

INTEGRATING SENSE OF SOCIAL JUSTICE INTO THE TEACHING OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

by Nurul Barizah

Submission date: 12-Aug-2020 11:24PM (UTC-0700)

Submission ID: 1369067536

File name: 10._Integrating_Sense_of_Social_Justice.docx (56.94K)

Word count: 3885

Character count: 21741

INTEGRATING SENSE OF SOCIAL JUSTICE INTO THE TEACHING OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

By

Nurul Barizah*

This paper argues that it is important for the lecturers to introduce a sense of social justice as part of intellectual property rights (IPR) subject in their teaching method and material. This paper argues that teaching IPR should not only provide explanation about national law, but to provide a professional jurist with a sense of social justice, it is important for student to have an explanation on IPR from different perspectives so that students have a comprehensive understanding on the subject. In this context, this paper emphases that teaching IPR should not only seen IPR as a main vehicle for transfer technology, investment and economic development of a nation, but also it in certain aspects lead to inhibit the development objectives of nations, particularly developing nations. Secondly, this paper also analyses that TRIPs adopted a protection paradigm with the objective to seek a balance the interests of innovators and users of technology. And in this context, it is fundamental to provide knowledge to students on how national laws of member nations should to take into account this perspective to achieve the TRIPs objective. Lastly, this paper explores several social justice and unfairness issues resulted from the protection of IPR, particularly in field of patent, copyright and plant varieties protection which have been a concern of a number of international organizations and forum.

8

Human genius is the source of all works of art and invention. These works are the guarantee of a life worthy of men. It is the duty of the state to ensure with dilligence the protection of the arts and inventions.¹

1. Introduction

The Introduction of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) law as a new subject or course in a majority of law schools or faculties in developing countries like Indonesia

*Lecturer at the Faculty of Law, Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, Indonesia, dipresentasikan pada Plenary Session, International Conference "Preparing for future

¹ See Gerald J. Mossinghoff and Ralph Oman, *The World Intellectual Property Organization; A United Nations Success Story*, 160 *World Affairs* 104 (1997) in Neil Weinstock Netanel (ed.), *The Development Agenda; Global Intellectual Property and Developing Countries*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1999, h. X.

44
can not be separated from the conclusion of the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs) Agreement on 1994.² Prior to 1994 there was no subject matter or course on IPR whether in the Faculty of Laws or other faculties in Indonesia. However, since Indonesian become a Member of the World Trade of Organization (WTO) by ratifying the Agreement of the Establishing WTO, including Agreement on Trade-related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs Agreement) in 1994³, a new subject matter have been introduced in the Faculty of Laws in Indonesia.

Subsequently, there was a need to increase the human resources capacity in Indonesia particularly for lecturer and legal enforcer bodies about IPR subject matters and to facilitate it, there have been in-house or overseas trainings of IPR for university lecturers, legal enforcers bodies promoted and supported by World Intellectual Organization (WIPO) incooperation with other international agencies or overseas fundings , such JICA, IASTP-AuSAID, USAID, etc.

One of the mains program was to send the lecturers and legal enforcers bodies to have in-house or overseas training about IPR in different countries such as Australia, Japan, Europe, etc. Accordingly, the perspective has been thought to the lecturer was the western IPR concept and perspectives, which seen IPR as one ways to promote technological innovation, economic progress and development of modern society. This perspective is in line with the objective enshrined under the TRIPs Agreement.⁴ Accordingly, there have been a prevalent thinking that protection of IPR enhance the economic and cultural development of Indonesia if this country provides IPR protection in accordance with TRIPs Agreement.

2. Current Content of Intellectual Property Subjects

Based on the knowledge and experience received from in-house and overseas training, lecturers sets up teaching material for the IPR subject matter, in which, traditionally it consists of all area of IPR subject matters, such as, copyright and related rights, patent, trademark, industrial designs, geographical indications, undisclosed information, layout-design of integrated circuit, and plant varieties protection. Such subjects are as provided under several international conventions and treaties related to the protection of IPR from Paris Convention on Industrial Property,⁵ Bern Convention on the Protection of Literacy Works,⁶ TRIPs Agreement, UPOV Convention on the Protection of Plant Varieties⁷ and other international systems and instruments.

27
²Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, Annex IC, Legal Instruments. Result of Uruguay Round, vol 31, 33 I.L.M.81 (Marrakesh; April 15, 1994).

³ Ibid.

⁴ See the objective of TRIPs Agreement in Article 7.

⁵ *Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property*, 21 U.S.T.1583, 828 U.N.T.S. 305, 20 March 1883 (entered into force 26 April or 19 May 1970).

⁶ The Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works of September 9, 1886, 828 U.N.T.S. 221

⁷ *International Convention for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants*, December 2, 1961, as Revised at Geneva on November 10, 1972 on October 23, 1978, and on March 19, 1991.

62 While the content of the IPR syllabus of has adopted mostly from the content of the IPR syllabus of the law schools or faculty of laws in developed countries because teachers have overseas training experience from developed country's law school. Eventhough there have been a number of concerns from developing countries's perspective about the protection of IPR and the potential impact for such countries in several sectors of development, such perspective have not yet been taken into consideration to be part of discussion or context of IPR subject matter or teching material. The basis of this is because the majority of the academics in Indonesia from 1995s until 2005s have a similar thoughts as the Government who believe that the protection of IPR is very important for protecting intellectual creativity effort, promoting technological innovation and transfer of technology, supporting investment climate, promoting the development of seed industries and in turn leads to support the development objective, including economic development.

The above believe is in line with the objective of the protection of IPR as provided under Article 7 of the TRIPs Agreement as follows:

“The protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights should contribute to the promotion of technological innovation and to the transfer and dissemination of technology, to the mutual advantage of producers and users of technological knowledge and in a manner conducive to social and economic welfare and to a balance of rights and obligation.”

