

## SEVEN

# Some Cultural Correlates of U.S.-Japanese Protectionism

---

John F. Sherry, Jr.

*Assistant Professor of Marketing*

*J.L. Kellogg Graduate School of Management  
Northwestern University*

*Professor Sherry joined the Northwestern University faculty in September 1984. Prior to that he was a member of the Marketing Department at the University of Florida, where he was also active at the following university centers: Center for Consumer Research, Center for International Economic and Business Studies, Center for Alcohol Research, Center for Gerontological Studies.*

*He received his B.A. (1974) from the University of Notre Dame, and his M.A. (1978) and Ph.D. (1983) from the University of Illinois. Professor Sherry is an anthropologist with several professional affiliations: Sigma Xi, American Marketing Association, Association for Consumer Research, Academy of International Business, American Anthropological Association, Society for Applied Anthropology, and the National Association for the Practice of Anthropology.*

*Professor Sherry's research interests include consumer behavior (with emphasis on gift-giving, symbolism, hedonic and deviant consumption, and health care delivery), international marketing (including subcultural and multicultural dimensions), and applied research (with emphasis on organizational behavior, occupational programming, and qualitative methods). He has conducted field research in the urban United States, Ireland, the French West Indies, and Japan.*

*Some of his articles have appeared in the Journal of Consumer Research, Advances in Consumer Research, Advances in Health Care Research, and the Florida Journal of Anthropology. He is an occasional book reviewer for Medical Anthropology Quarterly and The Anthropology of Work Review and an ad hoc reviewer for the Journal of Consumer Research and Advances in Nonprofit Marketing.*

## INTRODUCTION

In this essay, I have no particular intention of adding to the folk analytic literature on Japan, Japanese management, and global marketing, or of obscuring what little insightful analysis there appears to be. With a reading knowledge of Japanese culture and a period of diagnostic fieldwork under my belt, I recognize the limitations of my perspective as a *gaijin*, but harbor some closet aspirations of becoming a *henna gaijin*. Being more intimately acquainted with American business practices but perhaps less conscious of American cultural patterns, my work in Japan has heightened my awareness of the complex ways in which business is embedded in culture, and deepened my appreciation of comparative method. I will adopt a cultural perspective in my discussion of protectionism and offer some social rather than company-specific suggestions for construing East-West trade.

As an anthropologist whose interests center around consumer behavior, I am disturbed by the long-delayed second coming of "culture" as a meaningful construct in marketing theory and practice. If we look at the evolution of trade diasporas (Curtin, 1984), it is reasonably clear that marketers, as professional boundary crossers (Agnew, 1979), from virtually the dawn of trade, were anthropologists. Put somewhat differently, the first anthropologists were professional marketers, yet marketing is not popularly (nor academically) regarded as a subfield of applied anthropology. At least it is not yet. Somewhere between the dawn of trade and the recent proclamation of a global marketplace—a millenia-long hiatus for which it is difficult to account, given even the historical record (Wolf, 1982)—the cultural dimension of marketing behavior has been allowed to atrophy. With the current rush to globalization, however, conceptions of culture both spurious and genuine, have recaptured the marketing imagination. "Cultural analysis," variously construed, has worked its way into the lexicon of marketing and organization behavior. I suspect it has been invoked as

a hot button, or summarily dismissed as superfluous, more often than it has been rigorously undertaken. I will use the notion in this essay in a clinical fashion to denote the thorough immersion and studied alienation required of an analyst of business practices in a global marketplace.

My own fascination with metaphor as a cultural entity has shaped the direction of this essay. Metaphor assists in the social construction of reality. It also precipitates action. We use metaphor to assign intractable problems to a social rubric that allows us to deal with those problems (Room, 1978). Is it possible that the metaphors guiding our global marketing strategies are poorly turned? Certainly, they are culture-bound and may mask as effectively as they reveal. Both researchers and practitioners are susceptible to monocausal analyses of complex marketing behaviors, especially at the level of tacit undertaking. Such understanding is superficial and requires thoughtful reconsideration. I have been captivated, literally it seems, by the metaphors currently used to describe marketing behavior in general, and our relationship to Japan in particular. Much of the technical vocabulary of marketing can be described as "invasive" or "combative." As marketers, we are engaged in warfare (Ries and Trout, 1985) on a corporate battlefield (Solman and Friedman, 1982), employing guerilla tactics as well as more conventional military practices; in between our "cracking," "breaking into," "prying open," and "penetrating" encounters, we barely have time to grab a power lunch (Dienhart and Pinsel, 1983).

