BRANDS AND THE DYNAMICS OF INDUSTRIES

TERESA DA SILVA LOPES*

Abstract: *Standard accounts of industry dynamics tend to emphasise the role of technological innovations. This study argues that brands may have a similar power to impact the dynamics of industries. This power, which goes beyond brand monopolisation and the ability to change competitive structures, includes the shaping of ecosystems such as global value chains, and processes of industry globalisation. This study draws on different categorisations of brands — merchants' brands and collective brands — and on a wide variety of historical cases relating to firms and brands from multiple industries, in distinct periods of time and different parts of the world.*

Keywords: *brands; trademarks; dynamics of industries.*

Resumo: *As análises-padrão da dinâmica de indústrias tendem a enfatizar o papel das inovações tecnológicas. Este estudo argumenta que as marcas podem ter um poder semelhante para influenciar a dinâmica das indústrias. Este poder, que vai além da monopolização da marca e da capacidade de mudar estruturas competitivas, inclui a formação de ecossistemas, tais como cadeias de valor globais e processos de globalização da indústria. Este estudo baseia-se em diferentes categorizações de marcas — marcas de comerciantes e marcas coletivas — e numa grande variedade de casos históricos relacionados com empresas e marcas de múltiplas indústrias, em períodos distintos e em diferentes partes do mundo.*

Palavras-chave: *marcas; marcas registadas; dinâmica das indústrias.*

INTRODUCTION

Although the importance of brands as a key firm-level resource has long been recognised in the fields of corporate strategy, industrial economics and law, studies on the dynamics of industries tend to highlight the significance of «hard» technological innovations such as patents[1]. The «soft» side of innovation associated with the creation of brands and reputation building, the protection of brands through trademark registration, and the creation of effective distribution channels only appears considered implicitly in these typologies[2]. Historical evidence has, however, highlighted that brands and marketing innovations have had a very important role in shaping the growth of firms and also the dynamics of industries[3].

* University of York. I would like to thank Gaspar Martins Pereira, Carla Sequeira and Paula Montes Leal for the invitation to give a keynote speech on the topic of this chapter at the «International Congress on Brands and Designations of Origin: History and Identity», 13-14 May 2021. I would also like to thank the anonymous referee for his very valuable and expert comments on the topic.

[1] MARSHALL, 1899, 1919, 1920; SCHUMPETER, 1934, 1939, 1942; SCHERER, 1984; NELSON, WINTER, 1982; ROSENBERG, 1982; CARLSSON, 1992; NELSON, 1995; MURMANN, 2003; BOWENS, DONZÉ, KUROSAWA, 2018.

[2] DOSI, NELSON, WINTER, *eds*., 2000: 6; DOSI, MALERBA, 2002; DOSI, WINTER, 2000.

[3] WILKINS, 1992; JONES, MORGAN, *eds*., 1994; CHURCH, CLARK, 2001; JONES, 2005, 2010; LOPES, 1999, 2002, 2007, 2019; LOPES, DUGUID, 2010.

A brand is here distinguished from a trademark. A brand is defined as a logo, symbol or design, or a combination of these, which can be used to identify goods or services and to differentiate them from competition. A trademark refers to the part of the brand which provides exclusive rights to the innovator to its distinctive name, word, sign, symbol, or logo, also guaranteeing its origin, and is protected by law[4]. The concept of the modern brand can, however, be unbundled into two characteristics. The first relates to the ability of brands to differentiate products and services beyond providing information about their quality, and as part of firms' marketing strategies, creating barriers to entry to competitors[5]. Brands create constructs that evoke different meanings in consumers' minds, and ultimately have the ability to influence the social and cultural fabric of our world[6]. The second relates to the fact that brands are protected by law, allowing enforcement against imitations. This legal protection also enables brands to have «eternal lives» through the renewal of their trademark registrations[7].

«Soft» innovations associated with branding and marketing are analysed within the context of two main broad categories of brands — merchants' brands and collective brands. Merchants' brands relate to goods that are manufactured and sold by a specific merchant; collective brands cover a larger portion of the market, with individual brand members sharing similar characteristics. While most brands that we experience daily are merchants' brands such as Amazon, Apple or Google, which differentiate individual products or services and their merchants or producers, collective (or common) brands are also very common in certain trades such as agricultural products like wines (Porto, Champagne, Rioja) and cheese (Parmesan, Gouda and Stilton). Merchants' brands (or producer brands) are typically owned by a single firm and are protected by law through a trademark. A collective mark is one that indicates that the user of the mark is a member of a particular organisation[8]. With collective brands a group of firms share a common mark which is used to market their individual products, while retaining full autonomy with respect to all business decisions and the retaining of profits.

Collective brands are associated with place or geographical indications of origin and certification marks. They are typically owned by third parties, such as regional associations or public sector bodies, and are legally protected by devices such as geographical indicators or appellation of origin[9]. Apart from creating a reputation for goods, they may also help create national and international reputation and competitiveness for regions by attracting talent, business, tourism, and helping local economic

[4] DAVIS, MANIATIS, 2010; KORNBERGER, 2010.
[5] LOPES, LLUCH, PEREIRA, 2020.
[6] LANDES, POSNER, 1987; DUGUID, 2014.
[7] LOPE, LLUCH, PEREIRA, 2020.
[8] DUGUID, 2012.
[9] HIGGINS, 2018.

development. Additionally, they can be used as a key tool for international relations and to promote international trade[10]. Certification marks, another type of collective brand, focus on distinguishing products based on certain standards, such as ethical and social standards. They tend to be owned by certification bodies and are legally protected by trademarks[11]. There is a large overlap between the two types of collective brands — geographical indications of origin and certification marks — particularly in geographical collective marks, which often set standards for use[12].

This chapter provides a systematic analysis of the impacts of these different categories of brands on the dynamics of industries and analyses how innovations in brands can change the competitive structure of industries, especially their level of concentration and market power; how brands can also shape industry ecosystems — the networks of supporting and related sectors and the industry regulatory structure on which the core firms in an industry rely; and on how they may impact the globalisation of industries directly and indirectly. Following the introduction, sections 1 and 2 look, respectively, at the impact of merchants' brands and collective brands on the dynamics of industries. The analysis makes a distinction between «marketing-based industries» and «technology-based industries», where patents tend to be considered the main form of innovation. Section 3 analyses how brands have shaped different industry ecosystems. Section 4 discusses how brands have been central in the processes of globalisation of industries by opening up new markets, new sources of supply, changing business models and organisational forms, and by increasing concentration in industries. Finally, section 5 draws some conclusions, highlighting the significance of historical evidence in illustrating the power brands may have in explaining firm and industry dynamics in the long run.

