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Last week’s deal struck between Director of Health and Human Services Tommy Thompson and the German-based Bayer Corporation has instigated a number of outcryes from the developing world community, especially leaders in the developing world. Citing the need to “safeguard the public health” against the bioterrorist threat, the Bush administration threatened to lift the patent on Bayer’s Cipro, the potent antibiotic capable of effectively fighting all forms of anthrax. With the lifting of the patent, other generic manufacturers could legally produce the drug at a cheaper price. Not only would this provide a less expensive source of the antidote for the government, but it would also secure an ample supply of antibiotics to ensure that the American population could be sufficiently treated for anthrax.

However, instead of lifting the patent, the government negotiated with Bayer in November Nov. 9 that seeks the patent to stay intact for a limited time to recoup from their initial investments. The United States has been a staunch ally of the drug industry’s fight for patent supremacy and has refused to allow the developing nations to bypass the patent outright or even negotiate the price of the drug. This move sets the stage for a confrontation that the U.S. did with Bayer. (Keep in mind that this is the same Bayer Corporation that has been accused of buying out its competition. The corporation is currently under investigation for persuading generic drug maker Bayer Laboratories to drop its legal challenge to the Cipro patent by paying the lab a sum of $28 million (Bayer has spent a total length of the patent, 1997-2003).

Why would the United States government put the greed of the drug industry in front of the needs of the global population? Perhaps it is because the nature of the capitalist system and our strict adherence to its central tenets - one of which is the goal of maximizing profit. Obviously if a corporation had invested millions of dollars towards research (de- spite the fact that much of this basic research is funded by the U.S. government), it would seek to charge as high a price as possible to ensure maximum capital gains. Therefore, the government ought to defend the corporations and grant patents, so that they can enjoy a monopoly over the industry for a limited time to recoup from their initial investments.

While this argument is logical, and contains some truth, I offer another answer. The U.S. government, and especially the GOP, is simply in the interest of their campaign. Despite the fact that much of this basic research is funded by the U.S. government, it would seek to charge as high a price as possible to ensure maximum capital gains. Therefore, the government ought to defend the corporations and grant patents, so that they can enjoy a monopoly over the industry for a limited time to recoup from their initial investments.
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The trick, however, is to learn how to master this modern communication without fostering misunderstanding. It is now possible to have “fights” with people without even saying a word! For instance, I was talking with my best friend from home today. All of a sudden...I include the conversation for you here...

"Hey Bill, are you yelling at me?"
Sasso920: I was yelling at you?
Sasso920: I was expressing an opinion… I wanted you to “hear” it… if I were yelling, I would have used that yelling face thing.
Sara282: no… no, that face is for joko yelling. Caps lock is for real yelling! How I WAS? Thankfully, that “fight” did not rise (or sink?) to the level of one of us “blocking the other.” A “courtship” process, I say. I have ended IM and determined that he/she might be of interest to us. Outside the dating realm, it has become the sustenance of long-distance friendships. I manage to convince myself that, as long as I’ve read my friends’ away messages, I have done the job of “keeping up-to-date with their lives.”

We receive an ego boost every time we look at the 100+ names on our “Buddy List,” convincing ourselves these people must all be our close, loyal friends. We can advertise who we really are and save the courage it takes to be open all the time to those with whom we barely know by the imaginative use of away messages and profiles.
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