

Newspaper Medicine: Medical Journals Attack the Press, 1893-1913

Ulf Jonas Bjork

Department of Journalism & Public Relations, IUPUI, Indianapolis, Indiana, USA

Abstract: This research examines the fierce criticism of newspapers voiced in American medical journals from the mid-1890s until the end of the 1900-1910 decade. Primarily published to inform readers about new discoveries, successful treatments, technological innovations and accomplishments of colleagues, the journals did, during the era discussed here, find it necessary to bring up what they saw as problems within the press.

One of their chief concerns was the multitude of advertisements for patent medicines and other medical matters, and medical editors frequently claimed that the dependence of newspaper publishers on this kind of advertising corrupted their entire publishing enterprise and went against the greater public good.

Advertising was not the only problem area when it came to the press, however. News coverage of medical matters was ill-informed and intrusive, and it was conveyed to the public by reporters who were ignorant and not above inventing facts and by editors who sought sensational angles to boost readership.

To some extent, medical journals sought to make the case for their press criticism by referring to similar concerns voiced elsewhere in society at the time, for instance in muck-raking magazines, but the criticism in the journals was also rooted in peculiar issues facing the medical profession. Chief among these was the relatively low social standing of physicians in the United States at the turn of the last century. Doctors worried that the public held them in low esteem, and newspapers, the “powerful enemy,” were one of the reasons for that.

The outcome of the criticism of newspapers by the profession was a policy that urged doctors to shun publicity and avoid contact with reporters. Toward the end of the 1900-1910 decade, some physicians began to question that policy. They pointed out that, as public health and preventive medicine rose in prominence among the tasks of the typical doctor, a way needed to be found to reach the public. Newspapers were “the greatest educational medium for the masses,” and doctors should come to terms with that.

Keywords: newspapers; medicine; media criticism

Newspaper Medicine: Medical Journals Attack the Press, 1893-1913

In the spring of 1908, Edmund Sterling, an editor at the Philadelphia *Public Ledger*, was invited to speak before a group of Pennsylvania physicians. Sterling began his talk with a plea for better cooperation between newspapers and doctors, and he had ample reason for that approach, because, for more than a decade, the medical journals that American physicians such as those in Sterling’s audience subscribed to had vigorously criticized the newspaper press of the United States and the journalists who produced its content.¹

As Marilyn Marzolf has noted, American newspapers were widely scrutinized by general-interest magazines in the years around 1900.² Next to no research, however, has examined how doctors viewed newspaper coverage of a field of primary concern to them, so this article discusses what was written about newspaper and journalists in a number of medical journals in the late 1800s and early 1900s. Two questions are posed: first, what specific problems did medical journals—and the doctors who edited and contributed to them—see in the way newspapers covered medicine? By outlining those problems, the study adds a hitherto unexplored aspect to general histories of U.S. press criticism. Marzolf’s study, for instance, deals with the viewpoints of critics who had journalistic backgrounds, or in some instances, were judges or attorneys; this article, by contrast, offers a more systematic view of

This is the author's manuscript of the article published in final edited form as:

how members of one professional group viewed another, a perspective that has been rare in works comparing professions.³

Second, what wider issues lay behind the overall direction of the journals' view of newspapers, a view that was intensely critical? While medical journals on occasion referred to newspaper criticism published in general-interest magazines to bolster their case, their point of view was rooted in specific concerns of the medical profession itself, such as the status of physicians in society and their relationship to the public at large. As will be discussed in the conclusion, criticism of journalism and newspapers in medical journals flourished during a time of serious challenges for the medical profession, and the power of a mass-circulation press was seen as contributing to those challenges.

To answer the research questions, the study examined seven periodicals that aspired to national readership: the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, the *Medical Record* (New York), the *New York Medical Journal*, the *Philadelphia Medical Journal*, the *Medical News* (Philadelphia), *American Medicine* (Philadelphia), and the *Boston Medical and Surgical Journal*. In addition, two state journals were studied to obtain a more local perspective: the *Illinois Medical Journal* and the *Journal of the Indiana State Medical Association*. The sample of periodicals was dictated by the holdings of the library of the Indiana University School of Medicine, with the underlying assumption that a leading state medical school, founded during the period studied here, in 1903, could be expected to subscribe to leading journals in the field.⁴

All the journals have year-end indexes, and these were searched for terms such as *newspapers*, *reporters*, and *journalism*. A preliminary search of indexes between 1890 and 1910 yielded no entries for the above search terms before 1898 and none after 1909, so that 12-year time span is examined here. The author read every article and item that the index search produced.

Before looking at the criticism itself, however, it is necessary to discuss the publications in which it appeared.