3. Social Justice Issues in the Protection of IPR

According to Sun, IPR laws, has progressed without taken into account its effects on social justice, where reducing inequality is seen as essential for humanity and civilization.⁸ Otherwise, IP law has long been shaped by the percieved need to promote efficiency and protect individual interests in personhood and human labor.⁹ This social justice issue in the area of IPR have become a subject of intense discussion in a number of international forum between developed and developing countries. This issue rooted from the thought to harmonise IPR laws among the WTO –TRIPs Member countries without taken into consideration level of economic and technological development of each country. Many scholars argued that this thought is regarded as unfair and unjust particularly if it seen from John Rawl principle of justice.¹⁰ Sun also strongly states that “However, it would be shear arrogance to presume that a one size fits all approach toward intellectual provision will and should work for developing countries.”¹¹ Sir Hugh Laddie argues as follows:

22
⁸ Haochen Sun, “Can Louis Vuitton Dance with Hiphone? Rethinking the Idea of Social Justice in Intellectual Property Law,” *15 Pa. J. L. & Soc. Change* 389, 390.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹

¹⁷ “[f]or too long intellectual property rights have been regarded as food for the rich countries and poison for poor countries...Poor countries may find them useful provided they are accommodated to suit local palates. The ...appropriate diet for each developing country needs to be decided on the basis of what is best for its development, and that the international community and governments in all countries should take decision with that in mind.”¹²

The above argument clearly states that it is unjust to implement the protection of IPR based on one size fit all principles and there is a need to be taken into consideration when providing IPR protection for developing countries that is “what is best for its development”.

Accordingly, it is very important in IP laws to have a sense of social justice since it was found that the protection of IPR causes serious inequality problem. The following discusses social justice issues in different field of IPR.

3.1. Social Justice Issues in the Field of Patent

⁷ In the field of patent, social justice issues partly derived from the existence of the Article 27 (1) of the TRIPs Agreement, which states that:

“...Patents shall be available for any inventions, whether products or processes, in all field of technology, provided that they are new, involve an inventive step and are capable of industrial application...patents shall be available and patents rights enjoyable without discrimination as to the place of invention, the field of technology and whether products are imported or locally produced.”

From the above Article it can be interpreted that any inventions in the field of technology can be patented as long as they are fulfill the requirement of patentability, that are newness, inventive step and industrial application. This technology includes modern biotechnology industry and “life science industry”, such as biotechnological inventions, DNA sequences technology, etc. As Article 27 (3) further provides that:

¹ “Member may also exclude from patentability:

- (a) diagnostic, therapeutic and surgical methods for the treatment of human and animals;
- (b) plant and animal other than micro-organisms, and essentially biological processes for the production of plants and animals other than non-biological and microbiological processes. However, Member shall provide for the protection of plant varieties either by patents or by an effective sui generis system or by any combination thereof.”

¹² Hugh Laddie, Commission on Intellectual Property Rights Foreword, <http://www.iprcommission.org/papers/pdfs/final_report/CIPRfullfinal.pdf> (accessed at December 21, 2008).

The wide coverage of the Article 27 (1) is to ensure that no material will be excluded from a patent law,¹³ including biological resources. This article also subject to different interpretation particularly about the definition of “invention” from one jurisdiction to another depends on the level of technological development. In interpreting the term ‘invention’, proponents of biotechnology patents usually take a broader approach to include isolated and purified genetic resources and materials even though they are identical to their natural counterparts, including human genes, DNA sequences, and protein. they follow a liberal notion of patent law and policy that ‘everything under the sun made by man is patentable’.¹⁴ In contrast, opponents of biotechnology patents claims that the meaning of word ‘invention’ should exclude genetic resources found in nature.¹⁵

In practice, there are two types of patents involving genetic resources. Firstly, direct patenting of source material, in which a patent directly claims genetic resources obtained from separate source as an invention. Secondly, patenting of an invention which is derived from source material or somehow uses genetic resources.¹⁶ Such practices have extended the patentable subject matter and opened possibilities to grant patents on inventions which do not meet the patentability thresholds. Such practices are of concern because it opens uses of genetic resources that amount to improper or unfair misappropriation of the resources. This is potentially serious and, particularly unfair, where a patent permits a misappropriation of genetic resources related to traditional knowledge by biotechnology industries or other commercial entities.¹⁷ McCall argues that: “patenting biological substances is a mistake both morally and economically for

¹³ Maria Kruger, 'Harmonising TRIPs and the CBD; A Proposal from India', (2001) 10 *Minn.F.Global Trade* 169, 184-5.

¹⁴ The US PTO applies this principle.

¹⁵ Graham Dutfield, 'Intellectual Property and Basic Research; Discovery vs Invention', October 2001, Scidev. Net, 2001, revised December 2002), available from <<http://www.scidev.net/en/science-communication/>>, p. 1; See Also Carlos M. Correa, 'Access to Plant Genetic resources and Intellectual Property Rights' in Peter Drahos, and Michael Blakeney (eds), *IP in Biodiversity and Agriculture, Regulating the Biosphere* (Sweet & Maxwell, London, 2001)103-131, 111.

¹⁶ WIPO, 'Intellectual Property Questions in Relation to Genetic Resources' Information Meeting on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources, Geneva, September 15, 2004.

