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Abstract

The phenomenon of product piracy, when examined against different cultural, social and developmental needs, may result in a moderation of traditional moral judgments that have tended to deprecate piracy at every conceivable opportunity. Outlines the magnitude of product piracy, notably in the Asian region, presents a delineation of the relevant terminology, discusses strategies used in preventing product piracy and examines alternative views on the ethics of the practice.

Introduction

In spite of the resolve of negotiators at international trade talks and the combined efforts of individual companies and law enforcement agencies, the issue of product piracy seems to remain a permanent feature of the marketplace. Piracy, when products have been copied and sold without the permission of the rightful manufacturer, is a vast global business and one where successes in curbing it on one front have to be weighed against continued losses on another. In Hong Kong and Singapore the past decade has been one of notable achievements in controlling piracy but this progress has to be set against the continued and rampant piracy evident in Thailand, Taiwan, Korea and China. In the latter instances violations are so serious that they have often become the subject of special trade talks. Such deliberations have sought to penalize any trading nation that demonstrates a less than wholly committed approach to controlling piracy. The USA has tended to take a leading role in these talks primarily because government agencies have been the target of sustained lobbying by US corporations afflicted by the problem. Take the example of China, which some believe to be worthy of the dubious honor of being labeled the pirate capital of the world. In April 1991, the United States listed China, Thailand and India as leading violators of US copyright patents and gave China until November of that year to show significant improvements in copyright protection. After that date, it threatened to impose tariffs of up to 100 percent on specified Chinese exports. In June 1991, following three days of talks with Beijing over Chinese violations of US copyright, patents and other intellectual property, the Assistant US trade representative expressed pessimism regarding improvements in infringements by pirates (SCMP, 1991). Later, in March 1993, talks between Taiwan and the United States on copyright protection ended without agreement and with the threat of placing Taiwan on a list of unfair traders (SCMP, 1993); a move that would result in the US levying trade sanctions. It would appear therefore that corporations and governments alike will have to be prepared for the long haul in the fight against piracy and that at this stage it would be more realistic to think in terms of controlled, or contained piracy, rather than any immediate prospect of eradicating the practice.
The Magnitude of Product Piracy

Product and copyright infringements represent billions of dollars in losses to corporations throughout the world. Not only is piracy commercially costly, it is also a politically sensitive issue. In Thailand a US threat to retaliate against intellectual property violations, by withdrawing trade privileges, promoted heated discussions about the impact of product piracy on economic development. The debate in Thailand centered on whether to accede to pressure from the United States by tightening controls on the pirate production of books, cassettes, videos and other items, and ultimately resulted in a parliamentary show-down in 1988 (SCMP, 1988a). Legislation has since been passed which now imposes jail sentences and hefty fines for trademark infringements (Hong Kong Standard, 1990). Nonetheless these measures have been of limited value in attacking the root causes of piracy. Not the least of reasons for this is that the law is known to be particularly ineffective in dealing with systemic problems such as drug trafficking. The same is true of piracy; the more so as there is plenty of evidence to link it with criminal communities at national and international levels.

In recent years product piracy has changed considerably in terms of the range and technical complexity of products copied. This development, fuelled by access to better manufacturing technology and the lucrative gains derived from it, has afforded the pirate enterprise a host of new opportunities. Once confined to areas such as music and video recording, garments, watches, leather goods, cosmetics and software, piracy has developed a momentum all of its own. This has led to a profusion of products spanning the range of aircraft and automobile parts, prescription drugs, baby pacifiers, mannequins, alcoholic drinks, foodstuffs, vibrators, contraceptives, distilled water (fresh from the tap), snooker tables, car vacuum cleaners, silicon chips, and birds’ nests (for soup) (based on discussions with Mr Anthony Gurka, CTS Group, in Hong Kong which is involved in trademark protection activities).

A report by the International Intellectual Property Alliance to the United States Trade Representative on the piracy of US copyrighted works in ten selected countries (International Property Alliance, 1985) estimated annual trade losses to the United States alone to be US$1.3 billion. In 1992 US trade losses to the music industry were estimated to be in the region of US$199 million, to book publishing US$150 million, to the movie industry over US$414 million, and to the computer software industry over US$1 billion (Gorlin, 1993). Similarly, estimates at the time produced by the International Federation of Phonogram and Videogram Producers implicated Singapore audio pirates in the use of high-speed cassette dubbing machines to manufacture 70 million copies of illicit music tapes each year. Some 55 million of those music cassettes were exported to the Middle East and Africa, costing the US and British music industries about US$200 million annually (International Property Alliance, 1985).

