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Foreign attempts, particularly by America, to steal Southeast Asian medicine would further the Filipino brain drain problem and dash away any Filipino hopes at creating a sustainable nation
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In this report, we have attempted to provide some benchmarks on the brain drain phenomenon in the Philippines using more recent information. Although there is no direct evidence of the magnitude and extent of the brain drain except common knowledge, several clues give a pattern in the country. We have shown that in the last decade the number of professional workers who went abroad exceeded the net additions to the professionals in the workforce. This implies that many of those who migrated were already in the labour force and had come from the stock of professionals of the previous decade. Looking into the broad profile of OFWs, we showed that they have higher educational attainment than those employed. Indeed when compared to the population as a whole, the proportion of [Overseas Filipino Workers] with tertiary education is far greater than the proportion in terms of secondary education. In addition there is evidence that a large portion of the Filipino workers abroad belong to the most productive age groups when compared to those employed in the country. When we examined the profile of labour in a destination country like the U.S., these results are validated. U.S. immigrant profile shows higher brain content in such fields as health and medicine and computer sciences compared to native Americans. These are two fields that Filipino migrant workers are known for. Conversely the pattern of labour force profile of native Americans and the Philippine labour force is similar. The supply conditions of the country is professionals in the last decade seem to have displayed responsiveness and adjustment to the demand patterns. Some shifts in graduates of particular disciplines took place during this period ñ dramatic expansion in computer sciences in the latter part and declines in medical and allied fields, and some slight fall in engineering graduates. These are not inconsistent with what we have seen to be the behaviour of demand and the profile of Filipino overseas workers. The market for professional workers in the Philippines seems to be globalised. Needless to say a more globally responsive tertiary-education labour market in the Philippines ignores the fact that the migration of highly skilled and educated workers entails social costs (despite the fact that tertiary education in the Philippines is mostly private sector driven and therefore privatised education costs) since elementary and secondary education are predominantly publicly provided. The continued brain drain from the Philippines has always eluded policy solutions and remains a vexing problem. 21 The theoretical propositions in the past of imposing taxes on destination countries encountered practical problems of implementation and questions of enforcement. The extremes of ignoring the costs of the brain drain or completely regulating migration seem out of the practical question. In fact the increasing share of professionals among temporary migrants has increased rather than diminished the problem of the brain drain and the need for either reversing it or finding ways to mitigate its deleterious impact on the economy. Changes in the global economy and technology however pose new challenges to the way the brain drain may be addressed in the Philippines. In particular the global environment may be creating windows to address the brain drain more positively. On the other hand new technologies are providing options that reduce the attractiveness of migration temporarily or permanently. At the height of the recent U.S. economic boom was a high demand for ICT professionals in numbers the country could not adequately supply. For example, a major New York software company failed to recruit 500 computer programmers from the Philippines because of supply limitations. In 2000 a request for 3,000 programmers by another firm in New Jersey to its Manila subsidiary was not also met. Since the collapse of technology stocks, demands for large number of workers rapidly fell. While it is true that technology-related businesses have fizzled out in the U.S. and elsewhere, they have just started in the Philippines and in the rest of the developing world creating opportunities for ICT professionals. Not a few took up the challenge and returned to their country of origin to break ground in the fields where their migration experience has mattered. Integration of financial markets and financial liberalization has opened avenues by which some of the savings and financial resources from overseas Filipinos can be channelled for use in the country. This has been through flotation of bonds and other financial instruments geared for specific clients much like the non-resident Indian experiment. Without liberalization, convertibility and integration that characterize globalisation this would encounter severe hurdles. Regional cooperation, as another trend in the global economy, also improves the prospect of brain drain reversal as the expanded reach of services reduces the migration incentive. The growth quadrangle, for example, in Mindanao, Philippines with Indonesia, Malaysia, and Brunei anticipates medical and educational services to expand beyond the Philippines. The critical policy issue here is how this changing environment is enhanced in the country. Of course it need not be said that a more focused infrastructure program is an important enabler of initiatives that indirectly affect decisions on migration. But, more generally, capturing this environment simply means that the country achieves a higher economic growth plane, increases employment, raises real incomes, and narrows the 22 wage gaps between the Philippines and possible migration destinations (in terms of the low end of the wage gap). There are several studies of the experiences in some countries, which have successfully made the migration transition i.e., from being a net exporter of labour to a net importer. Outward migration has not been completely reversed but returning migration has been far greater. In more recent times there are experiences in several countries where skilled workers have returned to their countries of origin and taking on public or private initiatives that capitalize on extensive migration experience. Thus despite the continued numbers leaving, reverse migration brings with it the wealth of know-how that came with previous skilled migration.

