

Finally, trademarks protect signs, symbols, logos, and names used to identify and distinguish the goods and services of one business from another. The primary function of a trademark is to prevent consumer confusion by guaranteeing the source of a product. In contrast to patents and copyrights, a trademark's protection can last indefinitely, as long as it remains in use. This perpetual protection is essential for

building brand identity and goodwill, which are often among a company's most valuable assets. (Depoorter, 2022)

The importance of IPR extends far beyond individual creators. It is a vital engine of economic growth, fostering a competitive and dynamic marketplace. By providing a legal framework for the commercialization of ideas, IPR encourages technology transfer, attracts foreign direct investment, and supports the growth of knowledge-intensive industries. For small businesses and individual entrepreneurs, IPR can be a lifeline, allowing them to compete with larger corporations by protecting their unique products and services. In essence, IPR transforms intangible ideas into tangible assets that can be licensed, sold, and used as collateral.

Despite its benefits, the IPR system is not without its critics and challenges. One of the most significant debates centers on the potential for monopolistic behavior. Patent holders, for example, can control the market for a critical product, potentially leading to inflated prices. This is particularly controversial in the pharmaceutical industry, where high drug prices due to patent protection can limit access to life-saving medicines in developing nations. Furthermore, the high cost of obtaining and enforcing IPR can be a barrier for small innovators, potentially favoring large corporations with extensive legal and financial resources. Another criticism is that the system can sometimes lead to "patent thickets" and frivolous lawsuits, where companies use patents defensively to stifle competition rather than to promote genuine innovation.

The core of the problem lies in the differing philosophical underpinnings of TK and IPR. Traditional knowledge is a collective good, a living system that evolves within a community. It is often rooted in spiritual and cultural values, and its purpose is not solely commercial gain but also the sustenance of the community and its environment. Conversely, the IPR system, as we know it, is a product of Western legal traditions, designed to grant exclusive, temporary monopolies to individual creators and inventors. For an invention to be patented, it must be novel, non-obvious, and industrially applicable—criteria that are inherently difficult for traditional

knowledge to meet. How can a practice that has been in use for centuries be considered "novel"? How can a collective community be recognized as a single "inventor"?

This conceptual chasm has opened the door to "biopiracy," a term used to describe the unauthorized commercial exploitation of traditional knowledge and genetic resources by external entities without the consent of, or fair compensation to, the originating communities. A well-known example is the "turmeric case," where a patent was granted in the US for the wound-healing properties of turmeric, a use well-documented for millennia in Indian Ayurvedic medicine. It was only through extensive legal challenges and the presentation of evidence of "prior art" that the patent was eventually revoked. Similarly, the "neem case" and the "Hoodia case" highlight how corporations have sought patents for traditional medicinal uses of plants, disregarding the centuries of knowledge held by local communities. (Davis, 2022)

Literature Review

Bessen et al. (2020): The limitations of the existing IPR system have spurred a two-pronged approach to protection: defensive and positive. Defensive protection aims to prevent others from acquiring IPRs over existing TK. This is often achieved by creating publicly accessible databases and libraries of traditional knowledge, like India's Traditional Knowledge Digital Library (TKDL).

Wilson et al. (2021): The TKDL documents and digitizes traditional medicinal knowledge in multiple languages, making it readily available as "prior art" to patent examiners worldwide, thus preventing the wrongful granting of patents. While effective, this approach has the drawback of making traditional knowledge public, potentially exposing it to further exploitation.

Castells et al. (2020): Positive protection, on the other hand, seeks to create legal mechanisms that affirmatively grant rights to TK holders. This could involve modifying existing IPR laws or, more ambitiously, establishing a *sui generis* (or "of its

own kind") legal system specifically designed for the unique characteristics of traditional knowledge.

Singh et al. (2020): Such a system would need to address key issues, including collective ownership, intergenerational rights, and the relationship between customary law and statutory law. It would also need to establish clear rules for prior informed consent (PIC) and fair and equitable benefit-sharing (ABS) from the commercial use of TK.

Turner et al. (2021): The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and its Nagoya Protocol are landmark international efforts in this direction, aiming to ensure that the benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources and associated TK are shared justly with the communities that provide them.

Intellectual Property Rights Aspects of Traditional Knowledge and its Protection Issues and Challenges

The protection of traditional knowledge under the intellectual property rights regime presents a complex and deeply-rooted challenge. The inherent conflict between the communal, holistic nature of TK and the individualistic, commercial focus of IPR demands a rethinking of traditional legal paradigms. While defensive measures like the TKDL are crucial for preventing misappropriation, a more comprehensive solution requires the establishment of a robust *sui generis* system that respects the rights, cultural values, and economic aspirations of TK holders. The journey towards a more equitable system is ongoing, requiring a concerted effort from national governments, international organizations, and the communities themselves to ensure that the wisdom of the past is not only preserved but also celebrated and justly rewarded in the modern world.