1. MERCHANTS' BRANDS AND THEIR EFFECTS ON INDUSTRY STRUCTURES

While the impact of merchants' brands is easily visible in the dynamics of «marketing-based industries» such as soft drinks, which rely on the management of brands and distribution channels for firms' competitiveness, in «technology-based industries», where competitiveness is usually associated with «hard» technological innovations such as patents, brands don't tend to be considered so central. However, as illustrated below, merchants' brands can also have a profound impact on industry dynamics.

---

[10] DINNIE, 2004; ANHOLT, 1998, 2003, 2006; *The country of origin effect*, 2011.
[11] IPO, 2014.
[12] DUGUID, 2012.

1.1. Merchants' Brands in «Marketing-Based Industries»

Merchants' brands have the power to revolutionise industries. The British soap brand Sunlight, created as a household detergent, was a radical innovation which revolutionised an industry through «creative destruction» of existing business models[13]. Sunlight was developed by the newly established British firm Lever Brothers in 1884 for washing clothes and for general household use. This was the first time a household detergent was sold branded and wrapped attractively in a way that could be purchased directly by the consumer from the retailer's shelf. When the brand was launched Lever Brothers also used innovative and aggressive advertising to market the brand. These «soft» innovations, essentially marketing related, led to a radical transformation of the whole value chain ranging from production to trade. As a result of the success of Sunlight, many imitations emerged nationally and internationally. Lever Brothers became very active in protecting their trademark, again following strategies quite aggressive and pioneering for their times. In some cases, they pursued imitators through court cases, in others they changed their modes of entry into markets by using their own channels rather than using agents and other third parties to increase control and manage risk[14].

This radical marketing innovation by Lever Brothers with the introduction of Sunlight soap disrupted the whole industry. Soon Lever Brothers became industry leaders dethroning the two existing British oligopolist firms — Joseph Crosfield from Warrington, and William Gossage from Liverpool. The two businesses felt the competitive pressure and reacted by creating multiple brands and registering hundreds of trademarks of new household goods. They also invested heavily in marketing and advertising. These brands and trademark registrations were, however, not used in the same way as Sunlight was by Lever Brothers. They worked as labels rather than as means to create a personality for products with unique characteristics[15]. Over time, the competitiveness of Crosfield and Gossage eroded and both firms ended up being acquired and absorbed by Lever Brothers in the early twentieth century[16].

Another example of a brand which changed the dynamics of a «marketing-based industry» is Coca-Cola. Despite its longevity and heritage, Coca-Cola is still relevant today and is one of the most iconic and valuable brands in the world[17]. Coca-Cola was invented in 1886 in the United States, in a period when other soft drinks brands such as Schweppes, Hires, Clicquot Club, Moxie and Dr Pepper were also starting to develop. There is some controversy about the way in which the brand built its reputation relying on a background in alcohol and cocaine-laced drinks[18]. This was at the time a rapidly

---

[13] LOPES, GUIMARÃES, 2014; SCHUMPETER, 1942.
[14] LOPES, CASSON, 2012.
[15] LOPES, GUIMARÃES, 2014.
[16] WILSON, 1954.
[17] INTERBRAND, 2021; *The Top Global Brands*, 2019.
[18] PENDERGRAST, 2013.

growing industry, as soft drinks were perceived to have curative properties of various kinds and were also regarded as a temperance drink. Coca-Cola launched the first cola soft drink in the US and was the first soft drinks company to use national advertising and distribution of its new brand. To achieve national coverage, it relied on economies of scale and scope in production, advertising, and distribution, using its own trained salesmen. Apart from creating a new cola market, Coca-Cola changed the business model in the soft drinks industry from having a regional scope to having a national coverage[19].

1.2. Merchants' Brands in «Technology-Based Industries»

The existing published rankings of the world's most powerful and most valuable brands show that there are many brands owned by leading multinational enterprises operating in technology-based industries. They include Apple, Google and Microsoft[20]. Despite their high investments in path-breaking technology-based innovations which created new industries and disrupted existing ones, these multinationals also invest heavy in marketing and branding. For instance, in 2015 Apple's branding and advertising expenses rose to a record 1.8 billion dollars, corresponding to about 80 percent of its revenues for that year. Since then, and because of public scrutiny, Apple stopped publishing this information[21]. The power of the brands owned by these «technology-based» multinationals is so significant that they are now used as symbols of specific economic and social activities. For instance, Facebook (now renamed Meta) is used as a brand that symbolises friendship networks; eBay symbolises auctions; Microsoft and Apple symbolise work and office; Uber and Lyft symbolise ride hailing; LinkedIn symbolises professional networks; Instagram symbolises photo and video social networking; and Twitter is used for brainstorming and influencing, just to name a few. These multinationals fight fiercely to keep brand dominance, leading to an even higher concentration of the industries where they operate. For instance, Facebook bought out WhatsApp and Instagram soon after the two start-ups were created, increasing as a result its dominance as a truly global social media platform brand[22]. These two brands were subsequently renamed as WhatsApp from Facebook and Instagram from Facebook[23] and in 2021 the tag changed to WhatsApp from Meta and Instagram from Meta. Similar patterns can be found in other «technology-based» industries, with the strategic behaviour of leading multinationals such as Google and Microsoft, which have also been buying out start-ups, owners of successful niche brands with potential to become global challengers[24].

[19] KAHN, 1960; CHANDLER, 1977; TEDLOW, 1990; FRIEDMAN, 2004.
[20] *The Top Global Brands*, 2019.
[21] O'REILLY, 2016.
[22] SHEAD, 2019.
[23] GRIFFIN, 2019.
[24] LOPES, 2019.

When using open innovation and intellectual property landscapes to share resources, know-how and technology, «technology-based» multinationals are also found fighting for control of their brands over the platforms where they operate and for the protection of the intellectual property associated with their marks in order to keep market power. For instance, most of the high-profile Free/Libre Open Source (FLOSS) projects, while disdainful of the patents and copyrights used to control and restrain software-driven technology, nonetheless have registered and taken care of their trademarks. Taking the lead, Linux, Mozilla, Firefox, and Wikipedia have all fought to prevent misuse of their trademarks. For example, the Linux Foundation's «Trademark Guidelines» cover multiple marks and in spirit are quite unlike their view of software patents[25].