#### Patents are the prerequisite to medical innovation needed to prevent brain drain in the Philippines
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II. Background: Patents and Pharmaceutical Innovation Pharmaceutical innovation is often seen as the golden child of the patent system, with patents taking credit for the discovery and development of valuable new drugs that provide tremendous health benefits to the public.4 The purpose of the patent system is to encourage socially valuable investments in R&D that firms would not otherwise make due to the profit-eroding effects of competition. In the pharmaceutical industry, firms must invest hundreds of millions of dollars in clinical trials on their drugs before they can be sold to the public, while their generic rivals are exempted from those requirements and can enter the market at low cost. Without some way to delay generic competition, therefore, pharmaceutical companies would usually find it impossible to recoup their R&D investments and would likely invest their money elsewhere. With strong patent protection, however, firms can expect to enjoy a lengthy monopoly over their drugs, providing them an opportunity to profit from their investment in R&D. Although the public suffers from high prices for drugs while they are covered by a patent, most of those drugs probably would not have been developed without that protection. As a result, it is widely thought that the benefits of drug patents far outweigh their costs. The economic function of the patent system is to promote the creation, development, and commercialization of inventions.5 Successful innovation can be of great value to society, but it often requires significant investments in R&D.6 The public relies on private industry to provide most of that investment,7 and unless firms expect to profit from their R&D efforts, they are likely to spend their money on something else. Appropriating the returns from an R&D investment can be difficult in a competitive market since other firms may be able to imitate successful inventions without incurring the same costs and risks.8 The resulting price competition can undermine the original inventors' profits as competitors free ride off of their efforts. The patent system is an attempt to preserve the incentive to invest in R&D that would otherwise be vulnerable to free riding by awarding inventors temporary exclusive rights to make, use, and sell their inventions, thereby protecting them from the profit-eroding effects of competition.9 Although patent-law scholars typically focus on the role of patents in promoting inventive activity,10 patents can be equally important in encourag- ing investment in the subsequent development and commercialization of inventions." The idea for an invention is usually of little value to the public until it has been turned into a marketable product,12 and the process of doing so can be both risky and expensive. Indeed, the cost and risk of bringing an invention to market is often much greater than that faced during the initial research that gave rise to the invention.13 If competitors can produce and sell copies of the invention while avoiding its development and commercializa- tion costs, then there may be little or no incentive for firms to ever bring that invention to market. Under these circumstances, a patent can be essential for the investment that enables the practical use of an invention - a fact known to economists for at least 100 years.14 Even when patents are unnecessary for motivating the creation of an invention, therefore, they can still be critical for encouraging the subsequent investment in its development. Of course, not all inventions need a patent to incent their development and commercialization.15 In many cases the costs and risks of getting an invention to market are relatively small, and the inherent lead-time advantage that the inventors will enjoy over competitors is sufficient for them to recoup their R&D investments.16 In other cases patents are unnecessary for motivating post-invention spending because those investments are not vulnerable to free riding. For example, a firm might be willing to build an expensive new manufacturing plant to produce an unpatented invention because competitors would have to make the same investment in building their own plant before they could launch an imitation product.17 Additionally, on some occasions the underlying invention does not need a patent because the efforts to develop and commercialize it give rise to their own patentable invention,18 which can make it difficult for competitors to capitalize on the innovative firm's post-invention expenses.19 In any of these situations, the absence of patent protection for an invention may not deter its development. For some inventions, however, patents do play an essential role in promoting development and commercialization, and drugs are a clear example.20 Pharmaceutical companies on average spend upwards of $800 million on R&D for each new drug that reaches the market.21 Roughly half of that money is spent satisfying the FDA's clinical-trial requirements to establish the safety and efficacy of new drugs,22 producing data that cannot be protected with patents.23 Meanwhile, generics are exempted from the FDA's clinical-trial requirements and enter the market based on the clinicaltrial data submitted by the original pharmaceutical company.24 As a result, generic-drug manufacturers spend on average only about $2 million on the approval process.25 Once they are on the market, those drugs dramatically reduce the sales of (and profits from) the brand-name drugs they imitate.26 Pharmaceutical companies therefore rely on a lengthy period of market exclusivity to recoup their investments in developing new drugs. With strong patent protection, they are usually able to keep generics off the market for somewhere between ten and fourteen years27 and will invest hundreds of million of dollars in R&D in anticipation of this reward.28 For this reason, scholars often view drug development as "the paradigm of patents spurring innovation."29 Relying on the patent system to promote pharmaceutical innovation admittedly has its costs, since patents allow manufacturers to charge premium prices for their products.30 Although pharmaceutical companies sink vast sums of money into R&D of new drugs, the actual costs of manufacturing those drugs is usually quite low.31 Generic drugs are sold at prices that reflect these lower production costs, whereas patented drugs are priced much higher.32 When a drug is patented, therefore, some consumers who would be willing to buy it at the generic price are forced out of the market, and they must wait until the patent on the drug expires before benefiting from its use. Economists refer to this harm as deadweight loss, and it is a problem inherent in the patent system.33 With pharmaceuticals, the deadweight loss caused by patent protection is especially troubling because some people must forgo the use of drugs that would improve their health and sometimes even save their lives.34 Although the temporary high prices that result from patent protection are a significant problem, the benefits of the patent system can sometimes outweigh these costs. The public may suffer for a time from the higher prices charged for a patented invention, but that harm is necessarily smaller than the injury that would result if no one ever created or developed the invention in the first place, or if it had taken much longer for the invention to reach the public. As a rule of thumb, therefore, patents are socially desirable when, in their absence, the public would not otherwise benefit from the invention or there would be a substantial delay in the public's receipt of that benefit.35 The pharmaceutical industry is probably the best example of where patents are socially desirable under this rule of thumb because patents appear to be a prerequisite for the vast majority of pharmaceutical innovation.36 Given their high R&D costs compared to those of their generic rivals, pharmaceutical companies rely on lengthy periods of market exclusivitynormally ten or more years for the drugs currently developed- to support their investments in bringing drugs to market.37 Not surprisingly, firms in the industry consistently report that patent protection is essential to their efforts to discover and develop new drugs.38 Moreover, it is well known that pharmaceutical companies generally refuse to develop new drugs unless they have strong patent protection over them.39 Indeed, drug researchers who work in government and academia report that when they are looking for partners in private industry to fund the development of the drugs they discover, it is almost impossible to attract interest unless the drugs are patented.40 Some scholars even worry that the patent system may be too effective at promoting pharmaceutical innovation,41 although the available evidence indicates that society's investment in pharmaceutical R&D continues to generate substantial positive returns. In theory, the patent system could be harming the public by causing wasteful and duplicative R&D in "patent races."42 In the case of pharmaceuticals, however, numerous economic studies have found that the social benefits produced by new medical technologies signifi- cantly outweigh the costs of society's investment in medical R&D.43 According to one estimate, the average new drug launch in the United States increases average life expectancy among the U.S. population by about one week, leading to a cost-effectiveness ratio for pharmaceutical R&D spending of $6,750 for each additional year of life saved.44 Since most studies put the value of a year of life at $75,000 to $150,000,45 the social return on pharma- ceutical R&D investments appears to be extraordinarily high.46 This is not to say that all investments in pharmaceutical R&D are beneficial, because some of that spending goes toward drugs that fail to complete the FDA's clinical- trial requirements,47 drugs that offer little or no therapeutic advantage over existing drugs,48 and sometimes even drugs that do more harm than good,49 such as the now-infamous pain reliever Vioxx®.50 On the whole, however, society's investments in discovering and developing new drugs seem to yield substantial net benefits. The discussion above demonstrates why the case for the patent system is at its strongest in the pharmaceutical industry: innovation in the field is incredibly valuable to society and most of it would not occur without the patent system.51 Indeed, it is considered well established that the availability of patent protection for drugs improves social welfare.52 This is not to say that the patent system is perfect; no one questions that the public suffers greatly from high drug prices. At the moment, however, the public depends on the patent system to promote pharmaceutical innovation, and the public usually benefits when the system is successful in that task. III. The Patentability Standards for Pharmaceuticals: Rewarding the Invention of Drugs but Not Their Development