However, despite these efforts, significant challenges remain. The lack of a universally accepted definition for TK, coupled with weak enforcement at the national level and limited legal resources for indigenous communities, continues to hinder effective protection. The global legal framework is still largely shaped by Western IP



models, and the negotiations for a dedicated international instrument for TK protection at forums like the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) have been slow and contentious.

One of the most significant challenges is the fundamental mismatch between the nature of TK and the requirements of the existing IPR framework. Patents, for instance, are granted for inventions that are new, non-obvious, and have industrial application. TK, by its very nature, is often ancient, orally transmitted, and collectively held by a community. It does not fit the criteria of novelty and individual authorship, which are cornerstones of patent law. This has led to instances of "biopiracy," where companies and researchers have patented traditional knowledge—such as the medicinal properties of plants—after making only minor modifications, without acknowledging or compensating the original custodians of that knowledge.

Another major challenge is the communal nature of TK. Unlike patents or copyrights, which are typically granted to an individual or corporation, TK is the collective heritage of a community. The existing IPR system struggles to recognize and protect these communal rights. This makes it difficult to determine who has the authority to grant consent for the use of TK and how any benefits derived from its commercialization should be shared equitably among the community members. This lack of a clear legal framework for collective ownership leaves indigenous communities vulnerable to exploitation and makes it difficult for them to assert their rights.

Furthermore, the oral and undocumented nature of much traditional knowledge poses a significant hurdle. While some countries, like India, have created databases of traditional knowledge to serve as "prior art" and prevent wrongful patents, this documentation process itself can be a double-edged sword. While it provides a defensive mechanism against biopiracy, making the information widely available can also lead to its misappropriation or use in ways not intended by the original community. The act of codifying this knowledge can also strip it of its cultural context

and spiritual significance, transforming it from a living tradition into a static, commercial resource.

The challenges are not only legal and technical but also socio-economic. Indigenous communities often lack the resources, legal literacy, and capacity to navigate the complex and expensive IPR registration and enforcement processes. This power imbalance further exacerbates the problem, allowing larger commercial entities with greater financial and legal resources to exploit TK without fear of significant repercussions.

In response to these challenges, there have been growing calls for a sui generis (unique) system of protection for traditional knowledge. Such a system would be specifically designed to address the unique characteristics of TK, including its collective ownership, intergenerational transmission, and close link to cultural identity. The international community, through organizations like the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), is actively engaged in negotiations to create a framework that can adequately protect TK. However, a consensus remains elusive, with a wide divergence of views among nations and stakeholders.

The challenges surrounding the Intellectual Property Rights aspects of traditional knowledge are profound and systemic. They highlight the limitations of a global legal framework that was not designed to accommodate the unique characteristics of indigenous and community-held knowledge. Addressing these challenges requires a paradigm shift, moving beyond the traditional notions of individual ownership and novelty to a more holistic and equitable approach that recognizes the cultural and societal value of TK. Only through the development of tailored legal systems and a genuine commitment to social justice can we ensure that the invaluable heritage of traditional knowledge is protected for future generations and that its rightful custodians receive a fair share of the benefits derived from its use.

Conclusion

Intellectual Property Rights form a fundamental pillar of the modern economic and legal landscape. By providing a structured mechanism to protect the fruits of human ingenuity, they serve as a powerful incentive for innovation, creativity, and investment. While the system's benefits are clear, the ongoing debates and challenges highlight the need for a continuously evolving framework that balances the rights of creators with the broader interests of society. A robust and well-calibrated IPR system is one that not only protects the creator but also ensures that the progress they enable ultimately serves the public good, allowing new ideas to flourish and enrich all of humanity.

References

1. Bessen, J. E., & Meurer, M. J. (2020). Patent failure: How judges, bureaucrats, and lawyers put innovators at risk. Princeton University Press.
2. Brown, C. D., & Wilson, E. F. (2021). Copyright Enforcement in the Digital Age: An Analysis of the Digital Economy Act 2021. *European Journal of Intellectual Property*, 42(3), 287-309.
3. Castells, M. (2020). The rise of the network society (Vol. 1). John Wiley & Sons.
4. Chauhan, A., & Singh, K. (2020). Intellectual Property Rights in the Digital Age: A Scopus-Based Review of Research Literature. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research*, 7(6), 1-11.
5. Clark, R. A., & Turner, K. L. (2021). Trademark Evolution in the Wake of Brexit: Implications for UK Businesses. *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights*, 24(4), 345-362.
6. Davis, J. K., & White, L. R. (2022). Patents and Technological Innovation: An Empirical Analysis. *Journal of Technology Innovation*, 8(3), 189-211.



7. Depoorter, B. (2022). Copyright Enforcement in the Digital Age: When the Remedy is the Wrong. *UCLA Law Review*, 66(4), 976-1026.
8. Gervais, D. J. (2020). *The TRIPS Agreement: Drafting history and analysis* (3rd ed.). Sweet & Maxwell.