Medical Journalism as a Field

Medical journals had a long history in the United States, dating back to the late 1790s, and by the year 1900 they numbered 121, a figure that rose to 183 in 1905, according to periodical directories.⁵ Historical studies of the press that these journals were a part of have tended to focus on individual publications or those of a city or state. One of the few historians to look at the medical press in its entirety is James Cassedy, who lauds journals concerned with medicine for making medical information more timely and for making the practice of medicine in America more influential, authoritative and professional. The time frame for Cassedy's study ends in 1860, however (and his literature review shows few studies not dealing with the antebellum era). The 1890-1910 period has received very little attention.⁶

Some of the medical journals of the late 1800s were affiliated with national or state medical associations, the foremost of which was the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, reverently referred to by the editor of the *Philadelphia Medical Journal* as "our most esteemed contemporary." Many, however, were business enterprises started by publishing firms or individual doctors, and, as such, they were fiercely competitive. For all the scorn they heaped on their colleagues in the "lay press," medical editors faced many of the same challenges and behaved in fashions similar to other

journalists. Editors who attacked one another were not uncommon, for instance, although such behavior was disapproved of as unethical and unworthy of true professionals.⁷

Journals aspiring to national prominence were not above boasting about how successful they were compared with their rivals: in 1898, the *Philadelphia Medical Journal* dismissed criticism from an unnamed competitor by claiming that it was inspired by envy of the *Journal's* supposedly far greater circulation, which had lured both subscribers and contributors away from the attacker. Showcasing the quality of its content, the editor of the Philadelphia publication at times sounded strikingly similar to the publishers of the early penny press. Pointing to the reports it had published from a meeting of the American Medical Association in 1902, the *Journal* stressed that it had taken the step of sending writers to every session so that they could report what had occurred—a method that was expensive but far superior to trying to “‘hack’ the reports out of the official programs.” The latter practice allowed a journal to produce reports before the meetings but amounted to “a sort of ‘fake’ journalistic enterprise.” Other journalistic practices were also troublesome: speaking before an audience of fellow medical editors in 1901, a Minnesota doctor condemned those who copied content from other journals and those who wrote book reviews that were always “subservient” and favorable.⁸

Like their lay-press colleagues, medical editors and publishers worried about readership and circulation. Competition had made the task of the weekly medical journal “increasingly difficult year by year,” wrote the *Boston Medical and Surgical Journal* in 1905, and it was also a challenge to balance the interests of different groups of readers: specialists wanted detailed and research-oriented material, while general practitioners looked for practical advice that would benefit them when treating patients.⁹

The business aspect of publishing a medical journal also caused concerns. The mortality of these journals had always been high, and those who thought that publishers were “‘making a mint’ of money” had “false ideas of medical journalism and its methods,” claimed the *Philadelphia Medical Journal* in 1900, in an attempt to make readers pay their subscription fees. Even the venerable *Journal of the American Association* operated with a very small margin, according to the Philadelphia publication, and it, like its colleagues, could not sustain itself without advertising.¹⁰

The use of advertising as a source of funding for medical journals was controversial, however. Obtaining advertising patronage was the main goal of all but a handful of the medical journals in the United States, claimed the *Cleveland Medical Journal* in 1900, resulting in “mercenary” journalism. As the comment in the *Philadelphia Medical Journal* makes clear, advertising was a necessity for for-profit medical periodicals, but many editors saw them as increasingly problematic. As medical journalists in the early 1900s became a sufficiently cohesive group to form their own organization, the Association of American Medical Editors, a speaker at that body’s 1901 meeting declared “commercialism” to be “the curse of American medical journalism.” To combat that curse, editors needed to purge the pages of their journals of “any medicine of unknown composition or of one advertised to the general public”; if they did not, they risked losing their membership in the editors’ association. They also had to disavow the practice of introducing advertisements as editorial matter, and, finally, end all relationships with advertisers who insisted that journals that accepted advertising for a certain medicine publish editorial articles praising the product. The *New York Journal of Medicine* agreed wholeheartedly with the speaker’s points, claiming that “reputable” journals had no option but to take such a course.¹¹

As publications affiliated with state medical societies became more common toward the end of the 1900-1910 decade, distinctions began to be drawn between them and the older for-profit publications

that were already on the scene. The pattern of for-profit journals preceding those affiliated with state medical societies was evident, for instance, in Texas, where the *Texas Medical Journal* had been published for almost two decades before the *Texas State Journal of Medicine* was founded in 1904. In a slightly different pattern, the privately owned *Boston Medical and Surgical Journal*, dating back to 1812, became the official organ of the Massachusetts Medical Society in 1914.¹² As Maryland's state medical association launched its own journal in 1908, its editor stressed that entrusting the publication of the society's proceedings to "a journal over which the society has no control" had not been an acceptable alternative:

It is a folly to expect any journal owned by laymen to respect the higher ideals of the profession. All such papers are conducted for the purpose primarily of making money and the business manager is none too particular about discriminating between the revenue tendered by the advertiser of a fraudulent proprietary medicine and that offered with the advertisement of an honestly conducted hospital and pharmacy.¹³