The Brain Drain to the US extends American Colonialism, which in turn creates internalized racism by every single Filipino-American generation.
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Renato Constantino (1982) comments about this colonial educational context in The Miseducation of the Filipino. He critiques the institutionalized use of the English language in Philippine schooling, but he also brings awareness to intra-ethnic tension between tribes and provinces. While the official language of the Philippines is based on the Tagalog dialect, as there is conflict that arises from deciding on a language or dialect in which to educate Filipino students. Moreover, Constantino’s concept of miseducation entails the subjugation of colonies by means of education, and perhaps the spread of a certain ideology from the colonizer. In other words, miseducation is a notable legacy of colonialism in that it validates the positive intentions of the colonizer—at least in the colonizer’s perspective. His work asserts that Filipinos still associate the English language with intelligence and prospects of immigrating to the United States. Even decades after U.S. colonial rule, the educational institutions in the Philippines continue to implement American ideals into their society. 18Other U.S. colonial legacies that continue to affect Philippine society include the continued presence of military bases. U.S. militarism has not only affected the foodways and economy of the Philippines, but it has also contributed to the hyper sexualization of Filipino women as well (Balce, 2006). For instance, entering the word “Filipina” in Internet search engines primarily yields search results relating to pen pals, mail-order brides, and pornography involving Filipino women (Gonzales & Rodriguez, 2003, p. 223). This ideology adds on to the preexisting oppression of Filipino women through patriarchy, as it has informed the cultural practices of regulating and policing female sexuality within the diaspora (Espiritu, 2001, p. 415). This matters to Filipino American community college students in that their access to higher education in the United States is akin to the Philippines’ exposure yet lack of inclusion in the United States citizenry and culture. This also affects the ways that Filipino Americans are not only racialized, but gendered as well. After having discussed the sociohistorical context of the Philippines following colonial rule, the next section will elaborate on the racialization of Filipinos and Filipino Americans within this colonial context. Filipino Racialization Growing up, when people would try to racialize me or ask me what my ethnic identity was, they would ask me if I’m Thai, if I’m Burmese, if I’m Cambodian... Some would ask me if I was mixed; it really depends on what color my skin is at the time, cause I can be really light skinned or really dark skinned, and I guess that also informs that experience; how people would project their own ideas of what I may be.... I also got Mexican, and...they asked me if I’m [Pacific Islander] when I was younger...and Vietnamese. It was very rare, the people that would guess that I’m Filipino first. I always got these other ethnic identities first before I got Filipino, so I thought that was interesting growing up. [laughs] Even as an adult too.—“Nora,” research participant,on being racialized as anything but Filipino 19 In a testimony taken from the hearings on affairs in the Philippines before the Senate Committee on the Philippines in 1902, Governor William Howard Taft defines terrorism as a criminal way of obtaining independence. Henry Graff (1969) quotes Taft: In the very province of Batangas itself the great majority desire peace and are only held there because of the system of terrorism of which I speak. Now, I say that warfare which depends upon terrorism and murder is crime.... [Those who are fighting for independence] are guilty of a crime in the method which they seek to attain it. (as cited in Bascara, 2015; emphasis mine).By characterizing terrorism in the following manner, American imperialists make the link between terrorism and revolutionaries. In this case, they assert that Philippine insurgents are terrorists to the other subjects of U.S. Empire. Moreover, the year 1902 also marks the end of the Philippine-American War, which ultimately rendered the Philippines as a U.S. colony not long after the Philippines gained independence from Spain. Meanwhile, the U.S. war against the Moros in Mindanao persisted until 1913—in fact, there is the possibility that this war is still occurring, hence the hostile political climate in the region. In a way, the racialization of Filipinos as terrorists is akin to the ways that Filipino American students are often racialized as deviant students in the classroom, often leading to their differential experiences matriculating the educational pipeline.Corporeal Colonization 20The criminalization of Filipino revolutionaries as terrorists also connects to the their racialization as ‘savage’ in order to facilitate the beginning of U.S. Empire by 1898. Much of Catherine CenizaChoy’s research addresses the historical amnesia that Filipinos have regarding the history of the U.S. colonial rule over the Philippines. In her article “Salvaging the Savage: On Representing Filipinos and Remembering American Empire,” Choy (2013) introduces the notion of corporeal colonization, which she defines as “the use of the Filipino body to illustrate U.S. colonial narratives of diseased, and thus racially inferior, Filipino savages” (p. 40). She notes how this corporeal colonization occurs in the forms of deficit representations of indigenous Filipinos through anthropological research and showcasing nearly 1200 Filipino indigenous peoples—including Igorots, Bagobos, Negritos, and Moros—at the 1904 St. Louis World’s Fair (p. 40). In combination with the criminalization of Filipino revolutionaries as terrorists, the fixation on and spectacle of Filipino brown bodies contributes to the racialization of Filipinos as ‘savages.’ By using specific tribal groups to represent the United States’ image of Filipinos—in other words as ‘savages’—it is then possible to bridge the connection between the treatment of indigenous Filipinos and the portrayal of Filipinos as ‘terrorists.’ Adding onto the previous section, this is significant in the experiences of Filipino American community college students in that the concept of corporeal colonization persists as educators continue to racialize Filipino Americans differently from other Asian ethnic groups who phenotypically ‘pass’ as East Asian. Ultimately, having an understanding of the historical and colonial context of the Philippines in conversation with concepts of sovereignty and terrorism allows us to contextualize the racialization of Filipino Americans amidst their context of reception in the United States.Context of Reception 21The formation of the Filipino diaspora is linked to the economic exploitation of the Philippines. Even pre-dating the United States’ formation as a country, the first individuals of Filipino descent to set foot in the modern-day United States were indios from Luzon who escaped the Acapulco Trade Route and settled in modern-day Louisiana(Lee, 2015). This speaks to the historical legacy of Filipino migration associated withlabor. Centuries later, the majority of Filipinos who migrated to the United States in the early twentiethcentury would belaborers who contributed to Hawaii’s plantation economy. ‘Old-timer’ Filipino migrant workers—also known as manongs—helped address the labor shortage in the Western region of the United States following the restriction of migration from Asia due to the implementation of the Chinese Exclusion Act, the Gentlemen’s Agreement between the United Statesand Japan, the Immigration Act of 1924, and other legislation against Asian ethnic groups (Gotanda, 1996). Filipinos who did not migrate as laborers were pensionados who received their education at American universities, but were intended to return to the Philippines. The racial climate of the United States prevented pensionados from practicing their degrees in this country, so they either became laborers or they returned to the Philippines. Furthermore, the scarcity of female Filipino migrants and the implementation of anti-miscegenation laws in the United States resulted in manongs primarily existing as bachelor societies. In terms of gender composition, family structure, class, and racialization, this early generation of Filipino migrants significantly differs from Filipinos who have immigrated to the United States after 1965.Nevertheless, post-1965 migration from the Philippines to the United States is also a legacy of labor exploitation. The main difference is that by 1965, the Philippines functions as a post-colony (or neocolony) of the United States. In turn, Filipino migrants that arrive to the 22United States after 1965 are either immigrants who can be naturalized or as migrant workers—often termed as “Overseas Filipino Workers” (OFWs)—who can potentially lose their immigration status if they are unable to maintain their workers’ visa. These immigrants are labeled as tago nang tago(Tagalog for “always hiding”; refers to undocumented immigrants), whereas Filipinos who came to the United States in the early twentieth century were U.S. nationals during U.S. colonial rule. Filipino immigrants who became naturalized U.S. citizens often arrived to the U.S. following the Hart-Celler Act of 1965, which replaced the quota system with immigration policy based on family reunification and skilled labor. Those who arrived via family reunification often were part of military families, whereas skilled laborers included Filipinos in the nursing profession. In other words, the colonial and immigration context of Filipinos in America points to the diversity of the Filipino American community—which includes undocumented immigrants, “military brats” (Suarez, 2015), mixed race Filipinos, manongs, nurses, and American-born Filipinos. These various identities play an important role for Filipino Americans who attend community college. For instance, in terms of immigration status, they range from being American-born to first-generation naturalized citizens or undocumented immigrants. Those who are a product of post-1965 migration are likely to have a relative associated with migrant workers, nurses, or part of the U.S. Navy(Guevarra, 2009; Choy, 2003; Suarez, 2015). Ultimately, this is relevant to the current generation of Filipino Americans who are in higher education and attending community college. The next section will focus on the schooling experiences of Filipino Americans in higher education and how American schools function as colonial projects against students of color. 23K–12 Education as a Neocolonial Project Contrary to popular notions of K-12 schools being the “great equalizer” in American society in that they allow young children to work towards achieving the American Dream, schooling has in fact exasperated social inequity in the United States. Public schools serving students of color are subject to high-stakes testing and strict (if not scripted) teaching pedagogies. Students who do not possess cultural capital are often perceived as cultural deficits and at-risk of failing(Yosso, 2005). At the institutional level, the zoning of school districts and student tracking have had detrimental effects on how resources are distributed to students of different ethnicities and socioeconomic statuses(Oakes, 1982). Within the classroom, students are exposed to Eurocentric curricula and are stripped of their community cultural wealth—non-celebrated types of cultural capital possessed by communities of color such as navigational capital, aspirational capital, and linguistic capital (Valenzuela, 1998, p. 3; Yosso, 2005, pp. 77–80). Moreover, teachers and classmates perpetuate the racial hierarchy through cultural mismatch and expressing racial microaggressions against students of non-normative identities (Howard, 2015; Solórzanoet al., 2000, p. 60). Further research, however, should focus on schooling experiences of Filipino Americans. The next section discusses the history behind the racialization of Filipino Americans in the classroom.