¹⁷ Charles R. Mcmanis, 'Fitting Traditional Knowledge Protection and Biopiracy Claims into the Existing Intellectual Property and Unfair Competition Framework, in Burton Ong (ed) (Marshall Cavendish Academic, Singapore, 2004) 425-510.

any system of intellectual property and should be reanalysed at all levels, particularly as it affects developing nations.”¹⁸

Similarly, Mgbeoji explicitly claims that patent policy facilitates global biopiracy.¹⁹ Scholars like Drahos,²⁰ Blakeney,²¹ Dutfield,²² Andrews,²³ Maskus and Reichman,²⁴ Ullrich,²⁵ Aoki²⁶ and many others also express similar concerns. In general, they argue that the expansion of the subject matters of the IPR particularly to include biological resources, including life forms, might facilitate biopiracy of developing countries’ resources. Such condition has a potential to undermine the availability of public goods on the basis that those important resources can be privatised under a global IPR framework by biotechnology industrialised countries.²⁷ Martin Khor, also argues that the large scale granting patent for genes and other biological materials is leading to an even greater concentration of control over the world’s food crop by a few

¹⁸ Diana D. McCall, 'Stating the Obvious; Patents and Biological Material', 2003 *U. Ill. J. L. Tech. & Pol'y* 239-257, 241.

¹⁹ Ikechi Mcbeoji, above Chapter 1, n 13, 119-200.

²⁰ Peter Drahos, 'The Regulation of Public Goods', in Keith E. Maskus and Jerome H. Reichman *International Public Goods and Transfer of Technology Under a Globalized Intellectual Property Regime* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005) 46-68.

²¹ Michael Blakeney, above Chapter 1, n 13, 393-425.

²² Graham Dutfield, *Intellectual Property Rights, Trade and Biodiversity; Seeds and Plant Varieties* (Earthscan, London, 2000); Dutfield is also concerned about the quality of patents due to an increase in the number of patent applications as a result of granting patents to 'invention' that privatise parts of the public domain, in Graham Dutfield, 'Sharing Benefits of Biodiversity Is there a Role for Patent System?', in Keith E. Maskus, *The WTO, Intellectual Property Rights and the Knowledge Economy, Critical Perspectives on the Global Trading System and the WTO* (E. Elgar Pub., Northampton, MA 2004) 292-324, 301.

²³ Lori B. Andrews, 'Genes and Patent Policy; Rethinking Intellectual Property Rights', (2002) 3 (10) *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 803-8, available from <http://www.nature.com/reviews/genetics> in David Vaver III (ed) *Intellectual Property Rights; Critical Concepts in Law*, (Routledge, London, 2006) 261-273.

²⁴ Keith E. Maskus and Jerome H. Reichman, *International Public Goods and Transfer of Technology under a Globalized Intellectual Property Regime* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005).

²⁵ Hanns Ullrich, 'Expansionist Intellectual Property Protection and Reductionist Competition Rules; A TRIPS Perspectives', in Keith E. Maskus and Jerome H. Reichman, *International Public Goods and Transfer of Technology Under a Globalized Intellectual Property Regime*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005) 709-725.

²⁶ Keith Aoki, 'Traditional Knowledge, Intellectual Property, and Indigenous Culture; Article: Weeds, Seeds & Deeds; Recent Skirmishes in the Seed Wars', (2003) 11 *Cardozo J. Int'l & Comp. L.* 247; See also Keith Aoki, above Chapter 1, n 13, 11-58.

²⁷ See for example, Michael Blakeney, 'Intellectual Property Rights and Global Food Security', in David Vaver III (ed), *Intellectual Property Rights; Critical Concept in Law* (Routledge, London, 2006) 315-338.

corporations.²⁸ According to Khor, these patents pose a threat to a global food security, including farmer's livelihoods.²⁹ Furthermore, Jeffery states that:

Opponents to the pro-patent view assert that by creating patents over living organisms we are encouraging the destruction of biodiversity and creating monopolies that are unfair and immoral. This view says that such patents also support 'biopiracy', which is the unauthorized use of biological resources or the traditional knowledge held by indigenous communities or developing countries.³⁰

Moreover, the patent system is also used as a means to transfer the benefit of genetic resources from the BRDC to the BDC. Mgbeoji illustrates that:

5 Today's pirates don't come with eyes patches and daggers clenched in their teeth, but with sharp suits and claiming intellectual property rights. So those rich countries which take seeds away from their poorer neighbours and then try to patent them are guilty of theft – plain and simple; biopirates by an-other name.³¹

If intellectual property holders can commercialise the patented inventions and earn revenue on the basis of exclusive rights, the local communities or the countries that developed or used the knowledge or resources would not receive any revenue or benefit arising from patent.³² This condition is ironic if the patented inventions are relatively expensive to 54 developing countries from where the patented process and products originated.³³

28 Khor also notes that top five corporations involved in agricultural biotechnology (AstraZeneca, DuPont, Monsanto, Novartis and Aventis) account 60 percent of global pesticide market, 23 percent of the commercial seed market and virtually 100 percent of the transgenic seeds market, see in Martin Khor, above n 10, 22.

29 Khor argues that such patents may decrease farmer's access to affordable seed, reduce effort in public plant breeding, increase the loss of genetic diversity and prevent traditional forms of seeds and plant sharing. Khor also found that the companies were seeking patent protection on genes sequences, proteins, plants and seeds. Three-quarters of patents on plants genes were by the private sector and almost 601 patents on plants DNA were filed by just 14 multinational corporations. This includes main staples like rice, Maize, Potato, Wheat, Soybean, as well as patent related to medicinal plants. Martin Khor, *ibid* 24-29.

30 Michael I. Jeffery, above n 184, 200.

31 Ikechi Mgbeoji, above Chapter 1, n 13, 121, as quoted from *New Scientist*, <<http://www.newscientist.com/ns/980214/editorial.html>>; See also the analysis of the foundation of patent system that support biopiracy in David Conforto, as above Chapter 1, n 16, 357; See the narration of 'biopiracy' by using epithets 'biological colonialism', 'bioimperialism', and the newest form of Western imperialism, as above Chapter 1, n 16.