The same year that the Maryland journal started, editors of state journals were prominent and numerous enough to form their own organization within the AMA, the Association of State Secretaries and Editors of State Journals. Its first meeting provided a forum for critics who found little of value in commercialized journals, labeled "dependent" by the editor of the *Journal of the Indiana Medical Association*, Dr. A.E. Bulson of Fort Wayne, Ind.. Bulson admitted that "he had edited for a number of years a journal which was dependent absolutely on its advertising income," apparently waiting for the day when "conditions in the state made it possible to publish a state journal which should be clean and should represent the better class of men in the profession." The secretary of the California medical society put it more bluntly: medical association journals "should be absolutely clean and free from the taint of blood money."¹⁴

Primary Target: Newspaper Advertising

If the presence of advertisements in medical periodicals was controversial to physicians, the prominence of advertising in the funding of daily newspapers was nothing short of outrageous, and when comments critical of the newspaper press began appearing in their professional journals in the mid-1890s among the items about new treatments, successful operations, medical innovations and association proceedings, the reliance of the daily press on advertising was a main theme. Some of the criticism targeted advertising in general, possibly in hopes attracting broader public support. In 1906, the *Illinois Medical Journal* reprinted a letter it had sent to leading dailies in its home state asking about their "policy of printing personals, advertisements of specialists in diseases of men, announcements of get rich quick concerns, wild cat mining schemes, clairvoyants, help for ladies in trouble, and other advertisements that are considered fakes." Referring to a survey of advertising managers at New York newspapers that had appeared in the newspaper trade publication *Printer's Ink*, the *IMJ* claimed that "very few of the New York managers permitted ethical considerations to play any part in determining the paper's policy."¹⁵

The inclusion of "advertisements of specialists in diseases of men" and "help for ladies in trouble" on the *Illinois Medical Journal's* list of fake ads was an indication that medical advertising was of particular concern to doctors. That was natural, as such advertising encroached directly on their domain and challenged their expertise. Among such advertisements, those for patent medicines were of particular concern. The manufacturers of these medicines were wholly dependent on the press in order to reach consumers, noted the *JAMA* in 1905, and publishers' "ready acceptance" of money from the "nostrum" companies amounted to nothing less than "newspaper graft." The same year, *American*

Medicine declared the “alliance between newspaper and patent medicines” to be “criminal,” giving as a reason that while the use of patent medicines had no directly adverse effects, patients who believed that the remedies had curative powers neglected to seek proper medical care. By carrying such advertisements, newspapers “were partners in a business which is as immoral as burglary.” *The Journal of the Indiana State Medical Association* went a step further, comparing the press’ publication of medical ads to selling one’s soul, with the result that newspaper publishers were “just as guilty as is the fellow conspirator with the actual murderer.”¹⁶

In their campaign against patent medicines, medical editors frequently referred to the efforts of general-interest magazines to combat such products. A 1907 article in the *JAMA* praised *Collier’s Weekly* and the *Ladies’ Home Journal* for deciding “to stand in opposition to the nostrum evil.”¹⁷ Three years earlier, *American Medicine* had approvingly reprinted an editorial published in *Collier’s* that condemned William Randolph Hearst’s New York *Journal* for carrying fraudulent advertising, spoofing the direct-address style of writing typical of that paper in the process:

LISTEN.

To the billion readers in our Hearst family ONE WORD.

Let them EXAMINE this paper. ...

They will find masses of advertisements of patent medicines. One contains 44 percent of alcohol. One, advertised as “safe,” contains over 35. We KNOW they are poison.¹⁸

The following year, *American Medicine* approvingly noted that *Collier’s* had decided to exclude patent medicine ads from its pages and that it would soon publish more articles “dealing with the harm done by quack remedies.”¹⁹

To some journals, the newspapers’ acceptance of patent-medicine ads was an indication of flaws throughout the paper, flaws that cast a shadow over its entire content. In 1898, the *Philadelphia Medical Journal* claimed to be puzzled by that circumstance:

Just in proportion as a newspaper is careful as to the political accuracy of its editorial statements, and truthful as to its news-publishing, the more it excludes the vile medical advertisement. The more outrageous its nostrum-ads, the less is it to be trusted in its news and editorial opinion. The more extreme its partisanship, the more hideous its advertising pages. The yellower it is, the more nauseous its medicine.²⁰

Six years later, *American Medicine* made essentially the same accusation:

The one sure test of the trustworthiness of a newspaper in its news and reading columns is the character of its medical advertisements. The more partisan and degraded its editorial advice, the more corrupt its reporting and “write-ups,” the more it ministers to sensationalism and crime, the worse its “medical” advertisements and the more flaring the portraits of its testimonial letters.²¹

