In the early 20th century, advertising was criticized for either deceiving people or being a waste of money. Paul Cherington was the author who wrote about the rational aspects of advertising in opposition to criticisms. The purpose of this paper is to reconstruct his advertising thoughts indicated in his two writings (1913, 1928) in the form of replying to criticisms against advertising, that is, (1) advertising is a social evil, because it deceives consumers, and (2) advertising is a mere waste of money. Regarding the first point, he believed that fraudulent advertising should be eliminated from society by some means of regulation or a setting of higher moral standards among advertisers. He argued that it was quite important to remove untruthful advertising to protect good advertising. He discussed several concrete suggestions to eliminate false advertising.

Furthermore, concerning the second point, Cherington explained the reason why advertising was not wasteful. First, advertising was helpful to save excessive selling costs. Secondly, a source of advertising costs was from reduced production costs achieved by mass-production. And then stimulated demands through advertising would contribute to more productivity efficiency as well. Thirdly, reduced production and selling costs were reinvested in advertising to create long-term consumer’s goodwill. Finally advertising gave consumers a lot of knowledge about many kinds of products, and it had educational effects in making consumers “modern consumers.” Moreover, this consumer education would have positive effects towards a better standard of living. Cherington classified types of advertising as creative and competitive. Then he concluded that creative advertising was quite beneficial not only to individual consumers who bought any identified brand, but also to the entire society.

Through these arguments, I defined his argument as the macro-advertising research. In addition, his dichotomy of advertising, i.e., creative and competitive advertising influenced famous Marshall’s dichotomy, i.e., constructive and combative advertising. Even though his books might not be considered as theoretical research, it is worth mentioning that his discussions gave philosophical and ideological grounds for later macro advertising research. Although Cherington’s arguments have not attracted a great deal of attention among marketing scholars until now, I have come to the conclusion that Cherington should be recognized as the true pioneer of macro advertising research.
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