32 Martin Khor, above n 10, 21.

33 *Ibid*.

This perspective lies at the basis of widespread criticism of the patent system as being one of the roots of unfairness in the global wealth distribution. Patent law only protects inventions that satisfy the collective requirement of patentability, and such requirements in practice operate to eliminate the opportunity for traditional technological innovations to be protected under this system.³⁴ Patent law provides protection for modern laboratory products and processes in pharmaceutical companies' inventions even though such inventions are derived from traditional medicinal knowledge of certain local communities. The Prime Minister of Malaysia expressed this concern as follows:

¹⁶ [T]he poor countries have been told to preserve their...genetic resources on the off-chance that at some future date something is discovered which might prove useful to humanity...We are also told that the rich will not agree to compensate the poor for their sacrifices. The poor are not asking for charity. When the rich chopped down their forests ... and scoured the world for cheap resources, the poor said nothing. Indeed, they paid for development of the rich. Now the rich claim a right to regulate the development of the poor countries. And yet any suggestion that the rich compensate the poor adequately is regarded as outrageous. As colonies, we were exploited. Now, as independent nations, we are to be equally exploited.³⁵

³⁶ President Ali Hassan Mwinyi of Tanzania at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development also expressed similar concerns:

⁶ [M]ost of us in developing countries find it difficult to accept the notion that biodiversity should [flow freely to industrial countries] while the flow of biological products from the industrial countries is patented, expensive and considered the private property of the firms that produce them. This asymmetry reflects the inequalities of opportunity and is unjust.³⁶

Those statements indicate the great concern of developing countries on the issue of IPR and biological resources. They also indicate that developing countries consider that they have been left out of the benefit of the IP system, and that the system may be inconsistent with their social and cultural values, as well as their national and

³⁴ Under IPR regime, public and community –based knowledge is considered 'common heritage; that should be made freely available, see Biswajit Dhar, Sachin Chaturvedi, and R.V. Anuradha, *Regime of Intellectual Property Protection for Biodiversity; A Developing Country Perspective* (RIS and IUCN, 2001) 74.

³⁵ As quoted in William Fisher, *ibid* 9.

³⁶ *Ibid*.

technological interests. However, the IPR system has been implemented and forced upon them through multilateral³⁷ and perhaps bilateral trade agreements.³⁸

This unfairness seems more blatant when the technological element said to establish novelty or inventive step for the purpose of patent law is only a very thin veneer covering the traditional knowledge which was considered to be incapable of patent protection.³⁹ In simple words, patent system facilitate the interests of technological innovations which take place in modern technological societies and fails to acknowledge the traditional systems of knowledge that have evolved over time in traditional society.⁴⁰

Furthermore, strengthening IPR protection for pharmaceutical can lead to problem of public health. For example, people who are HIV-positive in some developing countries like Africa may not have the means to afford patent-protected HIV treatment drugs that could sustain their survival.⁴¹ Because of that, the Doha Declaration on the TRIPs Agreement and Public Health⁴² has concluded, in which this Declaration emphasises

³⁷ Susan K. Sell, 'Life After TRIPs – Aggression and Opposition', in *Private Power, Public Law; The Globalisation of Intellectual Property Rights* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003)121-62; See also, Susan K. Sell 'Intellectual Property Protection and Antitrust in the Developing World; Crisis, Coercion, and Choice', in *Power and Ideas, North-South Politics of Intellectual Property and Antitrust*, (State University of New York Press, New York, 1998)175-216; Donald G. Richards, 'The Political Economy of TRIPs', in *Intellectual Property Rights and Global Capitalism, The Political Economy of the TRIPs Agreement* (M.E Sharpe, Inc, New York, 2004) 112-140; See also, Michael Blakeney, 'A Critical Analysis of the TRIPs Agreement' in Meir Perez Pugatch (eds), *Intellectual Property Debate, Perspective from Law, Economics and Political Economy, New Horizons in Intellectual Property* (Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, 2006) 17-32; See also, Peter Drahos, 'The Universality of Intellectual Property Rights; Origins and Development' in *Intellectual Property and Human Right*, World Intellectual Property Organisation, Geneva, 1999, p 13-41, available from <<http://www.wipo.int/tk/en/hr/paneldiscussion/papers/pdf/drahos/pdf>>;

See also Tai-Heng Cheng, 'Power, Norms, and International Intellectual Property Law', (2006) 28 *Mich. J. Int'l L.* 109, 109-155.

³⁸ Carlos Correa, 'Bilateral Investment Agreements; Agents of New Global Standards for the Protection of Intellectual Property Rights?' A study commissioned by GRAIN, 2004, available from <<http://grain.org/briefings/?idl186>> (last visited 13 February 2006); See also, Peter Drahos, 'Bits and BIPs, Bilateralism in Intellectual Property', (2001) (4) *Journal of World Intellectual Property* 791, 791- 808; Peter Drahos, 'Expanding Intellectual Property's Empire; the Role of FTAs' (2003), available from <http://www.bilaterals.org/IMG/doc?expanding_IP_empire_-_Role_of_FTAs.doc> (last visited on February 2006).

