Intellectual property between U.S. and China : As we see one of the big reasons for the trade war is that the US thinks China is engaging in unfair trading practices, and included in that is something called ‘IP theft’, where IP refers to Intellectual property which means its patents, trademarks, copyrights, any kind of invention or innovation, and the US will actually put a monetary value to this innovation. It is included in the GDP, US companies invested almost one trillion dollars in intellectual property, so an example of ‘IP theft’ may be if there is an invention by a company in the US. They want it manufactured in china but then if that Chinese manufacturer takes that invention, makes it, and sells it on their own without paying for the rights to do, that is known as intellectual property theft. Historical and current facts :  As we can observe in the recent news, levels of IP in the US are much higher than that of China but if we really look at the variations in the levels, we can see the gap is starting to narrow, which means that the rate of growth for Chinese intellectual property is much faster than that of the US. So from historical fact to current fact, intellectual property grew in China by nineteen percent, while it grow in the US by only ten percent. Solution : As things are moving right direction for China, they still have ways to go before they catch up to the US, Perhaps in the meantime, both countries could agree to respect each other intellectual property, and they could finally achieve IP peace.

An intellectual property dispute can arise when the manufacturer of the good or a service believes that their invention is protected under intellectual property laws but when in reality it is not protected at all.

Intellectual property will remain a sticking point between the U.S. and China as they compete to develop next-generation technologies. Lawmakers and academics have expressed concerns that a large portion of Chinese trademark applications are fraudulent, meaning they do not correspond with real brands

There were a number of other laws, particularly those involving pharmaceutical IP protection, that were enacted after the phase-one agreement. Those might more properly be called “phase-one commitments.” With regard to effective implementation of new legislation, it is generally too early to say whether phase one has made a significant difference for American companies. We need to see how cases have been handled, and we need to collect relevant data to understand how effective phase one has been. We also need a higher degree of transparency from China. China did not commit to greater overall IP transparency in phase one; in fact, there have recently been renewed concerns about a diminishing commitment to publishing data and making cases available, compared to prior years.

China has acceded to the major international conventions on protection of rights to intellectual property. Domestically, protection of intellectual property law has also been established by government legislation, administrative regulations, and decrees in the areas of trademark, copyright, and patent.

When a maker of a commodity or service assumes that their creation is protected by intellectual property rules when in fact it is not, a dispute over intellectual property may result. As the United States and China fight to create the next generation of technology, intellectual property will continue to be a source of contention between them. Legislators and scholars are worried that many Chinese trademark registrations are fake, meaning they don't match up with legitimate brands. China has ratified the main international agreements for the protection of intellectual property rights. Government laws, executive orders, and decrees in the fields of trademark, copyright, and patent have all established domestic intellectual property law protection. After the phase-one agreement, a number of additional laws, particularly those pertaining to pharmaceutical IP protection, were passed. They might be better referred to as "phase-one commitments." It is typically too early to say whether phase one has significantly impacted American businesses in terms of the effective implementation of new legislation. To determine the success of phase one, we must examine how cases have been handled and gather pertinent data. We also need a higher degree of transparency from China. China did not commit to greater overall IP transparency in phase one; in fact, there have recently been renewed concerns about a diminishing commitment to publishing data and making cases available, compared to prior years.