We can also find historical examples of the role of brands in what are considered to be predominantly «technology-based industries». The German brand Aspirin created in 1897 by Bayer as an over-the-counter medicine to reduce pain, fever, and inflammation revolutionised the pharmaceutical industry, which until then relied essentially on the skills of pharmacists to prepare and dispense medical drugs which were sold for the same purposes[26]. While the first recorded use of salicylates as a pain remedy dates back thousands of years, Bayer was the first to use it in a pure form, with very few side effects and ready to use over the counter. The name «Aspirin» used for the new product was a combination of «Sperion» (meaning bark in Greek) and «A» for Acetyl. Soon after Bayer filed for patent protection of the revolutionary technology it had developed to produce the Aspirin in Germany and in other countries. However, except for the United States, the patent application was rejected in most countries. The argument provided was that the main component used in the production of the Aspirin and its benefits had been known and had been in use for that purpose for a long time. As an alternative, Bayer filed for protection of the trademark in different parts of the world. This type of IP protection was easily obtained due to the name's genuine innovative nature. Soon after the launch of the brand Aspirin, Bayer made a further technological breakthrough. In 1900 the company launched Bayer's Aspirin in tablet form. This prevented druggists from diluting Bayer's Aspirin with other powders and fraudulently selling the mixture as if it was Aspirin only[27].

The newly branded tablet Aspirin, apart from changing the dynamics of the industry, also created an important barrier to entry for potential competitors[28]. The Aspirin provided an easy, reliable, and inexpensive method to alleviate pain, changing the experience and expectations of patients and doctors, and leading to radical changes in the pharmaceutical industry. In 1915 Aspirin became available to the public without

[25] DUGUID, LOPES, 2011.
[26] MANN, PLUMMER, 1991.
[27] MANN, PLUMMER, 1991.
[28] ZÜNDORF, 1997; CHANDLER, 2009.

prescription, making it the first modern synthetic medicine to be mass-marketed, sold over the counter, and which became a household name around the world. Several serious influenza epidemics that took place in the early twentieth century provided an unexpected boost to the sales of Aspirin and its public reputation. Physicians and specialists in epidemics all over Europe prescribed the branded medicine Aspirin in considerable quantities, using the press to inform the public about the brand, which worked indirectly as free advertising for Bayer[29]. The brand and its international recognition and popularity became so generalised that the brand name eventually became genericised — the term «Aspirin» began to be used as synonymous of salicylic acid and pain killer throughout the world even by competitor firms (Bayer Co. v. United Drug Co., 272 F. 505 – S.D.N.Y. 1921).

2. THE IMPACT OF COLLECTIVE BRANDS ON INDUSTRIES

Collective brands in commercial activity can be traced back many centuries, gaining prominence from the twelfth century with the development of craft guilds which were at the origin of important industries and industrial clusters in Europe, producing goods such as cloths, bread, cutlery, edge tools and leather goods[30]. Medieval guilds had very distinctive and important roles in creating reputation for goods. They simultaneously authorised the use by members of indications of geographical origin and endorsed the quality of the goods they produced[31]. Guilds were particularly useful for dealing with adverse selection and asymmetric information when there were no legal standards. They also provided social benefits, even when there was some degree of monopoly power by the guilds[32]. In the Renaissance period firms such as the branch of the Medici family firm from Florence which focused on the trade of wooden textiles, relied on the network provided by their membership of the wool guild to outsource approved parties for several stages of their production process, including the purchase of the wool, and the dying of cloths and washing of the wool. The membership of the guild and their endorsement of these third parties provided an automatic reassurance of the quality and standards of the goods and services they offered. Some of these stages including the purchase of chemicals and stretching were carried out by the wool guild[33].

During the nineteenth century there was a globalisation wave which saw a rapid expansion of international trade as well as technological developments which increased the possibility of businesses to proliferate and internationalise their activities. These changes

[29] ALSTAEDTER, 1997.
[30] RICHARDSON, 2004; OGILVIE, 2011; CASSON, 2019.
[31] RICHARDSON, 1972, 2004.
[32] NORTH, 1981, 1990; RICHARDSON, 2004.
[33] FREDONA, Robert; LOPES, Teresa da Silva (2018). *Trademarks and Competitiveness in Renaissance Mediterranean Commerce.* Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association of Business Historians. (Sheffield 4-6 July 2018).

led to a demise of guild marks and brands, and the rise of other types of collective brands as well as merchants' brands protected by law. Two types of collective brands disseminated — place or geographical denominations of origin and certification brands[34]. Place or geographical indications of origin proved to be important in helping to build the reputation and competitiveness of industries and regions. They are distinct from indications of origin or «country of origin» which despite indicating geographical location, do not denote if the product from a particular region has special characteristics associated with geography such as soil, climate, or humidity[35]. Brands relying on geographical origin are different from trademarks because they denote geographical and not trade origin.

The earliest efforts to protect geographical indications of origin for wines illustrate how collective brands can produce radical transformations in the dynamics of industries. They provide an essential link between the geographical location of production and the specific quality attributes of the wine. The argument is that geographical location is distinctive and inimitable in terms of the unique combination of soil and climate, which influences the quality and the reputation of the wine. This was particularly important historically when there was significant fraud in the international trade of wines which often caused health hazards for consumers[36]. The original motivations to protect geographical indications of origin were associated with economic and consumer protection concerns. For producers, geographical indications of origin protected manufacturers and winegrowers from misrepresentation and loss of reputation and market share. Additionally, geographical indications served indirectly as endorsements — a marketing tool — to limit production areas and develop regional notoriety, and also provided monopolistic protection by creating more value added for businesses from those regions[37].

In beverages such as port wine and chianti the creation of a geographical indication of origin was very much connected with the quality of wines traded internationally with the main consumer markets; for the case of French burgundy, it was the domestic trade with Paris[38]. While Tuscany created a denomination for its wine in 1716, and the Tokaj region in Hungary created a denomination of origin in 1737, these were no systematic and enduring regulations. It is the Douro region which in 1756 creates the first denomination of origin for port wine with the meaning that we have today of continued government control in the region. Along with setting boundaries for geographical denominations of origin and ensuring quality for wines traded internationally and nationally, merchants were legally forbidden to use geographical names unless their

[34] HIGGINS, 2018.
[35] KOTLER, GERTNER, 2002; *The country of origin effect*, 2011; SUBRAMANIAN, 2017.
[36] STANZIANI, 2009; SIMPSON, 2011; LOPES, LLUCH, PEREIRA, 2020.
[37] PEREIRA, 1988; MARTINS, 1990; DUGUID, 2014.
[38] MAHER, 2001.

wines originated from the delimited areas[39]. Today, all major wine-producing nations have some sort of regulatory regime that sets out geographical limits on regions, and there is a controversy of whether this leads to equity and efficiencies or whether it creates distortions such as rents for those who own the production factors, such as land and vineyard owners[40].