³⁹ As an example, the case of a patent granted on the ailment 'dry eyes'. In the Indian literature, 'dry eyes' control has been spelled out through the use of leaves of aloe vera (leaves of Kumari plant in Indian Language). The process of the remedy is to take few leaves of aloe vera, wash these in clean water and then crush the leaves. Put some drops of solution that is extracted from the leaves into the eyes and the 'dry eyes' problem is cured. The patent application has been granted to the USPTO follow the same principle or similar process, the only different is that the clean water has been replaced with chlorinated water. And of course, the technical terms and languages also used to make it look like a new product. See, 'TK Digital Library; Another Tool For Biopiracy', *South Bulletin-39*, A South Centre Publication, 15 July 2002, p 9; Cynthia M. Ho, above Chapter 1, n 16, 456, also recognises that patents can also be based on traditional knowledge.

⁴⁰ Biswajit Dhar, Sachin Chaturvedi, and R.V. Anuradha, above n 249, 74.

⁴¹

⁴² The Doha Development Agenda,

13
the fact that “concern had been growing that patent rules might restrict access to affordable medicines for populations in developing countries in their efforts to control diseases of public health importance, including HIV, tuberculosis and malaria”.⁴³

In Indonesia, for example, it might be argued that the introduction of a patent system on pharmaceuticals will have a beneficial effect by allowing access to proper patented pharmaceuticals and its overall capacity for Indonesian investment in R & D in the health system. However at this time, the introduction of a patent system to some extent contributes to greater unaffordability and lack of access to medicines. The Department of Health has acknowledged that the TRIPs Agreement has created a wider dependency on developed countries for the stock and availability of medicines, which in turn has a negative impact on the affordability and price of medicines in Indonesia.⁴⁴ Siahaan from the Centre for Services and Technology R & D also found that the prices of medicines in Indonesia are high as compared to international reference prices, and there are significant differences between innovator brand (patented) & generic equivalent products.⁴⁵ Furthermore, there is a little evidence that the patent system increases Indonesia’s R& D capacity in health sector. This causes great concern.⁴⁶

Although the Indonesian Patent Act contains provisions intended to secure benefits for public health. Three legal mechanisms can be used to further the public interest in health problems. These are: Parallel Imports,⁴⁷ Compulsory Licenses,⁴⁸ and Government Use.⁴⁹ However, the ‘Government Use’ is the only option that has been used by Indonesia to deal with the spreading of HIV, while the first two has not been utilized.

The use of compulsory licensing was also recommended by the WHO in the case of the ‘abuse of patent rights or a national emergency’ with the aims to ensure that the price of drugs is affordable for local purchasing power. Similarly, UNAIDS has also suggested the use of such a licence, particularly in countries where HIV/AIDS is

10
⁴³ Ibid. See in <http://www.who.int/medicines/areas/policy/doha_declaration/en/index.html (Last visited Maret 21, 2013).

⁴⁴ Departemen Kesehatan RI 2005, above n 170.

⁴⁵ Selma Siahaan, ‘Medicines Prices in Indonesia’ (Centre for Health Services and Technology Research and Development, National Institute for Health R & D Indonesia, 14 June 2006) 1, available from <<http://haiweb.org/medicinesprices/surveys/200408ID/sdocs/MEDICINESPRICESININDONESIA.ppt#256>>

⁴⁶ Departemen Kesehatan RI 2005, above n 170, 9; See also Tomi Suryo Utomo, Indonesian Drug Policy and Patent Regulation After the TRIPs Agreement; Better Access to Essential medicines? (Dissertation, University of Washington School of Law, Seattle, 2006).

⁴⁷ See Article 135 of the Indonesian Patent Act, above Chapter 1, n 32.

⁴⁸ Ibid, Articles 87-74 of the Indonesian Patent Act.

⁴⁹ Ibid, Articles 99-103 of the Indonesian Patent Act.

spreading rapidly.⁵⁰ Contrary to general expectations, developed nations, which have well established public health systems, still use the opportunity to give a compulsory licence,⁵¹ while few compulsory licences have been granted in developing countries. This may be due to a number of reasons such as; the lack of adequate technology and manufacturing capacity of these nations, the lack of availability of full and reliable information on patents granted in developing countries, the complicated procedure and these mechanisms may also be viewed by the companies as threatening their interests.

Moreover, There is growing concern about the likely implication of patents hindering downstream research.⁵² This concern is derived from the analysis of Michael A. Heller and Rebecca S. Eisenberg, who argue that the recent rush in patenting will harm innovation by creating 'anticommons' that threaten innovation by raising the transaction costs of R & D.⁵³ By using the anticommons theory, Eisenberg argues that 'too many patent rights on 'upstream' discoveries can stifle 'downstream' research and product development by increasing transaction costs and magnifying the risk of bargaining failures'.⁵⁴ Earlier, Eisenberg argues that 'patent rights in some government-sponsored discoveries may actually be undermining, rather than supporting, incentives to develop new products and bring them to market'.⁵⁵ Furthermore, Eisenberg maintains that:

⁵⁰ UNAIDS, 'Statement of UNAIDS at the Third WTO Ministerial Conference, Seattle' 30 November- 3 December 1999, 2, access at <<http://www.southcentre.org/publications/publichealth-14.htm>>

⁵¹ Canada is probably the developed country with the largest number of compulsory licence based on the 1969 law amendment that authorised automatic licences on pharmaceuticals, and then followed by the US under antitrust laws. See Carlos Correa, above n 380, 97.

⁵² This concern can be seen for example in the case of Myriad Genetic in which advocates have questioned whether the broad coverage that Utah-based Myriad Genetic enjoys on its breast cancer gene patents is slowing down research in curing this disease. This is because Myriad received two patents on diagnostic tests and treatments involving these genes. Myriad then entered into licences with several medical schools, universities, and hospitals, and through this licences those institutions has the rights to research breast cancer and its related issues. However, the scope of these licences is very limited. One of examples is that the licences are confined only to laboratory research and do not extend to clinical settings. According to Jaffe and Lerner, many medical school researchers have been forced to throw away their research program due to the licensing terms and this condition has been happening since the first patent was granted in December 1997. See in Adam B. Jaffe and Josh Lerner, *Innovation and its Discontents; How Our Broken Patent System Is Endangering Innovation and Progress and What To Do About It* (Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 2004) 17.