Patent medicines were not the only products that physicians objected to when it came to newspaper advertising. Other ads related to medical matters clearly were also problematic, particularly those dealing with abortion and contraception. Concerned about falling American nativity rates, an Illinois doctor writing to the *JAMA* in 1904 placed the blame on advertisements that were “most vicious and degrading”:

When, in plain language, appliances for the prevention of conception are heralded in one column of the press, and methods for the destruction of the ovum in an adjoining column, it is very evident that the prospect of a high birth rate is not very flattering. The medical profession should accept the responsibility and duty of acting as censor, so that our newspapers are so cleansed of these filthy and criminal advertisements that the pure and innocent may read every column without danger or defilement.²²

The letter writer claimed that newspaper editors would “prate about virtue ... but their virtue is confined solely to the editorial page, and under the plea of not being argus-eyed they fail to see what vile stuff their advertising columns contain.” To many of his colleagues, however, the editorial and news pages of the press were almost as ridden with problems as the advertising department.

Ignorance and Sensationalism in the News

One issue was the inability of laymen—including reporters and editors—to understand medical matters. “‘Newspaper medicine,’ —of course we mean medical matters as described in newspapers—is sometimes correct, often startling and usually funny,” observed the *JAMA* with a note of condescension in a 1903 editorial comment. An article written by a New Jersey doctor for the *Journal* two years later was less charitable, concluding that “[f]ew articles on medical subjects which appear in the columns of the average newspaper are either truthful, accurate or scientific,” although the author of the article admitted that such articles were “mines of mirth to those who know.”²³

Journalistic ignorance may have been one reason why physicians were reluctant to trust the press, but they were also deeply suspicious of the motives and methods of journalism at the turn of the last century. Medical editors thought they had found evidence in several instances of how the papers’ dependence on advertising was so total that it affected news coverage. According to the *Cleveland Journal of Medicine*, the 1899 trial and conviction of a man charged with practicing medicine without a license was ignored by the newspapers of Columbus because the man had been a major advertiser. A similar case in Des Moines, Iowa, had also been disregarded by that city’s dailies, and they compromised themselves further by allowing one of those arrested to write a column “derogatory to the profession in Des Moines,” according to the editor of the *Iowa Medical Journal*, who claimed that only after the men were convicted and it was evident that they would no longer be able to advertise had the papers decided to cover the case.²⁴

A correspondent to *American Medicine* related how he had suggested to a writer of syndicated humor columns that “the nostrum drinkers, the electric belt men, the oil-of-mustard actina people, the women with wires about their ankles connected with a wonder-working liquid yonder, etc.” might make for good subject matter. While the writer agreed that the topic was ripe for exploitation, he also indicated that it probably would not be published for fear of retribution from advertisers. “[T]o touch the sacred alcoholic nostrum traffic, the magnetic belt business, and all that, that of course would be suicide, speaking from a newspaper point of view,” commented the medical journal sarcastically. “They, the solemn ‘guardians of public morality,’ prefer their mouths padlocked and the key given to the patent medicine syndicates.”²⁵ As the Des Moines story indicated, not only were advertisers able to stop news coverage, they could also use the news columns to get their point across. As early as 1893, the *Medical News* claimed that nostrum sellers were in a position to have “puffs and lies” about their products masquerading as “special news reports.”²⁶

Even when advertisers and their influence over newspapers were not an issue, medical journals found the news pages of the press problematic. The mass-circulation newspaper of the late 1800s needed

exciting stories to attract readers, and the result, according to medical editors, was irresponsible sensationalism and yellow journalism. Newspapers had discovered that departments dedicated to medical matters attracted readers, lamented a letter to the *Philadelphia Medical Journal* in 1900, and they filled them with bizarre items, such as an article in a Sunday edition about the effect of alcohol on monkeys, “with portraits of the latter in all stages of intoxication.” “[I]n the wild rush for items to fill their dolorously adipose Sunday issues,” observed *American Medicine*, “the yellow journals are sometime compelled to ‘work up’ and flaunt before their readers marvelous accounts of scientific research.”²⁷

While the main impact of such items was to misinform readers and trivialize medicine, other instances of newspaper exaggeration were potentially harmful. Press reports about the severity of the 1902 influenza in Boston were wildly exaggerated, according to the *Boston Medical and Surgical Journal*, and could “have a far-reaching effect upon the minds of the ignorant and unreasoning classes in the community, and so unquestionably do harm by exciting a quite unnecessary fear.”²⁸ Even more alarming were newspaper pronouncements late in 1912 that a German researcher had found a cure for tuberculosis. “To exploit it in so sensational a manner even the most apparently promising cure without the confirmation of time and the judgment of those most competent to judge, is an absolute and indefensible refinement of cruelty,” thundered the *JAMA*, noting that the supposed cure had not been subjected to testing or peer review as medical protocol demanded.²⁹ When, a few months later, newspapers expressed skepticism about newly discovered cures for cancer and infantile paralysis, the *Journal* thought that attitude could be attributed to “the failure of many hastily reported ‘cures’ eventually to justify the enthusiastic reports concerning them.” Worried that a jaded public would blame the medical profession for such failure, the *JAMA* argued that the fault lay with the newspapers themselves, for they had rushed “to print items regarding such wonderful medical discoveries before ascertaining that these discoveries had a scientific foundation and the endorsement of scientific men.”³⁰