When examining the global scope of piracy the spotlight frequently falls on Asia. In virtually every country it is possible to chronicle stories of piracy; in some, the practice is clearly endemic. Attempts to check the blatant excesses that have occurred have been more successful in some countries than others. Where this is so, piracy has been contained, if not drastically reduced, in terms of output volumes. Rarely has it been eradicated. Nonetheless the signs are encouraging for genuine product producers and progress made can be illustrated by quoting examples drawn from Hong Kong which, until recently, was a pirate paradise. That situation changed largely due to the concerted pressure brought to bear by a
combination of government agencies, surveillance specialists and manufacturers. In 1990 the Hong Kong Government confiscated a host of pirated products from different sources including 356,945 items of counterfeit clothing, 207,417 computer manuals and pieces of software, 128,008 videocassette tapes, 30 tonnes of Chinese patent medicines, 30,466 watches, and 29,101 items of plastic goods. Other items seized were leather wear, publications and foodstuffs (SCMP, 1990a). On a more specific note, the general manager of Imagineering, Lotus software’s Hong Kong agent, estimated that up to 1988, pirate software had cost the US parent company at least HK$20 million (approx US$2.5 million) in sales in Hong Kong alone. Indeed it has been suggested that as many as six out of ten copies of the product Lotus 1-2-3 sold in 1987 were pirated versions (SCMP, 1988b). These claims are not exaggerated: demand for pirated software has been substantial, coming from academics, students, corporations, business professionals, and PC buffs alike. In effect these consumers provided the motive for pirate operations. The demand for fake software in Hong Kong became so entrenched that it precipitated the creation of an entire shopping precinct devoted to serving its needs (SCMP, 1988c). Retail prices of pirated software in that precinct could be as little as 10-15 percent of the proprietary version.

Statistics produced by affected companies, notably of US origin, have calculated both the direct costs, in terms of cost to manufacturers, and indirect costs associated with fake products. The French Government, for example, has claimed that counterfeiting has resulted in a related problem, that of unemployment, and that the number of jobs lost in France because of this activity is estimated to be in the region of 50,000 (Yeow, 1987). However, the sale of pirated goods can not be exclusively measured in terms of their economic consequences for genuine article manufacturers. The existence of pirate versions of a brand detracts from the intangible asset values placed on the genuine brand by consumers. In addition the losses, measured in terms of human suffering, that have occurred as a direct consequence of the consumption of pirated goods also need to be considered. The sale of fake wine in China for example resulted in the deaths of 18 people. Similarly, the consumption of fake pharmaceuticals has had fatal consequences for unwitting victims. International concern has therefore grown over ethical pharmaceuticals and life saving drugs which have increasingly become fair game for pirates (Nakhom, 1990).

**Defining Product Piracy**

In attempting to offer a suitable definition of product piracy there is the immediate semantic difficulty of delineating between similar types of activities that are commonly grouped under the one heading. Any investigation of product or copyright infringement reveals several categories of activity. Instances of infringement cover a variety of interrelated phenomena: piracy, counterfeiting, look-alikes, sound-alikes, knock-off brands and a large “gray” area. The latter would include, for example, the unauthorized sale of garment production overrun by legitimately contracted manufacturers.

Pirate and counterfeit products are both illicit products yet it is reasonable to argue that the distinction to be made between these terms is based on the intention to deceive and therefore is a matter of the degree of ethicality. A counterfeit good is one which the manufacturer produces with the intention of deceiving the customer by leading buyers to believe that they are purchasing the genuine article. A deliberate attempt therefore is made to conceal the deception by as precise a duplication as possible. The most obvious example of this would be counterfeit currency. A pirated product is one with which the intention is
not to deceive the customer. On the contrary, the consumer is all too aware that the product he or she is buying is pirated. The awareness of the consumer that the product is fake stems from the purchase motive, i.e., it is a conscious act on the part of the buyer to seek out and purchase a fake product. The realization that he is buying a fake product is further evident from the purchase location, pricing or obvious differences in design, quality or features (Roberts and McDonald, 1984).