⁵³ Michael A. Heller and Rebecca Eisenberg, 'Can Patents Deter Innovation? The Anticommons in Biomedical Research' (1998) 280 *Science* 689, 689.

⁵⁴ R.S. Eisenberg, 'Bargaining over the Transfer of Proprietary Research Tools; Is This Market Failing or Emerging?' in R.C. Dreyfuss, (et.al) (eds) *Expanding the Boundaries of Intellectual Property, Innovation Policy for the Knowledge Society* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, England, New York, 2001) 223-250, 226-29.

⁵⁵ Rebecca S. Eisenberg, 'A Technology Policy Perspective on the NIH Gene Patenting Controversy' (1994) 55 *U. Pitt. L. Rev.* 633, 640.

¹⁴ The patent system aims to promote scientific and technological progress by granting exclusive rights ...But the enforcement of these exclusive rights against subsequent researchers can sometimes interfere with further progress in the field of inventions... That free access to prior discovery by subsequent researchers might be a more effective means of promoting progress... But as the line between basic and applied research becomes blurred in certain fields, patent protection increasingly threatens to encroach on the domain of research science.⁵⁶

To address this problem, Eisenberg suggests formulating carefully the experimental use exceptions from patent infringement liability.⁵⁷

The use of experimentation or research exceptions is permitted under Article 30 of TRIPs. Most countries provide this exception, but, the appropriate scope of this exception has been subject to intense debate among legal scholars. In the US, there is a statutory basis for the 'experimental use exception',⁵⁸ but it has been established based on case law using a very narrow term, only for 'philosophical experiments'.⁵⁹ *Madey v Duke*⁶⁰ reaffirmed the extremely narrow approach proposed by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.⁶¹ The *Madey* decision has not been well received by those concerned

⁵⁶ Rebecca S. Eisenberg, in David Vaver III (ed) above n 24, 121.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ See Advisory Council on Intellectual Property (ACIP), above n 348, 2. See also Carlos M. Correa, above n 90, 122.

⁵⁹ The opinion of the Supreme Court Justice Story in *Whittemore v. Cutter* (1813) stated that:

⁵⁶ '[I]t could never been the intention of the legislature to punish a man who constructed such a machine merely for philosophical experiments, or for the purpose of ascertaining the sufficiency of the machine to produce its described effects". And by 1861 it was generally accepted that 'an experiment with a patented article for the sole purpose of gratifying a philosophical taste, or curiosity, or for mere amusement is not an infringement of the rights of the patentee'.

See Advisory Council on Intellectual Property (ACIP), ⁵¹ *ibid.*

⁶⁰ *J. Madey v. Duke University* No. 1: 97CV1170, slip on (M.D.N.C. June 15, 2001); 307 F. 3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2002) *Madey* is a physicist who moved from Stamford University to Duke University. *Madey* had received two patents on 'free electron lasers' (FEL) while at Stanford. When *Madey* moved to Duke, this University built an FEL lab for *Madey*, including equipment protected by *Madey's* Patents. *Madey* headed this lab for almost ten years, but after than *Madey* was removed as head of the lab and left Duke University. But, Duke continued to operate the FEL lab, and on this basis *Madey* sued the University and claiming infringement of the patent that he held from his work during at Stanford. On the basis that Duke's established a patent policy that states that Duke is 'dedicated to teaching, research, and the expansion of knowledge ... [and] does not undertake research or development work principally for the purpose of developing patents and commercial applications' the District Court found that the Duke FEL was covered by the experimental use exception, and granted Duke's request for a ruling for its favour. But *Madey* appealed, and in this appeal the Court of Appeal for the Federal Circuit held differently, this Court decided that the universities, by their very nature, are not eligible for the experimental use exception. The Court also concluded that the exception use should continue but 'albeit in [a] very narrow form'. See also in Adam B. Jaffe and Josh Lerner, above n 353, 65-6. ⁵⁰

⁶¹ In which the Court of Appeal for the Federal Circuit held that:

to promote research. Some have predicted the decision will have devastating consequences for academic scientific research, particularly in the fields of biotechnology and biomedicines.⁶² Moreover, without an experimental use exception, research institutions will be highly dependant on the mercy of the patent's holders, consequently, blocking further innovative research.⁶³ For example, if this strict approach is applied in the context of a patent on seeds, it has the potential to prevent third party from using patented seeds to produce improved varieties even for non commercial purposes, like experimentation.⁶⁴

Lastly, in the context of access to patented material can be critical to the success of further research, but there is no uniform rule regarding the time of access.⁶⁵ In the era of economic pragmatism, this access is even more complicated. As noted by a researcher:

'... major research universities, such as Duke, often sanction and fund research projects with arguably no commercial application whatsoever. However, these projects unmistakably further the institution's legitimate business objectives, including educating and enlightening students and faculty participating in these projects... In short, regardless of whether a particular institution or entity is engaged in an endeavour for commercial gain, so long as the act is in furtherance of the alleged infringer's legitimate business and is not solely for amusement, to satisfy idle curiosity, or for strictly philosophical inquiry, the act does not qualify for the very narrow and strictly limited experimental use of defence. Moreover, the profit or non-profit status of the user is not determinative'.

See also, this citation in Adam B. Jaffe and Josh Lerner, *ibid*.