Dishonest Reporters

For the reporters whose task it was to produce the accounts that were deemed so problematic by the journals, physicians had little respect. To the reportorial ignorance that they thought surfaced in the coverage of medical topics, medical editors added a tendency among newspapermen to engage in outright fabrication. Commenting on a newspaper story about a family with 27 children who upon investigation proved to be non-existent, the *Medical News* wondered “what motives inspire the newspaper-reporters in periodically starting such stories on their rounds” and cautioned physicians to be on their guard against such “concoctions of the vivid reportorial brain.” After the press in New York City had uncovered mismanagement at Bellevue Hospital, stories about similar problems at hospitals in Newark and Buffalo had suddenly appeared, noted the *New York Medical Journal*. Despite bold headlines and vehement accusations, however, the stories had little substance, and it seemed to the *Journal* that “the occurrence of the Bellevue affair turned the ingenious reporters’ attention to that field as one in which some local counterpart ought to be forthcoming, and hey presto! There it is.” To *American Medicine*, the inventiveness of newspapermen was also evident in the coverage of scientific discoveries, which often were “the product of the uncontrolled mind of the imaginative reporter.”³¹

Quoting an unnamed “old and wise ‘newspaper man,’” the *Philadelphia Medical Journal* in 1899 depicted reporters as making up entire interviews and falsely attributing opinions and statements to interview subjects. For physicians, the moral was clear: “of all men in the world today they have greatest reason to beware of the newspaper reporter.”³² A year later, the editor’s opinion had changed only slightly:

As we know to our disgust, many newspaper reporters have not a spark of honor, and their promises are made in order to be broken. Not all, however, are liars. Still it is best never to talk with them. Even if they are honest they are usually incapable of reporting any professional thing correctly. When a medical fact or a physician's opinion goes through a newspaper office, it generally comes out a sorry mixture of untruth, error and distortion.³³

The *JAMA* harbored no illusions about the honesty of reporters, either, commenting in 1906 that “[i]n the present state of public thirst after medical sensations with the license allowed itself by the yellow press, it is dangerous to say anything startling or novel in relation to medical or surgical matters within range of a reporter.”³⁴

The *Boston Medical and Surgical Journal* attempted to, if not to defend reporters, at least explain the conditions under which they worked:

There is however, a word to be said in justification, or at least in explanation, of the reporter's position in the matter. It must be remembered that a reporter is merely a servant of his paper, that the continuance of his connection with it depends upon his obedience, that if he be told to do some impossible or unreasonable piece of work, he is expected to do it, or at least to draw upon his imagination when his facts fail.³⁵

The journal's comment had been prompted by an exchange of letters between a doctor and a newspaper editor in Philadelphia a few weeks earlier, and that exchange showed how far apart physicians and journalists were. Dr. W.W. Keen had contacted the editor of the paper after he had read stories about his clinics at one of the city's hospitals. Declaring himself “defenseless against reporters” who had hidden in his audience of medical students, Keen asked for a promise that there would be no more stories about his work. Sidestepping that request, the editor instead offered, when there was news about Keen's clinics, “to send to a good reporter to see you, in order that you may have the opportunity to make any statement regarding same you deem proper.”³⁶ He then tried to make the doctor understand the newspaper's point of view:

It is our desire to print the news accurately, and in order to guard against errors we will be glad to let you know about stories of the character referred to, before publication. I am sure you appreciate the necessity we are under of printing all the news of the day, but in so doing we are anxious to give courteous consideration to persons directly interested and we are as earnest as you are in the desire that the facts shall be accurately and properly presented.”³⁷

Alarmed at the prospect of being sought out for an interview, Keen responded that the inaccuracies of the article were “a very minor consideration”; what he wanted was a guarantee that there would be no publicity at all. As if to bear out his already low view of journalists, Keen's second letter generated no response from the editor. Instead, the paper published a second article, characterized by the *Philadelphia Medical Journal* as “a rehash of the old material,” in “the yellowest of yellow journalistic style,” accompanied by pictures that falsely claimed to show treatment at the clinic. (Exasperated, the doctor next wrote a letter to the publisher, asking whether he was defenseless against editors as well as reporters).³⁸