We view our Japanese competitors as being similarly bellicose (Kotler, Fahey, and Jatusripitak, 1985), but couch that belligerence in several interesting idioms. Drawing from popular and trade sources in the business press, three idioms are especially apparent. The first is a complex of mythical/mystical/theological character:

*MIRACLE BY DESIGN*

*SAMURAI SPIRIT LIVES ON IN JAPAN'S ECONOMIC DRIVE*

*JAPANESE TURNING AWAY FROM WEST*

*SUNTORY NEEDS ANOTHER SHOT OF MARKETING MAGIC*

*THE ART OF JAPANESE MANAGEMENT*

The second revolves around the notions of irresistible force/immovable object, of invasion/invulnerability, and of the juggernaut:

*SOME COMPANIES ARE FINDING WAYS TO KEEP JAPAN FROM ALWAYS WINNING*

*WE MUST OVERCOME OUR INFERIORITY COMPLEX*



MEET AMERICA'S NO. 4 AUTOMAKER: JAPAN INC.  
 TRADE TALKS MAY NOT HEAD OFF COLLISION WITH JAPAN  
 NOW JAPAN WANTS TO CONQUER GLOBAL FINANCE  
 WHY JAPAN WON'T CAVE IN TO U.S. TRADE DEMANDS  
 JAPAN'S LATEST INVASION: LADIES LINGERIE

The third idiom deals with Japanese society as a curious hybrid of mechanical and organic solidarity:

IN CONSUMER ELECTRONICS, IT'S PHILIPS VS. JAPAN INC.  
 MAZDA'S BOLD EMBRACE OF THE UNITED AUTO WORKERS  
 JAPAN INC. BECOMES A MARRIAGE BROKER  
 PRYING OPEN JAPAN'S MARKETS

The darker side of these idioms is captured effectively in condensed formats:

FRUGAL, RECLUSIVE COMMANDERS OF AN INDUSTRIAL ARMY  
 JAPAN'S SECRET ECONOMIC WEAPON; EXPLOITED WOMEN  
 JAPAN BACKLASH  
 BEHIND THE MASK

Ethnocentric images of Japan as sumo wrestler:

WE'RE UP AGAINST SOME PRETTY HEAVY COMPETITION.  
 BUT WE'RE IN VERY GOOD SHAPE,

and as samurai:

THEY'VE TAKEN A PRETTY GOOD SLICE OF THE MARKET.  
 BUT NOW WE'VE GOT THE EDGE,

combined with the equally potent image of America as Sisyphus (wherein a U.S. construction worker rolls the rising sun up a steep incline) wed these idioms and impart to them a profound cognitive and affective power. Reinforcing such irony and satire is our fear that, if we are not successful in

PUTTING A HEADLOCK ON JAPANESE IMPORTS,

we may have to answer in the affirmative to

YANKEE TRADER; DEATH OF A SALESMAN?

Curiously, we seem to ignore the literature on American marketing successes in Japan (Fields, 1983) as well as on Japanese marketing failures elsewhere in the world (Kotler, Fahey, and Jatusripitak, 1985; Johansson, 1985; Sethi, Namiki, and Swanson, 1984). It seems as if we've established a fairly effective supernatural assault tradition on the level of industrial culture at the same time that Toffler (1983) has advised us to shed our "theological attitudes" toward market mechanisms.

Against what must we protect ourselves, and against what must the Japanese protect themselves? My first instinct is to say: against the injudicious selection of metaphors that a piecemeal understanding of social dynamics encourages. To Cateora's (1983) inventory of protectionist logic and illogic, I would add one rationale: cultural autonomy. This is more a substratum than an addition, insofar as each protectionist measure is geared to preserving the culture in which an economy is embedded. Marketing as a cultural system is at base inescapably political (Kotler, 1986; Sherry, 1986; Thorelli, 1983). Consequently, if we are to market effectively, our efforts must stem from a thorough understanding of culture, culture contact, and culture change. Protectionism is one mechanism by which culture is regulated.

## THE DRAMATURGICAL MODEL

It appears that marketers, both American and Japanese, have lately become "social cynosures" (LaBarre, 1956), a class of persons which attracts a good bit of attention from the rest of society. This notoriety, as popularly expressed, obscures some fundamental cultural dynamics to which we ought to become attuned. The creation of strawmen and scapegoats masks some basic flaws in the way business is conducted and inhibits healthy social adaptation to a changing world. Cultural analysis is one corrective measure that can give us a sense of the larger picture.