Geographical indications of origin can also relate to other items beyond agricultural products such as footwear from Italy, automobiles from Germany, or fashion from France. This is what happened with the development of Paris as the capital of fashion from 1868, with the creation of a prestigious professional syndicate — Chambre Syndicale de la Couture Parisienne. The syndicate safeguarded good practices and know-how and lobbied public authorities in the pursuit of professional interests[41]. It was, however, from the 1950s in the aftermath of World War II that this and other similarly reputable associations which included most of the French luxury firms gained power lobbying the French government for favourable tax conditions, for protection from substitute products, and for the international promotion of Paris as a centre for fashion and luxury[42]. The popularity of this initiative led to the development of other fashion cities aiming to compete with Paris, notably London, and a series of Italian cities — Florence, Milan, and Rome[43].

Certification brands, such as Fairtrade and Rainforest Alliance, which have been particularly important in working as advocates for a better society, impacted on the dynamics of many industries by setting standards, creating greater equity in international production and trade, and making different parties in the supply chains more sustainable, cooperative, power sharing, and socially responsible. While the fair trade movement can be traced back to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, this phenomenon became mainstream, being used by multinationals in the twenty-first century[44]. Coffee is one of the multiple industries which was affected by this fair trade movement and the fairtrade label. This industry was historically concentrated in the hands of brand-name roasters, some of which also engaged in retailing[45]. In the early twenty-first century multinationals such as Starbucks with the Starbucks café brand, Procter & Gamble with Millstone, and Nestlé with Partners' Blend were crucial in changing the dynamics of the coffee industry by selling fairtrade coffee through mainstream channels[46].

[39] GUICHARD, ROUDIÉ, 1985; ASVANY, 1987; GEORGE, 1990; PEREIRA, 1996; UNWIN, 1991; ROBINSON, *ed.*, 1994.
[40] PARRY, 2008; GANGJEE, 2008.
[41] POUILLARD, 2015.
[42] DONZÉ, POUILLARD, 2019.
[43] MERLO, POLESE, 2006; BREWARD, GILBERT, 2006.
[44] GRANVILLE, DINE, *eds*., 2013; ANDERSON, 2015; LOPES, 2016.
[45] PONTE, 2002.
[46] *Fair enough – Taking the quality route to survival*, 2006; MACDONALD, 2007.

3. BRANDS AND INDUSTRY ECOSYSTEMS

Brands may impact on the dynamics of related and supporting industries, which directly or indirectly affect how they grow and thrive. Brands can produce radical changes in the contextual environments and in the «rules of the game» which govern industries. In many countries owners of successful brands were behind the creation of trademark law, from the second half of the nineteenth century, as innovators sought legal protection from imitators and counterfeiters for the misappropriation of their market share and reputation, and for misleading and sometimes also harming consumers' wellbeing and health[47]. In Brazil, for instance, the determining motivation for the Imperial Government to create a legislation for trademarks in 1875 is associated with a court case known as the «Moreira & Cia. vs. Meuron & Cia.», which took place in 1874 and was filed in Bahia by Meuron & Cia., a snuff producer owner of the brand Areia Branca against another snuff producer, for creating a very similar snuff brand, Areia Parda. The Court found that neither the existing Criminal nor Commercial Law provided enough grounds to protect the innovator, the owner of the original brand. As a result, Moreira & Cia., the imitator, sued Meuron & Cia. for damaging the reputation of his business. Eventually Meuron & Cia. won. In 1875, when the first trademark law came into place in Brazil, Meuron & Cia. was the first firm to register its trademark[48].

Brands have also contributed to the development of other related industries such as the professionalisation of marketing and advertising agencies and of trademark lawyers. An illustration is the case of the first advertising agencies in Brazil — Eclética, which was founded in 1914 in São Paulo to advertise foreign brands such as Aalborg cement from Denmark, and Ford automobiles and Texaco oil from the US. At the end of World War I more advertising agencies emerged in Brazil offering professional designs and advertising placements. The American advertising agency J. Walter Thompson which followed one of its clients General Motors was the first foreign advertising agency to open an office in São Paulo in 1929, and soon after another office in Rio de Janeiro[49]. In Argentina the spread of imitations of consumer goods brands in the late nineteenth century promoted the need for active surveillance of brands and the protection of intellectual property. That eventually led to the creation of trademark law in 1876 and also of law firms to deal with registration and litigation. Some firms such as Obligado & Co. and G. Brewer, which were formed around the same time the trademark was enacted in that country, still exist today[50].

---

[47] BENTLY, 2008; HIGGINS, 2008; LOPES, DUGUID, 2010; LOPES, CASSON, 2007, 2012.
[48] LOPES *et al.*, 2018.
[49] MACLACHLAN, 2003; WOODARD, 2002.
[50] LOPES, LLUCH, PEREIRA, 2020.

Imitation of collective brands can lead to the development of new and competing industries. In Spain, for example, the expansion and modernisation of the Rioja region in the second half of the nineteenth century was the result, to a large extent, of imitation of wines from the Bordeaux region. The French influence in the establishment of the Rioja wine region is visible in the techniques used in production and in the names of some firms and estates created such as Bodegas Franco-Españolas (1890) and Château Ygay (1893), which used in their wine labels expressions mixing French with Spanish wine-producing regions such as «médoc alavés» or «médoc riojano»; and also the technicians hired for the production of Rioja wines, many of which had previously worked in the production of Bordeaux wines. But Rioja wines were not being sold as Bordeaux wines. While there was imitation of production and imagery, there was no imitation of the commercial or collective trademarks. This type of imitation without trademark infringement was a success which impacted on the growth of the Rioja wine industry. It is possible, however, to find some Rioja wine producers following strategies associated with the counterfeiting of collective trademarks, characterised by imitation of product and use of false region of origin. For example, at the beginning of the twentieth century, Bodegas Bilbainas traded beverages such as Cognac Faro, Rioja Clarete, Cepa Borgoña, Cepa Sauternes, Tarragona port, South African sherry, and Catalan champagne[51].