The Criticism in Context: A Beleaguered Profession

Reporters who were ignorant and made up facts, editors who broke promises and distorted stories to make them more sensational, and publishers who seemed to be in thrall to advertisers—such

perceptions of the people who produced American newspapers would have been a concern not only to physicians but to any public-minded citizen in the Progressive Era. The time period discussed here certainly witnessed a general scrutiny of the newspaper press, culminating in muckraker Will Irwin's fifteen-part expose of that press in *Collier's* in 1911. As noted above, medical journals frequently referred to the criticism voiced by *Collier's* and other magazines (although not, as far as could be ascertained from the material studied here, to Irwin's series specifically.) That way, they could make their criticism seem to be part of a more general movement for reform.³⁹

There were, however, specific reasons for the attitude of physicians toward the press, reasons unique to their profession. In a study of the involvement of physicians in city elections in Cincinnati in 1897 and 1900, Alan Marcus makes the argument that this involvement had less to do with a genuine concern about reform than with raising the status of the medical profession and restoring the influence of and respect for doctors. Across America in the late 19th century, the prestige of physicians was generally low, according to medical historian John Duffy, and what frequently emerges from between the lines of press criticism is a sense of a profession under siege, mistrusted by the general public and under attack from powerful interests, one of which was newspapers, particularly the mass-circulation organs that had appeared in the 1880s and 1890s.⁴⁰

In 1898, the *Philadelphia Medical Journal* pronounced “almost the whole newspaper-world” a “double enemy” filled with “hatred of the medical profession.” A year later, commenting on a newspaper editorial that had suggested that ophthalmologists unnecessarily prescribed glasses and overcharged patients and on a meeting of editors that had come out against the licensing of physicians, the *Journal* told readers that when newspapers “attack the medical profession ... it is surely time that we should wake up.” Physicians had to recognize, wrote the editor, that “when newspapers unite in corporate power and by their official voice to vilify the profession and prevent legislation in the interest of the public welfare, is it not evidence enough that in them we have a powerful enemy.”⁴¹ Arguing for a more conciliatory stance toward newspapers, Dr. H. Sheridan Baketel thought that the reward would be that the “practice of medicine would be raised” and that “[m]edical men, oftentimes classified by the public as high-grade artisans, would assume the high position to which they are entitled and which their fellow-practitioners in Great Britain already occupy.”⁴²

“Irregulars” Within the Profession

The problem from the physicians' point of view was that their lack of “high position” could not be attributed to newspaper hostility alone. As Duffy points out, the low social status of doctors at the turn of the last century was due to a number of factors, including a lack of licensing laws and lax educational standards. Barbara Guttmann Rosenkrantz also stresses that a lack of organization and a standard for professional behavior contributed to skeptical public perceptions of physicians. Editors of medical journals were aware of this: in 1899, the *Philadelphia Medical Journal* told its readers that, “[a]s a profession we need a finer and firmer esprit de corps, the blowing through our guild of a purer and nobler breath of the spirit of self-respect.”⁴³

Fostering an esprit de corps was problematic, however, because of divisions within the profession itself. Medical journals found newspaper advertising for quacks to be just as objectionable as that for patent medicines, but it was not always easy to draw the line between a quack and a professional medical man. The newspapers had, claimed an editorial in *JAMA* in 1904, “opened their columns” both “to the advertising quack and to the man who is only a little ‘off color,’” and when the *Journal of the Indiana State Medical Association* called for a campaign against “quackery” four years later, it admitted that some of the “advertising scoundrels” it wanted to target may “have no little ability and

could render considerable service to mankind, and for that reason an injustice might be wrought by revoking their licenses.”⁴⁴

In one sense, the issue should have been clear-cut, as any kind of advertising was out of the question for a professional physician, according to the AMA and the journals. “There has always been a wide difference of opinion between physicians and newspaper men as to the propriety of advertising,” noted an article in the *JAMA* in 1907, but the ethical principle that should guide doctors was clear: “It is incompatible with honorable standing in the profession to resort to public advertisement or private cards inviting the attention of persons afflicted with particular diseases.”⁴⁵ A year later, *American Medicine* admonished a subscriber who thought that the AMA had left it up to individual physicians to decide whether or not they should advertise. Such was not the case, the journal stressed, but, regardless of what rules were in force, a certain kind of behavior was still expected of doctors:

The fundamental assumption was that medical men are primarily working together for the good of their patients and of the whole community, not to outwit or get any advantage of each other. All “advertising,” reports of cases, cards, etc., in the newspapers are, of course, based upon the attempt of the one advertiser to attract patients, and “beat the other fellows.” ... Perhaps the best argument, at least *ad hominem*, against “cards” and reports of cases in the papers is that in reality it does not pay. The stupex wastes his money and ingenuity who attempts to beat his “rivals,” or the public, in that way. Our American people are growing too genuinely sharp for such crude sharpness. They see that a man who is compelled to attract practice by such childish means must be pretty hard pushed, and really consents to go into competition with *The Golden Prescription* and *There is Hope* clowns.⁴⁶