I proposed that the U.S.-Japan trade relationship, and the protectionist tendencies arising from that relationship, be viewed as a social drama. A social drama (Turner, 1974) is a unit of aharmonic or disharmonic process, which arises in a conflict situation. It is best described as a contrast between influential paradigm-bearers, where paradigm is understood to mean rules for social action. Paradigms are typically expressed as metaphors. As I have sketched it, from our American perspective, the contest occurs between the "Yankee Trader" and "Japan Inc." Phrased more eloquently, market capitalism contends against "Confucian capitalism" (Gibney, 1982) and this contest is popularly portrayed in *jidaigeki*, the "noodle western" television samurai period dramas (Moeran, 1985).

Social dramas typically unfold in four acts. First, a *breach* of regular social relations between parties is publically signaled. The bilateral trade imbalance is such an instance. The trade deficit is its visible symbol. Second, a *crisis* supervenes and threatens to escalate, widening the

breach until it becomes coextensive with some dominant cleavage in the social relations between actors. In our case, eroding market share, rising unemployment, foreign direct investment, high interest rates, and the like are taken as symptoms of this crisis. I have labelled the crisis "converse colonialism," as it represents a role reversal of sorts in our traditional relationship, with "winners/losers,"; or "haves/havenots," exchanging places; rifts occur at the level of geography, moral philosophy, race, and "culture." *Redressive action* is the third phase of a social drama and is enacted to dampen the escalating crisis. It is in this phase that pragmatism and symbolism reach their fullest expressions, and that social change is most profoundly influenced (Turner, 1974). Protectionism is the adjustive mechanism that concerns us here, and upon which I will elaborate directly. The social drama ends in *reintegration or irreparable schism*.

Either outcome results in a realigning of social relationships. The continuum along which this final phase unfolds has radically different poles. On the one hand, the possibility of a multilateral world system based upon cooperation and coordination exists. On the other, balkanization, with its inevitable competition and conflict, is a potential result. The forging of some optimal, mid-level alternative depends upon how we address the issue of protectionism.

Clearly, much of our future success as global marketers hinges upon how thoroughly we are able to comprehend the cultures of our customers and how appropriately we are able to meet their needs. Such cultural propriety is also an essential key to synergy; economies of scale and scope are short-lived when achieved through economies of vision. By examining some of the forces that have given rise to this social drama, as well as some of the responses it has evoked, we may be able to avoid the ultimately sterile promise of protectionism and devise a form of megamarketing (Kotler, 1986) to benefit both trade partners.

## MARKETING, SEMIOTICS, AND CULTURE CHANGE

Of all the conceptions of culture employed by marketers and consumer researchers (Sherry, 1985a), the semiotic perspective is perhaps the most relevant to a discussion of protectionism. Grossly simplified, this perspective treats culture as communication. In Hall's (1959) well-known formulation, culture is a language whose grammar is rarely

apparent in casual use. Culture is composed of primary message systems reflecting and reflected in each other and operating on or across several different levels. While we may be said to "know" our own culture, that knowledge itself is culture-bound and partially distorted. Further, getting to "know" another culture is a prodigious undertaking fraught with difficulties. Clearly, our knowledge of other cultures is distorted as well. Intercultural communication—the exchange of meaning in a global marketplace—can and does frequently become a parody when the partners' esoteric and exoteric perceptions conflict. The negotiation literature is alive with such vignettes. As global marketers, we cannot afford to be insensitive to the subtle nuances or the range of apperception at work when culture communicates (Sherry, 1986).

A semiotic perspective of marketing long championed by Levy (1978) is becoming increasingly popular among researchers, and it has profound implications for a global marketplace. Marketers are engaged in creating, sustaining, and recasting meaning (Sherry, 1985b), as much as in facilitating the exchange of goods. Marketing is among the most prominent media of intercultural communication, as the globalization debates have made eminently clear. As "products" variously defined circulate across national boundaries, they become particularly interesting cultural artifacts; they acquire and shed meanings as they circulate. These products, in some aggregate sense, may come to represent their culture of origin in the eyes of the end user. Again, in an aggregate sense, these products may be perceived as attributes of some metaproduct (Sherry, 1986) which is the idea-systems of the culture of origin. Thus, global marketers export culture as readily as products.