The alternative: Identify and completely reject American attempts to colonize POC (note : im probably going to change American to Western for future debates just to lyk)

**Conscientization is portable and can translate to material action**

Osajima 7 (KEITH OSAJIMA, Professor and Director of the Race and Ethnic Studies Program at the University of Redlands, “Replenishing the Ranks: Raising Critical Consciousness Among Asian Americans”, 2/2017 https://muse.jhu.edu/article/213033#bio, DOA: 7/4/17)//AK

Given the profound change that conscientization had effected in the lives of respondents, it is not surprising that many of them wanted to be in positions where they could help to create for others the educational experiences that were so meaningful to them. They took leadership positions in student organizations; they helped to organize and put on educational programs; they worked in community organizations; they pursued graduate studies; and they took positions in student affairs to work closely with new cohorts of Asian American students. Pamela Kim, who wanted to become a professor of Asian American studies, best expresses their desire: One of the reasons why I want to be a professor of Asian American Studies is because I want to help these kids who are going through the same things that I did. I want to help them figure things out, to help educate them about these issues because I had no idea about them while I was growing up. I could see what these kids are all going through in college, and it helps to be where you can pop those bubbles that they have around themselves.37 As they go about the task of trying to replenish the ranks by raising critical consciousness amongst new groups of Asians, a number of lessons learned from their collective experiences may provide helpful guides. From the interviews, we can identify critical elements that contribute to conscientization. While these elements do not guarantee that conscientization will follow, incorporating them into one's practice may enhance the possibility that efforts will be successful. First, respondents described the importance of obtaining information and conceptual tools that helped them to cognitively understand how their lives and the lives of others are shaped by larger historical and social-structural [End Page 74] forces. An Asian American Studies course on a college campus was the most common source of relevant information, but as we have seen exposure can take place in many venues. People can learn from reading on their own, from student groups, and from multimedia sources. Second, breaking through isolation and interrupting the tendency to explain their life experiences solely in individual terms reflects a social dimension to conscientization. Contact and conversation with other Asian Americans was often the most effective way to help respondents make connections between their lives, the experiences of others, and information on the Asian American experience. Connections to key mentors and peers provided a safe environment in which to think and question further. Third, respondents described important affective aspects of conscientization. When respondents talked about important moments in their education or key social support that made a difference, invariably they referred to how they felt about these experiences. They were angered by the realization that their schooling had not taught them about racism or the Asian American experience. They felt inspired by the experiences of other Asian Americans who struggled to overcome harsh conditions. They were excited to learn more. Fourth, respondents' commitment to Asian American issues was deepened when they transformed understanding into action. Involvement in protests, organizing, programming, teaching, and research gave respondents a chance to extend their knowledge and learn from efforts to make change. Finally, the study indicates that conscientization occurs when the discrete elements work in combination. No respondent described his or her conscientization in terms of a single element. It was not a purely intellectual or cognitive experience in a classroom, absent of social or affective elements. Nor was it a purely social or affective experience without information and conceptual tools. Instead, respondents described multifaceted and interrelated experiences that reinforced each other, inspiring further thinking and commitment to action. For activists seeking to raise the critical consciousness of Asian Americans, the study's findings carry implications for practice. For some, combining elements in a single venue, like an introductory course or a [End Page 75] training program, will be the main focus. In these cases, the study suggests that the course or program should offer substantive content and concepts to lay the cognitive foundation needed for people to see themselves in relation to the world. It also should include social activities to break isolation and opportunities for people to share stories with each other in a non-judgmental, safe environment. On a broader level, the study suggests that there is a value in and need to offer a range of experiences across campus and community to increase the likelihood that students will combine, on their own, elements that contribute to conscientization. Pressure to have one person, course, or program that single-handedly transforms students' lives subsides when we recognize that the interrelated process of conscientization benefits from contributions across diverse segments of the community. The importance of combining influences also casts new light on how different parts of the campus and community can work collaboratively to raise critical consciousness. Breaking from binary