Brands can also have an important impact on the power of different agents in global value chains. An illustration is the wine chain between Britain and Portugal in the early nineteenth century. During this period wine consumption in Britain grew and the market expanded creating incentives for adulteration of wines. For instance, there was a lot of wine in the British market being sold as port, but instead of originating from the Demarcated Region of the Douro in the north of Portugal, it originated from other regions such as southern France, southern Spain and from the East End of London in Britain. Faced with a market crisis of quality in Britain, the trade needed means to control its supply chains to avoid adulteration and as a way to signal quality and reliability to consumers. Traditionally wine was sold in Britain under the name of the merchant, who often liberally blended consignments. To overcome the increasing problem with adulteration of wines merchants turned to their suppliers. British wine merchants started to put forward the names of reputable suppliers to improve the credibility of the wines. As a result, new names such as Sandeman's and Offley's disturbed the established balance of power in the global value chain by rising from obscurity to prominence and by adding more value to the production stage[52].

Brands can also lead to the development of other less related activities, not strictly connected with the value chains for the products. For instance, in the late nineteenth

---

[51] LOPES, LLUCH, PEREIRA, 2020.
[52] DUGUID, 2005, 2010.

century, the global success of the match industry which developed during this period and was dominated by the Swedish match company and challenged by match producers from other countries such as Japan. This led to the development of a new industry — phillumeny, the art of collecting matchboxes. The importance of this industry is portrayed in the novel by the Nobel prize winner Anatole France *The Crime of Sylvestre Bonnard*, where he portrays a princess and prince roaming the world to find rare matchboxes of which they were making a collection[53].

4. BRANDS AND INDUSTRY GLOBALISATION

Brands can have a profound impact on the globalisation of industries. They can be at the basis of processes of industry concentration, international network formation and changes in business models, and corporate governance. The alcoholic beverages industry provides a very rich illustration of an industry where these different phenomena took place. There were several waves of mergers and acquisitions from the 1960s. Firms' owners of successful brands such as Johnnie Walker scotch whisky, Gilbey's gin, Pimm's gin-based, Moët & Chandon champagne, Hennessy cognac, Pernod anise, Ricard pastis, Bacardi rum, Famous Grouse American whiskey, and Guinness, Tuborg and Carlsberg beers, among many others, were at the basis for such waves which led to the concentration and globalisation of the industry. The aim was to acquire firms, owners of brands with the potential to globalise. Many long-established and once leading firms such as United Distillers and Seagram and their predecessors disappeared, while others such as Diageo and Anheuser-Busch InBev became very large and truly leading globally. Global brands were also at the basis of processes of international alliance formation in distribution from the 1980s which took place between competing multinationals, owners of such global brands. Those strategic alliances proved to be a more efficient way of securing markets than vertical integration by firms, because they provided the means for alcoholic beverages firms to reduce risk and uncertainty while simultaneously obtaining economies of scale and scope[54].

Alcoholic beverages brands are also the basis of changes that occurred in the corporate governance of the industry. This industry was traditionally dominated by family managed and owned firms. As a result of globalisation, the predominant forms of governance in the industry changed, to becoming owned by family firms but managed by hired professional managers. While families proved to be particularly effective at creating brands and nurturing them to achieve success and leadership, professional managers were central in globalising those brands. The relevance of brands became so crucial in this industry that by the beginning of the twenty-first century several brands had become detached from the firms that owned them and were being sold and acquired

[53] FRANCE, 1881-1890; LOPES, TOMITA, 2022.
[54] LOPES, 2007.

as pieces of intellectual property. An illustration is the brand Bombay Sapphire sold by Diageo to Bacardi in 1997, where the sale only involved the transfer of stocks, the recipe, and the trademark. There were no physical production facilities involved[55]. The power of established brands, the difficulty, the long time it takes to build new ones, the capacity of brands to add new dimensions to products differentiating them from rivals, and the need for brands to «stay forever young» and remain relevant to consumers, explain their need to change ownership to firms with the ability to globalise them[56].

Brands can act as a form of soft power and public diplomacy also impacting on the dynamics of industries[57]. Industries and governments can play an active role in creating and building positive associations through the branding of places and using communications strategies which act as a form of direct endorsement for brands originating from those places[58]. During the Cold War era, Coca-Cola was banned from Cuba and countries in Central and Eastern Europe under planned economy regimes. While the «official» argument to do so relied on the possible harmful effects of the beverage for health, the actual reasons were associated with what the beverage symbolised and the political and cultural ideals of the United States. By banning Coca-Cola from these markets local governments were also protecting domestic beverages industries from foreign competition, and in doing so were encouraging the production of local imitations of Coca-Cola and preventing consumers from experiencing what was considered to be a symbol of «American Imperialism», «American capitalism», and the «American dream». Attempts made for Coca-Cola to enter markets such as Russia were also heavily criticised by the US media. Once Eastern and Central European countries opened their economies to the West Coca-Cola was one of the first US brands to be sold in those markets either through its own distribution channels or through alliances with local partners. In this new era Coca-Cola became the symbol of freedom, modernity, and cultural liberation[59]. In 2022 Coca-Cola suspended again its operations in Russia in the wake of that nation's invasion of Ukraine[60].

Brands have the ability to help industries come out of periods of crisis and conflict such as dictatorships, communism, conflicts, and terrorism. The collective and fictitious brand created by the Colombian Federación Nacional de Cafeteros (National Federation of Coffee Growers) at the end of the 1950s of what seems to be a merchant or private brand in the eyes of consumers — Juan Valdez — illustrates how a country was able to improve the reputation of one of its main export industries internationally through what

[55] LOPES, 2007.
[56] LOPES, 2002, 2007.
[57] NYE, 2004.
[58] AVRAHAM, 2020.
[59] KUISEL, 1991; ELMORE, 2015.
[60] *Which Western Companies are leaving Russia?*, 2022.

was in fact a collective brand. For half a century Colombia had been hit by social and political violence, in particular drug trafficking, insecurity, and corruption. The length, scope, depth, and regional and international implications of the conflict made it the most enduring and complex in the Western Hemisphere. That enormously diminished the country's reputation having huge repercussions in industries such as coffee. Juan Valdez was a fictional brand using a fictitious entrepreneur named Valdez. The logo portrayed this fictitious coffee grower, alongside his mule named Conchita. Thanks to this campaign, the Federación Nacional de Cafeteros succeeded in rebuilding the imagery of the Colombian coffee industry from 1958. This branding initiative transformed what was until then an industry essentially selling commodities internationally into an industry which through the creation of a strong collective brand enabled entrepreneurs to add more value to their business activities. Apart from governmental support, this rebranding of the industry greatly benefited from clever public relations[61].