Commerce has always been one of the most important stimuli to cultural change (Curtin, 1984). Elsewhere (Sherry, 1985b), I have described marketing as one of the most potent sources of cultural stability and cultural change at work in the contemporary world. Despite the dynamic tension between stability and change that makes culture possible, change is often viewed as a threat to cultural integrity. It is just such a perception, compounded by our unawareness of historical patterns and cultural configurations, that seems to be fueling protectionist sentiment. The notion of borrowing judiciously those innovations diffusing through the global marketplace is being eclipsed by proponents of indiscriminant borrowing and by critics who would ban borrowing altogether.



## PROTECTIONISM: A CULTURE-CONSERVING STRATEGY

That the spectre of being recast along Oriental or Occidental lines, of being remade (in Japan's case, *again*) in response to external demands, or merely of being contaminated can be exorcised by protectionist measures is a powerful argument. Returning to our social drama construct and drawing out contending metaphors from one of the most wonderfully condensed and multivocal symbols in either culture—baseball, or *bēsubōru* (Whiting, 1977)—we can say that protectionism mobilizes moral philosophy by setting conceptions of “fair play” against “*fea purē*.” One culture's conception of laissez-faire is another's conception of cultural hegemony.

Defense is one of the bio-basic primary message systems of which culture is composed (Hall, 1959). It ramifies through every other message system of culture. It works to ensure the integrity, autonomy, and posterity of the group. While protectionism is most easily discerned in the system of subsistence, we can detect or read the “defensive message” in a culture's system of interaction, territoriality, exploitation, and so forth. Any hope of overcoming, in some positive sense, a culture's defensive message system depends upon understanding how it ramifies throughout that culture, so that products or appeals can be tailored to the system. This kind of marketing syncretism (Sherry, 1986) requires intimate local knowledge.

A number of postures are assumed by nations in the global marketplace. Between the poles of autarky and free trade lies a grey area we can call “optimal protectionism” (Samuelson, 1985). Because the notions of fair play and *fea purē* intersect in this grey area, and closely reflect the world as it is, we can translate this concept as “fair trade.” On the near boundary of fair trade, we are faced with protectionism, on the far side with industrial policies; the former would seem to be a short-term, *ad hoc* practice, the latter a longer term and more systematic one. Popularly conceived, protectionism is fueled by passion while industrial policy is fueled by reason, yet this second alternative is decried as logically and persuasively (Sethi, Namiki, and Swanson, 1984) as it is advocated (Thurow, 1985a and 1985b). Midway between these boundaries is Kotler's (1986) recommendation that “megamarketing”—the “strategically coordinated application of economic psychological, political, and public relations skills to gain the cooperation of

a number of parties in order to enter/or operate in a given market”—be practiced in blocked markets.

The addition of power and public relations to the marketing mix marks an interesting watershed in the evolution of conceptions of marketing, in its open recognition of the importance of political behavior (Thorelli, 1983). A wrong-headed application of megamarketing principles, driven by a producer orientation (an orientation too frequently adopted by international marketers) might result in cultural dereliction, wherein local preferences and needs are discounted, and local culture ultimately degraded. An enlightened application of the same principle, driven by an ecological orientation, could produce cultural propriety, that is, an appropriate, humane fit between marketed resources and local culture. Such enlightened practice depends upon our diagnostic skills. Marketers cannot be effective political strategies without becoming adept cultural analysts. Nor can they use Western conceptions of power as effectively in Japan as they might use Japanese conceptions of power in countering the Japanese primary message system of defense.

## CULTURAL CONTEXT: MORE THAN A BARRIER TO ENTRY

Typologies and taxonomies become very tentative constructs when applied to entities as complex as cultures, yet pop managerial analysts have spared little effort to trying to characterize Japan for us. In a recent, penetrating critique of the “group model” of Japanese society, Befu (1980) qualifies much of what we understand about cooperation and conformity, internal harmony, paternalism and familism, loyal employees, social class, and the self-concept, and emphasizes the need to distinguish between ideology and actual behavior in our study of Japan. His concern is that group-ism has become a monolithic, explanatory quick fix that caricaturizes rather than characterizes Japanese culture. Befu (1980, 1983) suggests rather that we consult the *nihonron* literature—Japan's popular literature of introspection—and discover the scores of theories advanced by the Japanese themselves which contend for legitimacy, so that any particular theory can be viewed in perspective. What emerges from such comparative analysis is the vehemence with which Japan's cultural uniqueness is asserted,