constructions that often pit academic programs against student life activities, or divide academe from community, the study shows how conscientization arises when people are exposed to and combine lessons learned from a variety of sources. This process implies that increased appreciation for the work done across campus and community, along with greater coordination of influences, is an important dimension of conscientization. [End Page 76 Conscientization for these respondents meant being able to "name their world." That is, a meaningful education had helped them to recognize and understand the impact that societal conditions and forces of oppression have on their lives and the lives of others. As Freire writes, the process of conscientization, or education for critical consciousness, "involves a constant clarification of what remains hidden within us while we move about in the world," and it provokes "recognition of the world, not as a 'given' world, but as a world dynamically 'in the making."[24](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/213033#FOOT24) Such recognition often inspires people to work against that oppression, thus beginning their active efforts to transform the world.[25](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/213033#FOOT25) Naming the world was an important step toward actively changing it.

The Role of the ballot: The Role of the Ballot is to vote for the debater that best deconstructs systems of oppression

**Oppression in education is what prevents students from critically challenging the squo – the judge can make this space one where we can challenge it**

Kumashiro 2K (KEVIN K. KUMASHIRO, former Dean of the School of Education at the University of San Francisco, “Toward a Theory of Anti-Oppressive Education”, 2000 http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/1170593.pdf?refreqid=excelsior:9ba063bd396fb6de3733ce3467885eb1, DOA: 7/14/17)RM

Some researchers have turned to poststructuralism to help formulate conceptualizations of oppression that center around notions of discourse and citation (Britzman, Santiago-Valles, Jimenez-Munoz, & Lamash, 1993; Butler, 1997; Davies, 1989; Kumashiro, 1999a, 1999b; McKay & Wong, 1996; Walkerdine, 1990). Earlier, I mentioned Walkerdine's (1990) study on nursery classrooms. Her analysis suggests that oppression and harm originate in (or are produced by) not merely the actions and intentions of individuals or in the imperatives of social structures and ideologies. Rather, oppression originates in discourse, and, in particular, in the citing of particular discourses, which frame how people think, feel, act, and interact. In other words, oppression is the citing of harmful discourses and the repetition of harmful histories. To understand this notion of citation, consider the "model minority" stereo- type of Asian American students, that they are all smart and hardworking "aca-demic superstars" (Lee, 1996). As I discussed above, researchers have explained the harmfulness of stereotypes by turning to individual prejudice and discrimi- nation (Miller, 1995) and to a White-dominated racial order that claims to be meritocratic and non-racist by pointing to the "success" of "model" minorities (Osajima, 1988). They have argued that the power of a stereotype to harm either exists inherently in the stereotype (so that an individual using a stereotype is like an individual wielding a weapon) or derives from social structures and ideologies (so that using a stereotype is like assisting in the maintenance of the structures/ideologies). They have also argued that this stereotype has tangible consequences, that it may cause differential treatment of students by teachers and even psychological harm (Crystal, 1989; Lee, 1996; Osajima, 1993). These theories imply that in order to challenge oppression educators should prohibit the use of the stereotype-as well as the voicing of hateful, harmful speech (Butler, 1997)-or strategize ways to "resist," "challenge," or dismantle an al- ready-existing structure (through critical pedagogy). Post-structuralism offers a different view. As I have argued elsewhere (Kumashiro, 1999b), iterating a stereotype can cause harm because every such iteration cites past iterations of that stereotype. In other words, the power of a stereotype to harm derives from a particular history of how that stereotype has been used and a particular community of people who have used that stereotype and who constitute that history (Butler, 1997). If someone was to tell me that I should be a better student because I am Asian American, I would likely con-clude that the speaker is making racist assumptions about me because I have heard other people talk about and generalize about Asian Americans in similar ways before. The speaker's words would have racist meaning to me because I would read them as constituting part of the history of how the model-minority stereotype has been and is being used. Furthermore, if I believed that the speaker was judging me based on this stereotype and I valued the speaker's judgment, the speaker's words would likely produce in me feelings of failure or abnormal-ity. I should note that the model-minority stereotype plays out not only in individual thoughts and interpersonal interactions, but also in institutional prac-tices. Affirmative action offices and policies, or advisory commissions on race, for example, that fail to address the racism experienced by Asian Americans or otherwise ignore Asian Americans, are doing so because they are buying into the model-minority stereotype. In these institutions and ideologies the associa-tion between "Asianness" and "success" (or, the process in which Asianness cites success) gets repeated over and over.

