

# “Planned Obsolescence”: The Push for Big Pharma’s Booster Covid Shots and Annual Vaccinations

By [Timothy Alexander Guzman](#)  
Global Research, May 17, 2021

Region: [USA](#)  
Theme: [Science and Medicine](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the “Translate Website” drop down menu on the top banner of our home page (Desktop version).

Visit and follow us on Instagram at [@crg\\_globalresearch](#).

\*\*\*

*Last month, the CEO from Pfizer, Albert Bourla said that yearly Covid-19 vaccinations may need to become normalized just like the flu shot. A New York Times article headlined with [‘Booster shots and re-vaccinations could be needed. Drug companies are planning for it’](#) said that a single shot of the Covid-19 vaccine won’t be enough “Scientists have long said that giving people a single course of a Covid-19 vaccine might not be sufficient in the long term, and that booster shots and even annual vaccinations might prove necessary” but that was just a hypothetical scenario, however “that proposition has begun to sound less hypothetical.” The article goes on to say that “Vaccine makers are getting a jump-start on possible new rounds of shots, although they sound more certain of the need for boosters than independent scientists have.” The idea of getting a Covid-19 vaccine shot every year will be difficult task as more people are starting to refuse them because of the lack of trust. Bourla said that “a third dose of the company’s Covid-19 vaccine was “likely” to be needed within a year of the initial two-dose inoculation — followed by annual vaccinations.”*

But there seems to be a problem with these vaccines because people who got vaccinated eventually contracted Covid-19, but the vaccines are supposed to work against the virus, right? Obviously, all of the vaccines from Pfizer-BioNtech, Moderna, Johnson & Johnson and Astra Zeneca do not work as they claim and because of that, you need to take them annually to protect yourself.

As we know from all of the evidence that has been provided since the launch of these experimental vaccines can cause serious reactions that can lead to a host of injuries and even death in some cases. In fact, what they are telling you is that they don’t work as well as they expected, but that’s a good thing for them because it creates a population of ‘repeat customers’, sort of like planned obsolescence.

Planned obsolescence is

“a policy of planning or designing a product with an artificially limited useful life or a purposely frail design, so that it becomes obsolete after a certain pre-determined period of time upon which it decrementally functions or suddenly ceases to function, or might be perceived as unfashionable.” (Wikipedia)

Can we apply this definition to the new Covid-19 experimental vaccine market? *"The rationale behind this strategy is to generate long-term sales volume by reducing the time between repeat purchases (referred to as "shortening the replacement cycle"). It is the deliberate shortening of a lifespan of a product to force people to purchase functional replacements."* What is revealing is how this can be described as a business model of Big Pharma's pursuit of profits:

Planned obsolescence tends to work best when a producer has at least an oligopoly. Before introducing a planned obsolescence, the producer has to know that the customer is at least somewhat likely to buy a replacement from them (see [brand loyalty](#)). In these cases of planned obsolescence, there is an [information asymmetry](#) between the producer, who knows how long the product was designed to last, and the customer, who does not. When a [market](#) becomes more competitive, product life spans tend to increase

### So The Flu Shot Must Be Unprofitable

They needed a new product because demand for the flu shot was already in decline due to lack of trust. An interesting article from August of last year by *The National Interest*, '[Flu Shot: Why Do So Many People Refuse to Get Vaccinated?](#)' the article is primarily based on doctors who were urging the public to get the annual flu shot. *"Despite the [touted benefits](#) of getting a [flu shot](#) each year, the majority of U.S. adults and about 60% of children still refuse to roll up their sleeves for one, according to the [Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's 2018-2019 data](#)."*

Big Pharma needed a perfect storm to create a new product by first putting the fear in the people and making sure they will go and get their experimental Covid-19 vaccine shot. The National Interest, a neoconservative foreign policy publication that went on to say that *"In the [United States](#), on average, between nine and forty-five million Americans catch the flu each year, which leads to anywhere between 12,000 to 61,000 deaths. Between October 2019 and April 2020, [CDC's data](#) reveal that there were an estimated thirty-nine to fifty-six million influenza infections and 24,000 to 62,000 fatalities"* continued *"Still, perhaps many don't see the point of getting [vaccinated](#), especially when the shot's effectiveness only ranges from [20% to 60% each season](#)—depending on the types of strains circulating."* Then came Covid-19 and the rest is history.