A more obscure but related problem is the provision of products or services which, though not identical, could be viewed as similar in substance, name, shape, form, meaning or intent to an acknowledged and widely known product or service currently in the marketplace. Such goods are frequently referred to as knock – offs. An example is provided by the West German-produced paper handkerchief Tempo, which in Asian markets has run up against Tango, Tinpo and Temgo; similar products in all respects. The look – alike and sound-alike phenomenon is a low-cost attempt to develop brand names, product designs or characteristics similar to those of an established producer in the same industry. Problems of this nature confronted the French leisurewear designer Lacoste when a Hong Kong – based leisurewear company began retail operations under the name Crocodile. Benetton have been shadowed by the look – alike Hong Kong manufacturer Bossini, which produces a similar range of apparel retailed in stores that borrow heavily from the Benetton formula.

More overt examples of knock – off brands are the “smell – alikes” of established perfumes that are sold in the United States at greatly reduced prices. The knock – off brand trades on the image and goodwill that has been developed in the marketplace by the exclusive perfume house. In some circumstances the advertising of the knock – off refers directly to the name of the original product and openly invites the consumer to compare the two, e.g., “If you like Giorgio you’ll love Primo” (Roberts and McDonald, 1984).

Patent rights of course seek to secure the essential advantage inherent in a genuine manufacturer’s brand but the system is by no means foolproof. The ruling that led to the 1988 judgment against Kodak may, to some, represent the notion of natural justice. This case took place in the US, where an extensive body of codified patent law and case precedents guided the judges’ ruling. Kodak were found to have violated no less than seven of Polaroid’s patents and the ensuing judgment in the federal appeals court cost Kodak dearly. However, in other legal systems such “violations” of intellectual property rights are often more contentious. Infringement suggests any activity that attempts to access, without formal agreement, compensation, or acknowledgement, the intellectual property rights of another. It should be noted that such rights extend to elements of an ascribed persona. There are numerous examples of individuals resorting to the law to pursue those who they believe have, in some way, “used that person” or their intellectual property, thereby enabling them to offer a product or service without having reached some prior arrangement with the intellectual property owner. A serenade in court helped Mick Jagger to receive a judgment in his favor for a case that was heard by a New York judge in 1988. The plaintiff accused Jagger of stealing copyright composition in the production of contemporary rock music that Jagger claimed as “all his own work” (The NatioNn, 1988). In contemporary music the idea that imitation has long given way to innovation is rather dubious. Ever heard of the Japanese “Beatles” or the Japanese “Madonna”? They are as ethnically Japanese as saki, but they have been built, packaged and promoted to look, sound, and act like the real thing. In a similar vein Hong Kong also witnessed the case of lawyers acting on behalf of the American film actor Jack Nicholson, who sought to protect his “personality” which had been “borrowed” to endorse Pelegrino mineral water. The advertising agency, in using a look-
alike model and references in the copy to a film in which Nicholson had appeared, seemed to have the actor endorsing the product. This was viewed as violating the intellectual property of an intangible quality, Nicholson’s persona (SCMP, 1988d).

The Beatles’ recording company, Apple Records, also charged in a US$15 million law suit that the sportswear manufacturer Nike had used the group’s “persona and goodwill” in its advertisements without prior permission. Nike had taken an original recording of the song *Revolution* to promote a line of running shoes. Although the rights to this song are held by Michael Jackson it was alleged by Apple Records that those rights did not permit Jackson to sell the song for the purpose of commercially promoting a manufactured product (SCMP, 1990b).

**Preventing Product Piracy**

As product piracy has become more pervasive the international pressures to prevent this trend have intensified. The most obvious form of preventive action has been the drafting and signing of international conventions, examples being: the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, more commonly known as the Paris Union, the Inter-American Convention, the Madrid Arrangement, the Universal Copyright Convention, the Patent Cooperation Treaty and the European Patent Convention. It is clear however that the existence of such agreements produces neither necessary nor sufficient conditions to eradicate piracy. Nonetheless international initiatives are a first and significant step in curbing the practices of product and copyright piracy. In the 1980s pressure from the United States and Britain helped to spur Singapore to crack-down on copyright pirates, although the need to keep pace with technological progress was also cited as an impetus for a major revision of Singapore’s copyright laws in 1987. Singapore now has a comprehensive body of statutes dealing with the violation of intellectual property rights and adopts a hard line in their enforcement, thereby acting as a model for other South – East Asian nations where the growth of piracy has tended to go hand in glove with strong and sustained economic growth. Singapore has elected to put its house in order but their lead has not been universally followed and infringements still remain significant in other Asian countries.