⁶² See the Brief for Association American Medical Colleges (et.al), as *Amici Curiae* in Support of Petitioner at 14, *Duke Univ. v. Madey*, 123 S. Ct.2639 (2003) (No. 02-1007), See also expressing 'grave concern' that *Madey* will 'encourage patent holders to assert claims in a manner that will impede or altogether frustrate university scientists' ability to make further basic advances in critical areas of biotechnology and biomedicine', in David Malakoff, University Ask Supreme Court to Reserve Patent Ruling, 299 Sci. 26, 27 (2003) which reporting concern of academics that *Madey* will have 'disastrous' implication for university Science, in Cristina Weschler, 'The Informal Experimental Use Exception; University Research After *Madey v. Duke University*', footnote no. 5, available from <<http://www.law.nyu.edu/journals/lawreview/issues/vol79/no4/NYU406.pdf>>.

⁶³ Jennifer Miller, 'Duke University Sealing the Coffin on the Experimental Use Exception', available from <<http://www.law.duke.edu/journals/dltr/articles/PDF/2003DLTR0012.pdf>> and Rochelle Dreyfuss, 'Protecting the Public Domain of Science; has the Time for an Experimental use Defense Arrived?' (2004) 46 (3) *Arizona Law Review* 457.

⁶⁴ 35 U.S.C. §271(a); See also, Mark D Janis, 'Experimental Use and the Shape of Patent Rights for Plant Innovation', Paper for Economics of Innovation and Science Policy Lecturers, Centre for Agriculture and Rural Development, Iowa State University, September 15, 2003, 1, available from <<http://www.card.iastate.edu/reseach/stp/lectures.aspx>> (last visited 1 August 2008).

⁶⁵ The US law strictly stipulates that access only can take place after patent granting and only permissible for experimental use, while commercial use of the sample material constitutes patent infringement, While the European patent law follows the Budapest rule, and only for experimental purpose. See in Carlos M. Correa, above n 90, 121.

‘Even after the patent is filed and granted, access to the material can be denied by failure to answer requests. Such access as may be granted may not be meaningful since profitable use of the materials may be prohibited and, even if allowed, is subject to restrictions. The result is that the laws sometimes limit, or even prevent, beneficial applications.’⁶⁶

Access becomes more complicated since academics and university institutions are often engaged in a significant amount of commercial activity.⁶⁷ Eisenberg argues that “The greater commercial activity of academic scientists, and a greater awareness among commercial scientists of the potential value of IP associated with research, has raised concern of the slow down of the flow of research material.”⁶⁸

Therefore, patents protection may contribute to the unavailability of access to samples of protected and patented materials, and research inputs without any commercially based licence agreement.⁶⁹

3.2. Social Justice Issues in the Field of Copyright

In the area of copyright and trademark, IP has a potential to inhibit an individual’s ability to express her/his views in the public sphere because what people want to communicate, such as a passage from copyrighted work or a trademarked logo, is often subject to proprietary control by an IP owner. Although the fair use doctrine eases the speech-censoring function of copyright protection, this capacity has been substantially reduced with the vast expansion of copyright protection over the past few decades, thus it has an impact on protecting public interest in copyright law.⁷⁰ Because of that there has emerged an urgent need for reshaping IP law in favor of the “long – neglected concerns of the poor, the sick, the visually impaired and others” to respond

⁶⁶ Carlos M. Correa, *ibid.*

⁶⁷ John P. Walsh, Charlene Cho and Wesley M. Cohen, *Patent, Material Transfers and Access to research Inputs in Biomedicine Research*, Final Report to the National Academy of Sciences, Committee Intellectual Right in Genomic and Protein-Related Inventions, September 2005, 37.

⁶⁸ R.S. Eisenberg, in R.C. Dreyfuss, (et. al) (eds) above n 355, 223-250.

⁶⁹ Access to sample material (tangible property) in the form of material is more likely to impede research. There are increasing numbers of researchers who did not receive materials in response to their last request. The reason for academics not sharing materials is the time and cost of providing those materials and scientific competition, while for industrial researchers, the reason is for commercial interest (patents). See the study conducted by John P. Walsh, Charlene Cho and Wesley M. Cohen, above n 398, 27-28.

⁷⁰ Haochen Sun, “fair Use as a Collective User Right, 90 N.C.L. Rev.12, 159-63 (20011) in Haochen Sun “Can Louis Vuitton Dance with Hip-hop? Rethinking the Idea of Social Justice in Intellectual Property Law, 15 U. Pa. J.L. & Soc. Change 389 (391).

the backdrop of “⁴⁵ a global crisis in the governance of knowledge, technology and culture”.⁷¹

International intellectual property laws affect the flow of knowledge between countries. They influence trade, licensing agreements and information shared about products and new technologies. They award exclusive rights to produce and sell products for a minimum period of time. In an international context, IP obligations impose a set of rules on countries that they may or may not have the capacity to implement, much less enforce.⁷²

²⁵ Copyrights some times also regarded as impediment to the fulfilment human right to enjoy the benefit of scientific progress as enshrined under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights⁷³ and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights,⁷⁴ particularly access to knowledge and education material. Although human rights treaties have recognised the redistributive needs related to IP law for nearly sixty years, there have been a little progress in realizing in this human rights.

4. Conclusion

⁷¹ Geneva Declaration of the Future of the World Intellectual Property Organization 1 (2005) available at <<http://www.cptech.org/ip/wipo/futureofwipodeclaration.pdf>>

⁷² Pedro Roffe and Gina Vea, “The WIPO Development Agenda in an Historical and Political Context”, in Neil Weinstock Netanel (ed.), above p. 80.

⁷³ Universal Declaration of Human Rights, G.A. Res. 217(III) A, U.N. Doc. A/RES/217 (III), December 10, 1948).