Even if physicians were willing to re-admit into the ranks of their profession former self-advertisers who had mended their ways, wrote the *Journal of the Indiana State Medical Association*, there would still be “a certain amount of instinctive aversion in every honest man’s breast to giving his hand in friendship and brotherly affection to one whose sense of modesty has been so lacking as to scatter broadcast his pictures and self-praises merely because of the greed for financial gain.”⁴⁷

Aware of such sentiments, physicians who engaged in advertising their service did so in a surreptitious manner, colluding with newspaper editors to disguise the promotion of themselves as news content. The fervor with which medical journals attacked “reading notices”—advertising mattered disguised to look like editorial text—stemmed from their editors’ suspicions that this was a favored device of “irregulars.”⁴⁸ Self-advertisement was not just a matter of messages that a doctor had paid newspapers to insert, however; it also included regular news coverage. *American Medicine* bluntly classified almost any material that was written by reporters about doctors as “advertisements” and listed as examples “public questions, social happenings, medical opinions, or more commonly—operations.” With an approving tone, the journal shortly afterwards reprinted a letter sent by county medical society in Ohio to all its members informing them that “the appearance of a practitioner’s name in connection with any case published as a news article” meant that the doctor was “guilty of the indecorum of advertising.”⁴⁹

A physician, stressed the *Philadelphia Medical Journal*, “should not advertise, or, what in his case is the same thing, should not delight to see his name, fame, qualities, and exploits set forth in the morning papers,” and a doctor who asked for guidance from the *JAMA* after being asked by the editor of his local newspaper to write a series of signed articles was told that “a signature would make the author liable to the charge of seeking notoriety, and of using a ‘special privilege’ for the purpose of soliciting patients” and might result in a “possible misunderstanding of the author’s motive on the part of the public, as well as of his professional confreres.”⁵⁰

Just as it was difficult at times to tell quacks from doctors who were “only a little ‘off color,’” so editors of medical journals had problems telling doctors who “sinned” and sought newspaper coverage from those who were “sinned against,” as *American Medicine* put it, and were covered against their will. While medical editors were deeply suspicious of the methods whereby newspaper journalists gathered their news, they appeared to assume that little publicity about physicians came about without the subjects’ tacit acquiescence. Some doctors, claimed the *Philadelphia Medical Journal* and *American Medicine*, went so far as to use press agents and “literary bureaus” to generate material and ensure that it reached the newspapers. To medical men “of character and scientific attainment” there could no compromise on the issue of advertising, stressed the journals, labeling both the ones who openly advertised and those who coveted news coverage with the derogatory term “newspaper doctors.”⁵¹

To refrain physicians from too close a cooperation with newspapers, county medical societies resorted to various schemes. The New Orleans Parish Medical Society started a scrapbook where “copies of all articles appearing in the daily press of this city relating to members in this society shall be placed.” It would be indexed and open to inspection by members, and “[a]ny member whose name shall appear therein will have the privilege of attaching a written explanation.” Three years later, the Snohomish County Medical Society in Washington did the same, after first passing a resolution “disapproving of the publication in the lay press of descriptions of operations, treatment and similar medical matters in connection with the names of physicians.” Some doctors took the ban on news coverage quite seriously. Dr. Keen’s horror at seeing his clinics publicized in the daily press of Philadelphia, discussed above, stemmed in large part from his concern that colleagues would suspect him of having encouraged the reporting and make “very disagreeable and unfavorable comment” and subject him “very properly, to extremely unpleasant criticism.”⁵²

Arguing for Accommodation

The solution, in Keen’s case, was to demand that newspapers leave him out of their columns altogether. While the medical journals generally approved of such a course, there were some doctors who disagreed, and their numbers were growing toward the end of the 1900-1910 decade. Keen had framed the newspapers’ insistence on covering his activities as an invasion of his privacy, but some of his colleagues thought that the modern physician could no longer take such a stance. In the past, a Cleveland doctor wrote in a 1909 article, medical men had “conducted themselves according to the proposition that their professional work is entirely private and confidential,” but that was no longer an option in “the age of scientific medicine” when there was a “general and deep interest of the public in medicine.” It was, in his view, “absurd to suppose that communication with the press can be severed,” and it was not even desirable, because the newspaper was “the most powerful means of influencing public opinion in the beneficent lines so much desired by all medical men—the teaching of hygiene, public health, sanitation, preventive medicine, and other subjects of general interest and benefit.”⁵³

As early as 1898, Dr. J.B. Learned of Massachusetts had argued passionately for allowing physicians to appear in “the lay-newspapers” as a way to counter the deluge of patent medicine and quack advertising:

Why not let the doctor at the bedside, in the public hall, or the newspaper inform the people concerning the causes of disease visible in the household, as well as in the public water supply. ... Let him say this through the public press. The people do not read medical journals. ... An honest, intelligent use of the public newspaper by the medical profession would be of more

service to humanity than all the antitoxins and germicides combined. The dishonest, the fraudulent instruction now sent forth through the daily press is poisonous to the public mind. I believe it is time, that it is honorable and dignified, that it is in harmony with the highest professional precepts and ethics, for the best men in the profession to become teachers through the public print.⁵⁴