One of the peculiarities of globalisation and fast increase in world trade from the 1960s was that some countries and cities were able to assume greater importance as indicators of the origin, quality, and prestige of goods. However, that trend was challenged towards the end of the twentieth century with many goods having their components produced in multiple countries as a result of the disintegration of production value chains through offshoring into different countries and outsourcing to third parties. The Swiss watch is a good example of an industry where the need to preserve the right to use a very reputable collective brand, Swiss Made, constrained the level of disintegration through offshoring and outsourcing within the global value chain. The Swiss watchmaking industry which has historically been a world leader in watchmaking and relied on the country's reputation for high quality and craft as part of its international competitiveness was highly challenged from the 1970s, when there were important technological shifts in watch movements which led to its progressive advancements from mechanical to electric, electronic, digital, and finally quartz. These technological innovations led to the development of very competitive watchmaking industries based in the Far East. Many Swiss watch producers did not survive, others merged and acquired smaller ones. In order to obtain efficiencies in production and remain competitive watchmakers from different parts of the world started to disintegrate their production processes and form flexible production networks, spread geographically, each performing a limited subset of activities. Even the most exclusive Swiss brands, such as Tag and Omega, followed this pattern, by moving part of their production processes to the Far East either by setting up production operations abroad or by outsourcing third parties to produce some components considered to be less central in the production of quality watches. As a reaction to this de-industrialisation, and to keep the reputation of the Swiss watch industry worldwide, new legislation was

[61] BASSOLS, 2016.

passed. For watches to be labelled as Swiss Made, Swiss watch companies had to produce at least a fixed percentage of the value added in Switzerland, in particular the mechanical part, including the movement and the quality control[62].

The geographical disintegration of industrial production brands has also served to hide many aspects of supply chains from consumers, which not always ethical and favourable for society. An illustration relates to brands such as Benetton and Primark which in 2013 were outsourcing work in Rana Plaza in Bangladesh when an eight-story building which housed factories producing those brands collapsed, killing 1,134 people and leaving thousands more injured. These and other brands were complicit participants in the creation of a work environment which led to such tragedy, as they failed to meet safety standards and working conditions in the work environment[63].

CONCLUSION

This chapter draws on historical research and provides a comprehensive analysis of different impacts that brands may have on the dynamics of industries. It distinguishes merchants' brands from collective brands. Similarly to the role patents may have in technological innovations, brands can also be key in explaining marketing innovations. As illustrated, marketing innovations impacted on the dynamics of industries through processes of competition, concentration and diversification; new regulations; changes in the boundaries of firms and in the types of organisational forms; entry and exit into markets; and vertical integration and disintegration. Brand innovations can disrupt industries by changing business models, transforming commodity markets into branded markets, and by changing the way in which products are sold and consumed. Brands also have the ability to produce radical changes in the «rules of the game» in which industries operate and change the power relations between agents within value chains, having a strong impact not only on domestic industries but also on global industries.

Brands are particularly important when they help boost industries' reputation and act as indirect endorsers of merchants' brands and products. They may also symbolise particular cultures and values in international markets which may act in favour or against the globalisation of firms and industries. Nonetheless, brands can also produce negative impacts when they symbolise ideals, lifestyles and personalities that consumers or markets disapprove of or might want to repress. While all these types of impacts are to be expected in «marketing-based industries» which rely on brand innovations more than technological innovations, they are not so obvious in «technology-based industries». And yet, as illustrated by their rankings among the top brands in the world and also by the intellectual property strategies pursued by «technology-based MNEs» for achieving

62 DONZÉ, 2011.
63 FITCH, 2014.

oligopoly power and brand dominance, brands have in recent years also been crucial in impacting on the dynamics of «technology-based industries». This is because in today's business environment, characterised by industries where technological innovations produce incredibly short product lifecycles and which last only a few months in some high-tech industries, it is brands that provide the continuity, trust and information about quality and reliability, which are so central in consumers' decision taking and in business survival and longevity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALSTAEDTER, R. (1997). *100 Jahre Acetylsalicylsäure*. Leverkusen: Bayer AG – Geschäftsbereich Consumer Care.

ANDERSON, Matthew (2015). *A History of Fair Trade in Contemporary Britain: From Civil Society Campaigns to Corporate Compliance*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

ANHOLT, Simon (1998). *Nation-brands of the twenty-first century*. «Journal of Brand Management». 6, 395-406.

ANHOLT, Simon (2003). *Brand new justice: The upside of global branding*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

ANHOLT, Simon (2006). *Competitive identity: The new brand management for nation, cities and regions*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

ASVANY, Akos (1987). *Designación de los vinos de denominación de origen de la región de Tokay-Hegyalja*. In *Symposium «Denominaciones de origen históricas»*. Cádiz: OIV, pp. 189-196.

AVRAHAM, Eli (2020). *Nation branding and marketing strategies for combatting tourism crises and stereotypes toward destinations*. «Journal of Business Research». 116, 711-720.

BASSOLS, Narcís (2016). *Branding and promoting a country amidst a long-term conflict: The case of Colombia*. «Journal of Destination Marketing and Management». 5:4, 314-324.

«Bayer Co. v. United Drug Co.», 272 F. 505 – S.D.N.Y. (1921).

BENTLY, Lionel (2008). *The making of modern trade mark law: The construction of the legal concept of trade mark, 1860-1880*. In BENTLY, Lionel; DAVIS, Jennifer; GINSBURG, Jane C., *eds*. *Trade marks and brands – An interdisciplinary critique*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3-41.

BOWENS, Bram; DONZÉ, Pierre-Yves; KUROSAWA, Takafumi (2018). *Industries and global competition: Business beyond borders*. London: Routledge.

BREWARD, Christopher; GILBERT, David (2006). *Fashion's world cities*. London: Bloomsbury.

CARLSSON, Bo (1992). *Industrial dynamics: A framework for analysis of industrial transformation*. «Revue d'Économie Industrielle». 61, 7-32.

CASSON, Catherine (2019). *Guilds*. In LOPES, Teresa da Silva; LUBINSKI, Christina; TWOREK, Heidi J. S., *eds*. *The Routledge companion to the makers of global business*. London: Routledge, pp. 159-170.

CHANDLER, Alfred D. (1977). *The visible hand – The managerial revolution in American business*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

CHANDLER, Alfred D. (2009). *Shaping the industrial century – The remarkable story of the evolution of the modern chemical and pharmaceutical industries*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

CHURCH, Roy; CLARK, Christine (2001). *Product development of branded packaged household goods in Britain, 1870-1914: Colman's, Reckitt's, and Lever Brothers*. «Enterprise & Society». 2:3, 503-542.

DAVIS, Jennifer; MANIATIS, Spyros (2010). *Trademarks, brands, and competition*. In LOPES, Teresa da Silva; DUGUID, Paul, *eds. Trademarks, brands, and competitiveness*. London: Routledge, pp. 119-137.