### The Covid-19 Experimental Shot is Profitable

According to a website dedicated to the health industry and medical innovations called the *Managed Healthcare Executive* (MHE) published '[The Price Tags on the Covid-19 Vaccines](#)' said that

"The race to find both novel and repurposed therapeutics and develop vaccines has been a multinational effort, although heavily funded by U.S. government dollars." Realistically, government dollars means US taxpayer dollars "but should the vaccine developers profit off their efforts?" You know what the answer will be, but let's continue "during a House Committee on Energy and Commerce hearing last summer, manufacturers were asked whether they would sell the vaccine at cost."

Merck did drop out of the vaccine race since no profits were to be made but hey, at least they were honest about their profit motives. *"Moderna and Merck (which announced in*

January that it was dropping out of the COVID-19 vaccine development race) said they would not sell their vaccines at cost.” However, Pfizer, BioNTech, AstraZeneca and Johnson & Johnson have received US funding to develop and distribute the experimental Covid-19 vaccines to the public:

The first vaccine pricing announcement came in July, when the U.S. government contracted with Pfizer and BioNTech to purchase enough vaccines for 50 million Americans. It’s no coincidence that the price of \$19.50 per dose was similar to the pricing of the flu shots. Pfizer has said the research and development costs of its the vaccine approach \$1 billion, and the company declined to take direct government funding.

But other companies have accepted huge government checks. AstraZeneca received up to \$1.2 billion upfront, in exchange for at least 300 million doses. J&J is also receiving government money from the federal government’s Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority (BARDA). Early in the pandemic, BARDA agreed to provide \$456 million toward the company’s research and development effort. In August, the federal government agreed to pay J&J \$1 billion for 100 million doses of its vaccine, thus the \$10-a-dose price.

As of mid-July, Boston-based Moderna had received \$955 million in U.S. funding. The company said in August that it would charge between \$32 and \$37 per dose for its vaccine, although company officials also said the price would be adjusted depending on the amount ordered. That may explain the price of \$15 per dose price charged to the U.S. for its order of 100 million doses. Still, the company has been criticized for its pricing, partly because it has received so much government research support. The Lown Institute in Boston gave Moderna one of its Shkreli Awards in January. The awards are for the “worst examples of profiteering and dysfunction in health care”

In terms of profit-making motives plus adding insult to injury, any person who was injured or who had died from any of the experimental vaccines, the manufacturers will not be held liable according to ‘42 U.S. Code § 300aa-22 - *Standards of responsibility*’ which clearly says the following:

No vaccine manufacturer shall be liable in a civil action for damages arising from a [vaccine-related injury or death](#) associated with the administration of a vaccine after October 1, 1988, if the injury or death resulted from side effects that were unavoidable even though the vaccine was properly prepared and was accompanied by proper directions and warnings

At the end of the day, Big Pharma is generating profits and in order to profit from a product, you need repeat customers. How do you keep your customers? By continuously spreading fear of an invisible enemy that is always lurking around you and that invisible enemy is Covid-19 and its army of new variants.

Wake up people! Big Pharma is like every other corporate entity that seeks profits at whatever cost even if it means that people will die from a toxic experimental vaccine that does not protect you against any variant of Covid-19. These so-called vaccines were produced in under one-year without sufficient human or animal testing, but that’s not important because all they want to do is to keep their corporate board members happy, and that’s all that matters to them at this point.

\*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above or below. Follow us on Instagram, @crg\_globalresearch. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

*This article was originally published on the author's blog site, [Silent Crow News](#).*

*Timothy Alexander Guzman is a frequent contributor to Global Research.*

*Featured image is from SCN*

The original source of this article is Global Research  
Copyright © [Timothy Alexander Guzman](#), Global Research, 2021

---

**[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)**

**[Become a Member of Global Research](#)**

Articles by: [Timothy Alexander Guzman](#)

#### About the author:

Timothy Alexander Guzman is an independent researcher and writer with a focus on political, economic, media and historical spheres. He has been published in Global Research, The Progressive Mind, European Union Examiner, News Beacon Ireland, WhatReallyHappened.com, EIN News and a number of other alternative news sites. He is a graduate of Hunter College in New York City.

**Disclaimer:** The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)  
[www.globalresearch.ca](http://www.globalresearch.ca) contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.  
For media inquiries: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)