A more common recourse in combating product piracy is through local legal action. This may result in a partial solution but only where the law relating to infringement is in existence, heavily documented, supported by case precedents and meticulously upheld. For many countries, legislation of this nature is of very recent origin. For example, it is only since July 1 1993 that it has become a criminal offense to make or handle fake products in China.

Relying on legislation to defeat piracy has the added complication of technical differences between legal systems of different countries and possibly within countries (e.g. in the US, English Common Law serves as the basis for the legal system except in Louisiana which is governed by Napoleonic Code). First, legal systems in differing locations may not necessarily be based on English Law but on Code Law. In the latter case prior ownership does not imply exclusivity to associated rights. McDonalds encountered this problem on entering the Japanese market where the use of their name, in conjunction with hamburgers and the Golden Arches symbol, was by no means a foregone conclusion. One enterprising Japanese citizen had registered the name prior to McDonalds’ market entry thereby establishing a legalistic barrier, until a financially acceptable solution was negotiated. It should also be noted that even where the law does afford protection of a registered design this may be
circumvented in countries where the law does not comprehensively protect the processes by which a design may be replicated. In these circumstances a manufacturer may legitimately copy a registered design provided that he can demonstrate that he has engaged an alternative manufacturing process to reproduce that design. Elsewhere it may be almost impossible to protect effectively a process in the first place and of course this invites imitation.

Second, the law may not exist. Where this is so, it is reasonable to conclude that the issue of intellectual property rights assumes little significance on the political or legal agenda. This may reflect a cultural difference in terms of how “the crime” of commercial theft is regarded. The perception may well be that ideas should not be the exclusive property of a person or company but should be the collective property of a nation and shared among its people, such that all may benefit.

Third, the law may well exist but is effectively emasculated either because confusion prevails, as a result of widely different interpretations made in legal judgments, or because it is not in any sense rigorously enforced. The law has demonstrated itself to be a less than perfect solution in many countries where piracy is rampant. Thailand offers a case study of this. Under pressure from US trade negotiators, using strong-arm tactics, the Thais have responded by introducing legislation, increasing vigilance and raiding pirate manufacturers and their stockpiles. In spite of these measures the trade in pirated goods continues unabated. Locals and tourists alike flock to street markets where pirated products are openly displayed and purchased in large quantities. This situation leaves manufacturers of the genuine article asking themselves why the law has failed. The usual response to this question hinges on the fact that there has been piecemeal or lukewarm enforcement of the law.

In the Asian region not only is there considerable variation between legal systems but also there is the related issue of administering and enforcing the law. Effective prosecution demands support from an extensive network of enforcement agencies both related to the state and independent of it. Countermeasures to combat product and copyright violations invariably require combined efforts by specialist units within the police or customs, supplemented by private investigative organizations such as Pinkertons, which exist to protect the legal and commercial interests of their clients. Laura Ashley, Louis Vuitton, Cartier and Revlon all use extensive networks of lawyers and private firms to protect their markets worldwide. Under these circumstances there is every prospect of an infringement being readily identified by those acting on their behalf and of a subsequent legal action being successful. Inevitably surveillance of this sophistication makes protection both expensive and time consuming. Cartier for example claims to spend in excess of US$3 million worldwide protecting 10,000 registered designs in more than 125 countries, and 2,000 patents and industrial designs registered in about 100 countries (The Peak Magazine, 1993).

The lack of enforcement is not altogether surprising in those countries where the law is derided or where enforcement agencies have themselves been implicated in pirate activities. Add to this the fact that repeated penalties levied on convicted pirates by the courts have failed to dissuade the practice and you are left concluding that the law has failed as a deterrent. Operators in Thailand have been raided by the authorities as many as seven times and yet they continue to operate, in fact they are thriving. In more extreme
cases product piracy has become a matter of little consequence to enforcement agencies other than as a source of payment that buys a blind eye. This mentality derives from the presence of corrupt practices and is abetted by the belief that product piracy does not amount to criminal activity. On the contrary, it is argued that pirate operations provide a positive contribution to the economy by offering employment and consumer choice at affordable prices. In such circumstances the legal solution may prove to be frustratingly elusive unless some senior ranking official or politician takes up the crusade.