DINNIE, Keith (2004). *Country of origin 1965-2004: A literature review*. «Journal of Customer Behaviour». 3:2, 165-213.

DONZÉ, Pierre-Yves (2011). *History of the Swiss watch industry: From Jacques David to Nicolas Hayek*. Bern: Peter Lang AG.

DONZÉ, Pierre-Yves; POUILLARD, Véronique (2019). *Luxury*. In LOPES, Teresa da Silva, LUBINSKI, Cristina; TWOREK, Heidi J. S., *eds*. *The Routledge companion to the makers of global business*. London: Routledge, pp. 424-437.

DOSI, Giovanni; MALERBA, Franco (2002). *Interpreting industrial dynamics twenty years after Nelson and Winter's evolutionary theory of economic change: A preface*. «Industrial and Corporate Change». 11:4, 619-622.

DOSI, Giovanni; NELSON, Richard R.; WINTER, Sidney G., *eds*. (2000). *The nature and dynamics of organizational capabilities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

DOSI, Giovanni; WINTER, Sidney G. (2000). *Interpreting economic change: Evolution, structures and games.* «Review Économique». 54, 385-406.

DUGUID, Paul (2005). *Developing the brand: The case of alcohol, 1800-1880*. «Enterprise & Society». 4:3, 405-441.

DUGUID, Paul (2010). *Brands in chains*. In LOPES, Teresa da Silva; DUGUID, Paul, *eds*. *Trademarks, Brands, and Competitiveness*. London: Routledge, pp. 138-164.

DUGUID, Paul (2012). *A case of prejudice: The uncertain development of collective and certification marks*. «Business History Review». 86 (Summer) 311-333.

DUGUID, Paul (2014). *Information in the Mark and Marketplace: A Multivocal Account*. «Enterprise & Society». 15:1, 1-30.

DUGUID, Paul; LOPES, Teresa da Silva (2011). *The penguin in chains – Brands and trademarks in an open innovation world.* « Big Innovation Centre – Blog». (5 Dec. 2011). London: Work Foundation.

ELMORE, Bart J. (2015). *Citizen Coke: The making of Coca-Cola capitalism*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.

FAIR enough – Taking the quality route to survival. «The Economist». (20 Mar. 2006).

FITCH, Nathan (2014). *The deadly cost of fashion*. «The New York Times». (14 Apr. 2014).

FRANCE, Anatole (1881-1890). *The Crime of Sylvestre Bonnard*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

FRIEDMAN, Walter A. (2004). *Birth of a salesman – The transforming of selling in America.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

GANGJEE, Dev (2008). *(Re)Locating Geographical Indications: A response to Bronwyn Parry.* In BENTLY, Lionel; DAVID, Jennifer; GINSBURG, Jane C., *eds*. *Trade Marks and Brands – An Interdisciplinary Critique*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 381-397.

GEORGE, Rosemary (1990). *Chianti and the wines of Tuscany*. London: Sotheby.

GRANVILLE, Brigitte; DINE, Janet, *eds.* (2013). *The Processes and Practices of Fair Trade – Trust, Ethics and Governance*. London: Routledge.

GRIFFIN, Andrew (2019). *WhatsApp and Instagram to be renamed as part of Facebook re-brand*. «Independent». (5 Aug. 2019).

GUICHARD, François; ROUDIÉ, Philippe (1985). *Vins, Vignerons et Coopérateurs de Bordeaux et de Porto*. Paris: CNRS.

HIGGINS, David M. (2008). *The making of modern trade mark law: The UK, 1860-1914. A business history perspective*. In BENTLY, Lionel; DAVID, Jennifer; GINSBURG, Jane C., *eds*. *Trade marks and brands – An interdisciplinary critique.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 42-61.

HIGGINS, David M. (2018). *Brands, geographical origin, and the global economy: A history from the nineteenth century to the present*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

INTERBRAND (2021). *Best Global Brands 2021 – Rankings*. London: Interbrand.

IPO (2014). *Collective and certification trade marks.* London: Intellectual Property Office.

JONES, Geoffrey (2005). *Renewing Unilever – Transformation and tradition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

JONES, Geoffrey (2010). *Beauty imagined – A history of the global beauty business*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

JONES, Geoffrey G.; MORGAN, Nicholas J., *eds.* (1994). *Adding Value – Brands and marketing in food and drink*. London: Routledge.

KAHN, Ely Jacques (1960). *The big drink: The story of Coca-Cola*. Reinhardt: New York.

KORNBERGER, Martin (2010). *Brand society: How brands transform management and lifestyle.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

KOTLER, Philip; GERTNER, David (2002). *Country as brand, product, and beyond: A place marketing and brand management perspective*. «Journal of Brand Management». 9:4, 249-261. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.bm.2540076.

KUISEL, Richard F. (1991). *Coca-Cola and the Cold War: The French Face Americanization, 1948-1953*. «French Historical Studies». 17:1, 96-116. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2307/286280.

LANDES, William M.; POSNER, Richard A. (1987). *Trademark law: an economic perspective*. «The Journal of Law and Economics». 30:2, 265-309.

LOPES, Teresa da Silva (1999). *Internacionalização e concentração no vinho do Porto, 1945-1995*. Porto: GEHVID/ICEP.

LOPES, Teresa da Silva (2002). *Brands and the evolution of multinationals in alcoholic beverages*. «Business History». 44:3, 1-30.

LOPES, Teresa da Silva (2007). *Global Brands – The evolution of multinationals in alcoholic beverages*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

LOPES, Teresa da Silva (2016). *Building brand reputation through third party endorsement: Fair trade in British chocolate.* «Business History Review». 40:3, 457-482.

LOPES, Teresa da Silva (2019). *The nature of the firm – and the eternal life of the brand*. «Enterprise & Society». 20:4, 752-776.

LOPES, Teresa da Silva *et al.* (2018). *The «disguised» foreign investor: Brands, trademarks and the British expatriate entrepreneur in Brazil.* «Business History». 60:8, 1171-1195.

LOPES, Teresa da Silva; CASSON, Mark (2007). *Entrepreneurship and the development of global brands*. «Business History Review». 81 (Winter) 651-680.

LOPES, Teresa da Silva; CASSON, Mark (2012). *Brand protection and globalization of British business*. «Business History Review». 86:2, 287-310.

LOPES, Teresa da Silva; DOURADO, Bruna; SOUZA, Elizabeth Santos de (2022). *Unbundling the brand: Differentiation and the law in the Brazilian South American tea industry*. «Business History». DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/00076791.2022.2036130.