## 1nc-case

#### Patents are key to global South pharmaceutical industries that stop neglected diseases

Soyeju and Wabwire 18 [Olufemi Soyeju, Lecturer at Lagos State University, and Joshua Wabwire, educator at the Catholic University of Eastern Africa, 01-2018, “The WTO-TRIPS Flexibilities on Public Health: A Critical Appraisal of the East African Community Regional Framework,” World Trade Review; Cambridge <https://www-proquest-com.ezproxy.library.unlv.edu/docview/1994279823?accountid=3611&pq-origsite=primo>]/Kankee

Conclusions The problem that this research has highlighted is the already too familiar tension between patent protection and access to medicines. The legal framework for patents and access to medicines in the EAC region consists of the Policy and the accompanying Protocol. What has emerged from the analysis is that the policy tools are aimed at enhancing access to medicines mainly through price reduction. This is done at the direct expense of promoting research and development of medicines, which, in line with the utilitarian justification, is achievable through patent protection. This policy position that weakens patent protection is not appropriate for developing African countries. This is because African countries are faced with peculiar, region-specific diseases. Currently, these diseases are largely neglected by the profit-driven pharmaceutical companies, which do not have economic incentives to invest in developing medicines for populations that cannot afford to pay for them. Most of these pharmaceutical companies are foreign, largely based in the Global North. Since these companies do not have economic incentives to invest in the research and development of medicines for developing countries' diseases, even patent protection has not necessarily been an attractive incentive.194The focus of these companies is now on developed countries' diseases. In these circumstances, the only standing incentive, especially for spurring domestic innovation from within developing countries, is patent protection. Consequently, any strategy that eliminates this last straw will only worsen the already bad situation. The situation described above underscores the urgent need to develop local pharmaceutical industries and to create alternative incentives for investment in research and development of medicines for neglected diseases, for example through Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs). Both of these can be attained through an appropriate patent protection regime that does not weaken patent protection. Such a regime must, for instance, be omniscient of domestic innovators' limited capacity and, consequently, avoid strict patentability criteria, which cannot be met by the small-scale, underfunded domestic innovators. Strict patentability criteria may also discourage disclosure of certain important discoveries, for fear of not attaining the criteria and losing out by disclosure. In developing local pharmaceutical industries, it is also necessary to find ways of affording patent protection to indigenous medicines and practices, which, for centuries, have been as useful to the populations as western medicine now is. It is the failure to protect these medicines and practices in the first place that has resulted in foreign pharmaceuticals appropriating the knowledge and patenting it, only to return with expensive medicines.195 It is the argument here that a patent protection policy would only achieve the greatest good for the greatest number of people, in line with utilitarianism, if it balances the goal of price reduction with the need to encourage further research and development of medicines by ensuring that inventors are able to recoup their investments in research and development. It is only through research and development that the medicines will be made available.

#### **Generics don’t solve; they are wildly more expensive in LDCs due to poor drug markets**

**Glassman 19** [Amanda Glassman Executive Vice President of CGD, CEO of CGD Europe, and Senior Fellow, JUNE 17, 2019, “New Study Finds Some Poor Countries Paying 20 to 30 Times More for Basic Medicines Than Others,” Center for Global Development, <https://www.cgdev.org/article/new-study-finds-some-poor-countries-paying-20-30-times-more-basic-medicines-others> ]/Triumph Debate