**Alternative Views of Product Piracy**

In looking at the phenomenon of piracy in the context of South East Asia it is clear that widely different views exist regarding its acceptability. These views are contingent on several factors and any discussion of piracy needs to be set against the broader backdrop of economic and social development.

**Economic Development**

In reflecting on the post-World War II economic development of Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Singapore and Taiwan it is clear that each country has resorted to imitation and piracy as one strategy on the road to home-grown innovation. This is not an exoneration of indulgence in ethically questionable practices but it does serve to illustrate that, in manufacturing pirated products and cheap imitations, the industrial experience gained from so doing may well have provided the seedbed for bigger and better things. Some observers of the pattern of economic development have gone further by suggesting that imitation and piracy were very necessary constituents of this process, quite simply because technological dominance was heavily stacked in favor of Western multinationals not renowned for their philanthropic support of rudimentary economies. Only relatively recently have attitudes changed, either because of the threat that cheap imitation or pirated products pose, or because the real potential of these economies suddenly dawned on multinationals as a great opportunity. To such views may be added the suggestion that, for many South-East Asian countries, where tourism has become a major foreign exchange earner, there has been a realization that tourist revenues could be readily magnified by the lucrative sale of pirated products.

**Transfer of Technology**

Whether newly industrializing countries can ever hope to emulate the technological prowess of the most advanced Western economies is a debatable issue. What is less contentious is that imitation and piracy have provided the prospect of an alternative to craft industry and an economy tied to primary resources. In short, pirated products have provided the prospect of the transfer of knowledge, employment and perhaps a stimulus “to the new industrial order” of developing economies.

**Undermining Manufacturer Self-interest**

This line of argument has resulted in some observers concluding that piracy is a problem that genuine product manufacturers have precipitated by virtue of their relentless pursuit of self-interest. This is perhaps most obvious where the item pirated is of prestigious designer origin. Invariably that means exclusive houses drawing on tradition and privilege as the
rationale for charging super-premium prices. The picture is exacerbated by the view that the direct export of designer products, resorting to local involvement only in terms of distribution and retail marketing, amounts to an abuse that is the prerogative of an elitist mentality. The absence of “local involvement” beyond a level of tokenism, provides an open invitation to piracy. Not only are the rewards to the genuine article manufacturer substantial but profits earned are returned to the home country widely known for its economic wealth and security. In this context pirate activity could be viewed as an attempt by local entrepreneurs to exploit legal, cultural and market differences, thereby redressing the perceived imbalance between rich and poor.

**Satisfaction of Market Need**

In some instances the role of the genuine manufacturer is also called into question. When supply of product from an exclusive source fails to equate with different levels of need, market mechanisms will prevail. Simply put, pirates will enter the marketplace to satisfy the perceived need, at a substantial discount on genuine article prices, thereby meeting the shortfall. So if premium-priced brands fail to engage pre-emptive strategies, in a bid to avert pirate activity, then they might be regarded as having no one to blame but themselves. Even in marketplaces not complicated by the existence of pirated product, failing to pre-empt competitor emulation is something that most marketing strategists are aware of. It is not surprising that piracy is one outcome of a marketplace characterized by buoyant demand that satisfies one level of need i.e., status, at a premium price. In this respect the pirate offers an alternative, otherwise known as that much-revered commodity, consumer choice i.e., implied status, at a low price. What we have here are uninvited guests to the market party and, like any other party, there are those who will object to the gatecrashers.

**Alternative Pricing**

In the market where a genuine product is subjected to the presence of pirated products, the latter may be regarded as “alternative” competition, albeit from a source that Michael Porter would categorize as a “bad competitor”. What is more important though is that the existence of these “bad competitors” should come as no surprise. Any need which is apparent, characterized by frustrated demand, and for which the marketplace is unable to provide a legitimate supply at affordable prices, openly invites supply from an alternative source. So, pirated product may be seen as alternative competition, with the advantage of a substantial mark-down on prevailing prices. Using this argument, piracy becomes no more than an attempt by some operators to address imbalances in the marketplace.