LOPES, Teresa da Silva; DUGUID, Paul (2010). *Trademarks, Brands, and competitiveness.* London: Routledge.

LOPES, Teresa da Silva; GUIMARÃES, Paulo (2014). *Trademarks and British dominance in consumer goods, 1876-1914.* «Economic History Review». 67:3, 793-817.

LOPES, Teresa da Silva; LLUCH, Andrea; PEREIRA, Gaspar Martins (2020). *The Changing and Flexible Nature of imitation and adulteration: The case of the global wine industry, 1850-1914*. «Business History Review». 94:2 (Summer) 347-371.

LOPES, Teresa da Silva; TOMITA, Shin (2022). *Trademarks as «Global Merchants of Skill»: The Dynamics of the Japanese Match Industry, 1860s-1930s*. «Business History Review». 96:3 (Autumn) 559-588.

MACDONALD, Kate (2007). *Globalising justice within coffee supply chains? Fair trade, Starbucks and the transformation of supply chain governance*. «Third World Quarterly». 28:4, 793-812.

MACLACHLAN, Colin M. (2003). *A History of Modern Brazil: The Past Against the Future.* Wilmington Delaware: Rowman & Littlefield.

MAHER, Michael (2001). *On Vino Veritas? Clarifying the Use of Geographic References on American Wines Labels*. «California Law Review». 89:6, 1881-1925.
MANN, Charles C.; PLUMMER, Mark L. (1991). *Aspirin Wars: Money, Medicine and 100 Years of Rampant Competition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.
MARSHALL, Alfred (1899). *The economics of industry*. London: Macmillan.
MARSHALL, Alfred (1919). *Industry and trade*. London: Macmillan.
MARSHALL, Alfred (1920). *Principles of economics*. 8th ed. New York: Macmillan.
MARTINS, Conceição Andrade (1990). *Memória do Vinho do Porto*. Lisbon: Instituto de Ciências Sociais.
MERLO, Elisabetta; POLESE, Francesca (2006). *Turning fashion into business: The emergence of Milan as an international fashion hub*. «Business History Review». 80:3, 415-447.
MURMANN, Johann Peter (2003). *Knowledge and competitive advantage: The coevolution of firms, technology and national institutions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
NELSON, Richard R. (1995). *Recent evolutionary theorizing about economic change*. «Journal of Economic Literature». 33:1, 48-90.
NELSON, Richard R.; WINTER, Sidney (1982). *An evolutionary theory of economic change.* London: Belknap Press of Harvard University.
NORTH, Douglass C. (1981). *Structure and change of economic history*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.
NORTH, Douglass C. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
NYE, Joseph S. (2004). *Soft power and American foreign policy*. «Political Science Quarterly». 119:2, 255-270.
O'REILLY, Lara (2016). *Apple mysteriously stopped disclosing how much it spends on ads*. «Business Insider». (24 Nov. 2016).
OGILVIE, Sheilagh (2011). *Institutions and European trade: Merchant guilds, 1000-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
PARRY, Bronwyn (2008). *Geographical indications: Not all «Champagne and Roses»*. In BENTLY, Lionel; DAVID, Jennifer; GINSBURG, Jane C. *eds. Trade Marks and Brands: An Interdisciplinary Critique.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 361-380.
PENDERGRAST, Mark (2013). *For God, Country and Coca-Cola*. New York: Basic Books.
PEREIRA, Gaspar Martins (1988). *O Douro e o Vinho do Porto – De Pombal a João Franco*. Porto: Edições Afrontamento.
PEREIRA, Gaspar Martins (1996). *A região do Vinho do Porto – Origens e Evolução de uma demarcação pioneira*. «Douro – Estudos e Documentos». 1:1, 177-194.
PONTE, Stefano (2002). *The «Latte Revolution»? Regulation, markets and consumption and in the global coffee chain*. «World Development». 30:7, 1099-1122.
POUILLARD, Véronique (2015). *Managing fashion creativity: The history of the Chambre Syndicale de la Couture Parisienne during Interwar period.* «Investigaciones de Historia Económica – Economic History Research». 12:2, 76-89.
RICHARDSON, Gary (2004). *Guilds, laws and markets for manufactured merchandise in late Medieval England.* «Explorations of Economic History». 41:1, 1-25.
RICHARDSON, George B. (1972). *The organization of industry*. «The Economic Journal». 82:327, 883-896.
ROBINSON, Jancis, *ed.* (1994). *The Oxford Companion to Wine*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
ROSENBERG, Nathan (1982). *Inside the black box – Technology and economics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
SCHERER, Frederic M. (1984). *Innovation and growth: Schumpeterian perspectives*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
SCHUMPETER, Joseph A. (1934). *The theory of economic development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. First published in German in 1912.

SCHUMPETER, Joseph A. (1939). *Business cycles: A theoretical, historical and statistical analysis of the capitalist Process.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

SCHUMPETER, Joseph A. (1942). *Capitalism, socialism and democracy*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

SHEAD, Sam (2019). *Facebook owns the four most downloaded apps of the decade*. «BBC News». (18 Dec. 2019). Available at <https://www.bbc.com/news/technology-50838013>.

SIMPSON, James (2011). *Creating Wine – The Emergence of a World Industry, 1840-1914.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

STANZIANI, Alessandro (2009). *Wine reputation and quality controls: The origin of the AOCs in nineteenth century France*. «European Journal of Law & Economics». 18:2, 149-167.

SUBRAMANIAN, Samanth (2017). *How to sell a country: The booming business of nation branding.* «The Guardian». (17 Nov. 2017).

TEDLOW, Richard S. (1990). *New and improved – The story of mass marketing in America*. Oxford: Heinemann.

THE COUNTRY of origin effect. «The Economist». (4 Aug. 2011).

THE TOP Global Brands 2019. «Financial Times». (2019).

UNWIN, Tim (1991). *Wine And The Vine. An Historical Geography of viticulture and the wine trade*. London; New York: Routledge.

WHICH Western Companies are leaving Russia? «The Economist». (10 Mar. 2022).

WILKINS, Mira (1992). *The neglected intangible asset: The influence of the trade mark on the rise of the modern corporation*. «Business History». 34:1, 66-95.

WILSON, Charles (1954). *The history of Unilever*. London: Cassel. 2 vols.

WOODARD, James P. (2002). *Marketing modernity: The J. Walter Thompson Company and North American Advertising in Brazil 1929-1939.* «Hispanic American Historical Review». 82:2, 257-290.

ZÜNDORF, Uwe (1997). *100 years of aspirin: The future has just begun*. Leverkusen: Bayer AG.

I

AS MARCAS ANTES DAS MARCAS