⁷⁴ International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights, adopted Dec.16, 1966, 993 U.N.T.S .3 (entered into force January 3, 1976).

INTEGRATING SENSE OF SOCIAL JUSTICE INTO THE TEACHING OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

ORIGINALITY REPORT

22%

SIMILARITY INDEX

18%

INTERNET SOURCES

13%

PUBLICATIONS

12%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

journals.sagepub.com

Internet Source

1%

2

Submitted to CSU, Pomona

Student Paper

1%

3

www.arl.org

Internet Source

1%

4

www.anu.edu.au

Internet Source

1%

5

www.newscientist.com

Internet Source

1%

6

volokh.com

Internet Source

1%

7

webgate.ec.europa.eu

Internet Source

1%

8

www.oapi.wipo.net

Internet Source

1%

9

David L. Parker, Nicole Stafford. "Biotechnology

and Patent Infringement in the USA", Industry
and Higher Education, 2016

Publication

1%

10

Submitted to CITY College, Affiliated Institute of
the University of Sheffield

Student Paper

1%

11

www.lessig.org

Internet Source

1%

12

Ann Mills. "?Junk? Patents in Biotechnology: An
Illusion or a Real Threat to Innovation?",
Biotechnology Law Report, 06/2007

Publication

1%

13

iboninternational.org

Internet Source

1%

14

Submitted to University of Adelaide

Student Paper

1%

15

www.uncitral.org

Internet Source

<1%

16

Phillip M. Saunders. "Moving on from Rio:
Recent Initiatives on Global Forest Issues",
Canadian Yearbook of international
Law/Annuaire canadien de droit international,
2016

Publication

<1%

17

Submitted to Middle East Technical University

Student Paper

<1%

18	Inweb90.worldbank.org Internet Source	<1%
19	spin.wellcome.ac.uk Internet Source	<1%
20	Submitted to Xavier University Student Paper	<1%
21	storage.googleapis.com Internet Source	<1%
22	fordhamlawreview.org Internet Source	<1%
23	www.btlj.org Internet Source	<1%
24	www.bookfinder.us Internet Source	<1%
25	www.europarl.europa.eu Internet Source	<1%
26	www.idea.piercelaw.edu Internet Source	<1%
27	web.si.umich.edu Internet Source	<1%
28	Kshitij Kumar Singh. "Chapter 4 Legal, Social and Policy Implications of Genetic Patents: Issues of Accessibility, Quality of Research and Public Health", Springer Science and Business	<1%

Media LLC, 2015

Publication

29

Petri Rouvinen. "Are Intellectual Property Rights Hindering Technological Advance? The Need for Technological Commons¹", Review of Policy Research, 01/2009

Publication

<1%

30

Mohammed K. El Said. "The European Trips-Plus Model and The Arab World: From Co-Operation to Association— A New Era in the Global IPRS Regime?", Liverpool Law Review, 2007

Publication

<1%

31

www.jnu.ac.in

Internet Source

<1%

32

M. Geist. "Dangerous copyright proposals hit medical community hard", Canadian Medical Association Journal, 2005

Publication

<1%

33

gnlu.ac.in

Internet Source

<1%

34

www.piipajournal.org

Internet Source

<1%

35

sippi.aaas.org

Internet Source

<1%

36	Submitted to University of Dayton Student Paper	<1%
37	Submitted to Higher Education Commission Pakistan Student Paper	<1%
38	www.ubcic.bc.ca Internet Source	<1%
39	www.researchgate.net Internet Source	<1%
40	elpub.bib.uni-wuppertal.de Internet Source	<1%
41	www.houstonlawreview.org Internet Source	<1%
42	www.e-elgar.com Internet Source	<1%
43	www.fdimoot.org Internet Source	<1%
44	www.neliti.com Internet Source	<1%
45	Blakeney, Michael. "Intellectual property rights", The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Globalization, 2012. Publication	<1%
46	www.ippolita.net	

Internet Source

<1%

47

law.uui.ac.id

Internet Source

<1%

48

www.communia-association.org

Internet Source

<1%

49

www.uspto.gov

Internet Source

<1%

50

Submitted to City University

Student Paper

<1%

51

www.invispress.com

Internet Source

<1%

52

Laura A. Foster. " Patents, Biopolitics, and Feminisms: Locating Patent Law Struggles over Breast Cancer Genes and the Plant ", International Journal of Cultural Property, 2012

Publication

<1%

53

www.mdpi.com

Internet Source

<1%

54

www.biowatch.org.za

Internet Source

<1%

55

Walsh, J.P.. "Where excludability matters: Material versus intellectual property in academic biomedical research", Research Policy, 200710

Publication

<1%

56

Submitted to Middlesex University

Student Paper

<1%

57

"UN Commission on IP Issues Report: SBA Sees Problems with Proposed Revisions to Examination Proceedings: Amgen Asks ITC to Block Epo Import: Patent on Anti-HIV Combination Opposed", Biotechnology Law Report, 06/2006

Publication

<1%

58

www.sisudoc.org

Internet Source

<1%

59

Submitted to Bocconi University

Student Paper

<1%

60

www.springer.com

Internet Source

<1%

61

Submitted to University at Buffalo, SUNY

Student Paper

<1%

62

www.upov.org

Internet Source

<1%

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography On

INTEGRATING SENSE OF SOCIAL JUSTICE INTO THE TEACHING OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

GRADEMARK REPORT

FINAL GRADE

/100

GENERAL COMMENTS

Instructor

PAGE 1

PAGE 2

PAGE 3

PAGE 4

PAGE 5

PAGE 6

PAGE 7

PAGE 8

PAGE 9

PAGE 10

PAGE 11

PAGE 12

PAGE 13

PAGE 14

PAGE 15