Such a view is at least worthy of consideration in terms of its impact on genuine-article pricing strategies. A significant reduction in the differential in price between that of the genuine article importer and a locally licensed manufacturer may very well erode the market for pirate manufactures. Companies such as Fila and Playboy have recognized this and use locally licensed manufacturers, which not only produce a range of products under these widely recognized labels, but do so at much more affordable prices. When companies do not engage this approach, or one similar to it, designer-label merchandise is seen to be exorbitantly priced, of restricted availability and appealing to a very small group of elite customers. The sheer magnitude of price acts as an incentive for the pirate. For example, the target customers for Louis Vuitton in Hong Kong are the glitterati and Japanese tourists.
Locals who want a Louis Vuitton bag go to Mongkok or Bangkok and buy the pirate version at a fraction of the price.

**Encouragement through Trade Controls**

It may well be that the situations expressed here are a direct outcome of government policy. For example where newly industrialized countries, through the mechanisms of taxation, surcharges and import controls, contribute to super-premium market prices, they consciously perpetuate the problems of piracy. Pirated products may therefore fulfill the needs of a group of customers, notably where genuine article manufacturers, or their distributors, fail to adequately service the marketplace. In Hong Kong some retailers of genuine computer software have been publicly criticized for their market insensitivity and poor levels of service (SCMP, 1988e). Consumers have reacted against this. In so doing they have again provided the motive and justification for sustaining the pirated software business. Given the cost of genuine software and, until fairly recently, the deliberate attempts to maintain what were perceived to be high retail margins, it is little wonder that the software market in South East Asia became saturated with pirate versions.

An additional argument, not completely accepted by the genuine article manufacturer, is that the existence of a sizable market for pirate product may well have a residual or carry-over benefit for the bona fide producer. Healthy demand in the pirate market may just create a level of awareness and emulation need that, in the longer term, stimulates demand for the genuine article. Pirate product buyers know of their deception and seek ultimately to trade up to the genuine product as they become more affluent. On the issue of deception the view has also been expressed that pirated product should not be taken too seriously. Pirated product deceives only the most naive. Who is fooled by a “Rolex” or “Dumshil” watch? This being so the two markets may co-exist with each other because the vast majority of the population are quite capable of noting the differences in design, price and quality between the legitimate article and the pirate version. Pick up a genuine Rolex and a fake Rolex, there is no doubt which is which. That aside the consumers of a pirated Rolex are not, and possibly never will be, the target market of Rolex of Geneva.

**Conclusion**

Few phenomena can be viewed simplistically as black or white, good or bad, and commercial piracy is one such phenomenon. Piracy, set in the context of economic development, may be viewed as an inevitable and tolerable problem for the developed world and not a problem at all for the developing world. The counter arguments to piracy are usually presented in relation to lost revenues (assuming that every pirated good purchase corresponds to a loss purchase of the original product), or that pirated products do serious harm to the consumer. An example would be in the area of pirated ethical pharmaceuticals where the conditions under which drugs are produced and distributed may be anything but conducive to the well-being of the customer.

Obviously potentially dangerous goods present a very different circumstance from the situation in which the consumption of the pirated product is unlikely to do any bodily harm to the consumer, e.g., the consumption of a pirated Gucci handbag. The issue we are therefore questioning is the extent to which product piracy should be regarded as a criminal and as such something to be deterred.
One physical law (first expounded by Sir Isaac Newton) states that each action has an equal and opposite reaction. We might at least entertain the notion that piracy is in fact a reaction, one that implies that all is not well with the prevailing practices of genuine article manufacturers and it is these, and the role of legislation, as much as the activities of pirates that need to be re-examined.

To conclude it must be said that the law offers but one perspective on piracy and as such does not adequately target the complexities surrounding the phenomenon. It is therefore instructive to view piracy in the context of economic arguments especially where these relate to the economics of developing nations. It is pertinent here to paraphrase the words of Adam Smith: the only acceptable function of production is consumption. If legal and ethical judgments are temporarily suspended, it could be argued that pirates are rather good marketers. They have found a need and a way of satisfying it. The logical extension of this is that piracy will never be eliminated as long as efforts fail to address the demand side of the equation; and demand is undeniably massive.
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