the hard sell with which being a legitimate force in the world is promoted. Befu (1983) asserts that the cultural identity crisis precipitated by Japan's internationalization is responsible for this radical claim. Since acculturative impact has come largely from the West, so also does the threat to cultural integrity. Thus, as Japan internationalizes in an economic sense, it "nationalizes" in a cultural sense, to preserve its sense of cultural autonomy. The unintended consequence of Japan's emergence as a world player has a dark side, which Befu labels "U-turn anti-internationalism":

*Japan can continue on the road of neo-nationalism (kokusuika) with impunity since it happens as Japan flies the banner of internationalism (kokuzaika). Thus, the two processes are as inextricably inseparable as the two Japanese terms for them are barely distinguishable (Befu, 1983:42).*

He concludes by suggesting that neo-nationalism in the guise of internationalism may be a cross-cultural occurrence and that it may be one of our most significant contemporary problems. In fact, the growing protectionist sentiment in the United States may portend such a U-turn.

To return one last time to the dramaturgical model, we can see the levels upon which stress—and here protectionism is at once a cause and a consequence—is managed in a global marketplace. At the level of individual society, we see some consumers experiencing *reactance*, a motivational state that impels an individual to re-establish his freedom in response to excessive compliance attempts. When group pressures become too intense, an individual may reject group norms and demonstrate independent behavior. Thus, some individuals may develop a "nativist" or domestic orientation, and actively boycott foreign products. Others may become more like a "world customer," and develop a consumerist orientation which allows them to integrate foreign products easily into their lifestyles.

At the level of society, we can witness occasional *rituals of rebellion* (Gluckman, 1956), in which people protect against the existing social order. Collectively, a questioning of established principles is permitted. Incidents of "Japan-bashing," whether public declamations or actual product destruction (perverse potlatches, if you will), comprise a case in point. A vociferous adherence to ABMAS (Sethi, et al, 1984)—the American business management system—and a scorning of im-

ported management principles is another. Conversely, a public embracing of "Japanism," whether through art, fashion, or philosophy, to say nothing of traditional product consumption, constitutes a rebellion. So also does the enthusiastic rush to install (albeit misunderstood or misapplied) JABMAS—the Japanese business management system (Sethi et al, 1984)—in American firms for whom it may be entirely inappropriate. These rituals of rebellion may actually preserve and strengthen the existing social order, emphasizing instead the social cohesion within which the conflict exists (Gluckman, 1956).

It is at the cultural level that I find adjustments to the global marketplace to be most fascinating. It is also the level on which popular futurists such as Toffler and Naisbitt make their most suggestive pronouncements. Involvement in a global economy could trigger a *revitalization movement*, a deliberate, conscious, organized effort by society's members to create a more satisfying culture. Such a movement arises under conditions of high stress for individual members of society and general disillusionment with a distorted cultural gestalt (Wallace, 1956). Should protectionistic sentiment grow sufficiently strong, a nativistic (xenophobic) movement might be spawned. Conversely, "vitalistic" (xenophilic) movements have arisen over time in response to the spread of market culture. Both opportunity and danger await global marketers, should either of these movements arise.

## CONCLUSION

Overcoming protectionism is a matter of determining what in fact is being protected and understanding how in fact your product offering constitutes a threat. To the list of excellent offensive, defensive, and counterattack options and strategies offered by Kotler, Fahey, and Jatusripitak (1985) to managers facing the new competition, I would add one suggestion. Marketers must return to their anthropological roots. Intimate acquaintance with local needs and wants and effective delivery of benefits are heroic demands in much of the global marketplace and nowhere more so than in Japan. The knowledge that marketing is seen as an invasive practice that threatens a culture's autonomy must be transformed into strategies that tap the potential for marketing to enhance cultural integrity. Acculturating marketing, and syncretizing products and appeals, are challenging jobs. But somebody has got to do them.