WASHINGTON – Basic, everyday drugs can cost up to 20 to 30 times more in some poor countries than others, according to a new study released today by the Center for Global Development. The study examined billions of dollars of health spending on common, life-saving medicines in developing countries, mostly in Africa and Asia. To date, it is one of the largest-ever studies on global health procurement. “Developing countries are often paying far more for everyday drugs than they should be. Why do some poor countries pay 20 to 30 times as much as others for common medicines to relieve pain or treat hypertension? In large part, because of flawed drug buying practices and broken generic medicines markets,” said Amanda Glassman, one of the authors of the study and the executive vice president at the Center for Global Development. “A robust market for generic drugs is a core part of an affordable health system. But in way too many countries, generic drug markets are broken and patients are paying the price,” said Kalipso Chalkidou, the director of global health policy at the Center for Global Development and an author of the study. “You need enough competition to keep prices low and quality assurance that consumers trust, or essential medicines are going to be much more expensive than they should be.” The study had three main findings: In developing countries, prices for basic generic medicines can vary widely and far exceed wealthy-country prices. Some purchasers in low- and middle-income countries pay as much as 20 to 30 times more for basic generic medicines like omeprazole, used to treat heartburn, or acetaminophen (also known as paracetamol), a common pain reliever. Low- and middle-income countries purchase more expensive branded generic drugs rather than unbranded quality-assured generics. In the US, most drugs are either on-patent medicines or unbranded generics, but in many developing countries more expensive brand-name generics are widely used, because people are concerned about unsafe or counterfeit drugs. In the poorest countries, unbranded generics are only 5 percent of the pharmaceutical market by volume—in comparison to the US where unbranded quality-assured generics are 85 percent of the market by volume. There is little competition in the supply of essential medicines in low- and middle-income countries. The largest seller of products like contraceptives, cancer medicines, and antiparasitics can account for upwards of 85 percent of all sales in some countries. “We’re talking about access to common medications for pain or high blood pressure, not the latest cutting-edge cancer drugs,” Glassman said. “It’s not as exciting to talk about procurement as new health technologies or biotech breakthroughs,” she continued. “But drug purchasing is incredibly important, and if it’s done badly you end up with the poorest countries in the world paying some of the highest drug prices.”

**Didn’t read**

#### Empirics prove lower vaccine profit margins harms future innovation – R&D investments solve the aff by supplying vaccines globally

Roberts 6-25 [James M. Roberts, Research Fellow For Economic Freedom and Growth at the Heritage Foundation with a master’s degree in international and development economics from Yale University, 6-25-2021, "Biden’s OK of Global Theft of America’s Intellectual Property Is Wrong, Dangerous," Heritage Foundation, <https://www.heritage.org/public-health/commentary/bidens-ok-global-theft-americas-intellectual-property-wrong-dangerous>]/Kankee

Mr. Biden wants to waive the World Trade Organization’s “Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights” (TRIPS) agreement for U.S. vaccines and let foreign countries issue “compulsory licenses“ allowing their domestic pharmaceutical companies to manufacture the medicines without adequately compensating the companies that invented them. Practically speaking, countries such as India and South Africa are unlikely to manufacture the vaccines. They lack an advanced infrastructure for cold supply-chain distribution and many other crucial resources required by these products’ capital-intensive, state-of-the-art manufacturing process. But the Biden policy is bad for many other reasons. Developing breakthrough medications takes tremendous ingenuity and immense financial investments. It’s an extraordinarily high-risk endeavor, and the prospect of making a profit is what convinces private companies to undertake those risks. Signaling that the United States will not fight to defend their intellectual property rights actively undermines innovation and manufacturing in American health care and medicines. It also erodes patient protections by undermining quality control. Foreign companies may take the president’s policy as a green light to produce reverse-engineered, counterfeit substitutes. Already there are reports of ineffective and even dangerous counterfeit COVID-19 vaccines being sold around the world. Those pushing to break U.S. pharmaceutical patents say they want to do so for altruistic reasons. Consequently, they also insist that the prices for the medications be set far below their actual value. But history shows us that forcing private companies to provide vaccines at an “affordable price,” regardless of the cost to the companies, actually impedes the manufacture of high-quality vaccines. Moreover, it inhibits the future development of vaccines needed to meet as-yet-unknown diseases. Washington first imposed vaccine price controls as part of Hillary Clinton’s 1993 healthcare-for-all crusade. As the Wall Street Journal later noted, it was a body blow to the U.S. vaccine industry. Ironically, government-decreed prices left the companies unable to produce enough vaccines to meet Mrs. Clinton’s admittedly admirable goal of universal immunization of children. Since then, U.S. firms have largely eschewed the vaccine market because they could not recoup their R&D and manufacturing costs and earn enough profit to fund future innovation. Ultimately, compulsory licensing legalizes the theft of intellectual property. Recognizing this, senators from both sides of the aisle have joined with other government officials and industry leaders to call on the administration to reverse this bad decision. The U.S. patent protection system has served the nation well since its founding. It is and has been a bulwark of American prosperity, but the strength of that protection has been weakening in the past few decades. Compulsory licensing contributes to the erosion of that protection. As the U.S. and the rest of the world emerge from the pandemic, it is clear that more innovative medicines and vaccines will be needed for future protection from viruses and other emerging biological threats. The best way to prevent and treat those new diseases is to ensure that private American pharmaceutical companies continue their innovative research and vaccine production. That way, U.S.-manufactured vaccines can be made available to all Americans quickly. And governments can subsidize their export and sale to other countries far more effectively and less expensively than through compulsory licensing schemes. Meanwhile, let’s hope Mr. Biden listens to the more reasonable and less-agenda driven voices in this debate and reverses course on the TRIPS waiver.
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Aff prevents brain drain reversal to