## REFERENCES

- Agnew, Jean-Christophe (1979), "The Threshold of Exchange," *Radical History Review*, 21(Fall): 99-118.
- Befu, Harumi (1980), "A Critique of the Group Model of Japanese Society," *Social Analysis*, 5/6(December): 29-43.
- (1983), "Internationalization of Japan and Nihon Bunkaron," in *The Challenge of Japan's Internationalization*, eds. H. Mamari and H. Befu. Tokyo: Kodansha International.
- Cateora, Philip (1983), *International Marketing*. Homewood, Illinois: Irwin.
- Curtin, Philip (1984), *Cross Cultural Trade in World History*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dienhart, Ligita and E. M. Pinsel (1983), *Power Lunching*. Chicago: Turnbull and Willoughby.
- Fields, George (1983), *From Bonsai to Levi's*. New York: New American Library.
- Gibney, Frank (1982), *Miracle By Design*. New York: Times Books.
- Gluckman, Max (1956), "The Licence in Ritual," in *Custom and Conflict in Africa*. London: Basil Blackwell.
- Hall, Edward (1959), *The Silent Language*. New York: Anchor Doubleday.
- Johansson, Johny (1985), "Japanese Marketing Failures." Forthcoming in *International Marketing Review*.
- Kotler, Philip (1986), "Megamarketing." Forthcoming in *Harvard Business Review* (March/April).
- Kotler, Philip, Liam Fahey, and S. Jatusripitak (1985), *The New Competition*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- LaBarre, Weston (1956), "Social Cynosure and Social Structure," in *Personal Character and Cultural Milieu*, ed. D. Haring. New York: Syracuse University Press, pp. 535-546.
- Levy, Sidney (1973), *Marketplace Behavior—Its Meaning for Management*. New York: AMACOM.
- Moeran, Brian (1985), "Confucian Confusion: The Good, the Bad, and the Noodle Western," in the *The Anthropology of Evil*, ed. David Parkin. New York: Basil Blackwell, 92-109.
- Ries, Al and Jack Trout (1985), *Marketing Warfare*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Room, Robin (1978), *Governing Images of Alcohol and Drug Problems: The Structure, Sources and Sequels of Conceptualizations of Intractable Problems*. Ph. D. dissertation. University of California at Berkeley.
- Samuelson, Paul (1985), "Analysis of Free-Trade or Protectionist Response by America to Japan's Growth Spirit," in *Economic Policy and Development: New Perspectives*, eds. T. Shishido and R. Sato. Dover, MA: Auburn House. pp. 3-18.

- Sethi, S. Prakash, Nobuaki Namiki, and Carl Swanson (1984), *The False Promise of the Japanese Miracle*. Boston: Pitman.
- Sherry, John (1985a), "The Cultural Perspective in Consumer Research." Forthcoming in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol 13, ed. Richard Lutz. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.
- (1985b), "Advertising as a Cultural System." Unpublished manuscript, J.L. Kellogg Graduate School of Management.
- (1986), "Cultural Propriety in a Global Marketplace." Forthcoming in *Philosophical and Radical Thought in Marketing*, eds. R. Bagozzi, N. Dholakia, and F. Firat.
- Solman, Paul and Thomas Friedman (1982), *Life and Death on the Corporate Battlefield*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Thorelli, Hans (1980), "International Marketing: An Ecologic View," in *International Marketing Strategy*, eds. H. Thorelli and H. Becker. New York: Pergamon Press. pp. 5-20.
- (1983), "Concepts of Marketing: A Review, Preview and Paradigm." Paper presented at the Third Annual American Marketing Association Faculty Consortium, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.
- Thurrow, Lester (1985a), *The Management Challenge. Japanese Views*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- (1985b), "The Case for Industrial Policies in America," in *Economic Policy and Development: New Perspectives*, eds. T. Shishido and R. Sato. Dover, MA: Auburn House. pp. 225-259.
- Toffler, Alvin (1983), *The Third Wave*. New York: William Morrow.
- Turner, Victor (1974), *Dramas, Fields and Metaphors*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Wallace, Anthony F. C. (1956), "Revitalization Movements." *American Anthropologist*, 58: 264-281.
- Whiting, Robert (1977), *The Chrysanthemum and the Bat*. Tokyo: The Permanent Press.
- Wolf, Eric (1982), *Europe and the People Without History*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

# PROTECTIONISM

CAN AMERICAN BUSINESS OVERCOME IT?

*Edited by*

Douglas Lamont

Visiting Professor of Management

J.L. Kellogg Graduate School of Management

Northwestern University

*With a Foreword by*

Rand V. Araskog

Chairman and Chief Executive

ITT Corporation

BooksCraft, Inc.  
Indianapolis, Indiana