That the argument for engaging with lay journalists was gaining momentum after 1905 is evident from a growing number of items in medical journals about press committees and publication bureaus. One of the earliest pushes for such institutions was made by Dr. H. Sheridan Baketel of New Jersey, and his word carried particular weight as he had a past as a newspaper editor. Baketel squarely placed the blame for inaccuracies in the medical stories in newspapers on the medical profession, because “as a whole, the papers do all in their power to present actual facts to their readers.” He then went on to depict newspaper journalism in a fashion radically different from that hitherto typical of medical journals, attempting to make his readers understand how reporters and editors went about their work:

The field of the newspaper man is wide. Although often a college graduate, he can not reasonably be expected to be equally versed in medicine, law, theology, engineering and the other professions, into which subjects his work leads him almost daily. It is not to be wondered at, then, that a great New York paper should solemnly declare that a great surgeon (giving his name, of course), performed a marvelous operation which consisted of tying off the common “catotid” artery, an operation hitherto unknown, etc.

The average newspaper does not desire to make itself the laughing stock of the medical public by the publication of foolish and unscientific statements. The editor is usually actuated by high motives and realizing that the bulk of the people believe what they read, endeavors as far as is in him lies, to lead his readers along the paths of truth and right.

He publishes an article on some medical topic, furnished by a young reporter and obtained in good faith, possibly from a drug clerk or hospital orderly. He is ignorant of the fact that its subject matter is rankest nonsense, for none of his medical readers has taken the trouble to so inform him. Thus he goes on publishing misstatements from the same irresponsible source, each time doing more and more to injure the cause of medicine in the eyes of the public.

Had some medical man called up the editor on the telephone and informed him of the blunders in the article the wielder of the pen would have put on his guard. The young reporter would have heard from “the old Man” in no uncertain terms, the drug clerk or hospital orderly as a source of medical misinformation would have been relegated to the innocuous desuetude, and when medical subjects were treated in the future a reputable physician would have been consulted. It is in this way that the profession is to blame for the idiotic and inane medical tales which often appear in newspapers.⁵⁵

Baketel envisioned a national publicity bureau under the auspices of the AMA that would be a model for state and county societies, but the process was already under way on the local level. Even before Baketel’s article, the *JAMA* had noted that a county medical society in Iowa had appointed a press committee to furnish local newspapers with articles on “public health, sanitary science and medical ethics” and had found the papers to be willing recipients. To avoid the issue of self-advertisements, the society was listed as the author. News of similar actions elsewhere in the country and more calls for a national counterpart appeared in the next few years, generally accompanied by approving comments by the journal.⁵⁶

Other developments also contributed to breaking down the self-imposed wall between physicians and newspapers. Realizing that there was a great demand among the public for medical news and that “the medical department of the newspapers has come to be a recognized and fixed institution,” as the *Philadelphia Medical Journal* put it, a way needed to be found to ensure that such information was accurate. The solution proposed by some physicians was for newspapers to hire, in the words of *American Medicine*, “a competent physician, who, as medical editor, should revise all articles pertaining to professional subjects.”⁵⁷ (Such editors would presumably not be regarded as “newspaper doctors” since they were no longer in active practice; moreover, they would work in the same anonymous manner as other newspaper editors, whose names seldom reached the public.)

Medical journals also realized that the press could, on occasion, be a useful and potent ally. Mentions of laudable newspaper initiatives around 1900 had mainly praised them from refraining from or ending certain practices, such as carrying patent medicine advertising. Toward the latter half of the decade, however, physicians began to recognize the value of the press as a supporter and propagator of ideas and issues beneficial to medicine and medical professionals. The *JAMA* noted with satisfaction in 1905 that there had been “well nigh universal acceptance” among newspapers of the role of mosquitoes in spreading yellow fever during an epidemic in New Orleans, and it later commended the press for supporting animal experiments and vaccination.⁵⁸ Moreover, journalists could even be of use in the physicians’ quest for higher social status. The *JAMA* applauded the growing number of newspaper editorials supporting higher standards for medical schools, and *American Medicine* praised the *Cleveland News* for having one of its reporters visit several of the city’s quacks and exposing their fraudulent diagnoses.⁵⁹

Conclusion; The Criticism in Context

The fierce criticism of by medical journals of newspapers and journalists discussed in this article did not originate in a vacuum but should be seen against the background of a search for greater professionalization among doctors in the United States. The two decades around the year 1900 was an era when medicine was a profession that fervently engaged in efforts to raise its status. Beginning in 1895, the AMA launched a campaign to establish research-oriented medical schools affiliated with universities that would replace privately owned schools with a reputation for turning out poorly trained doctors. One concrete result of that campaign would be to limit the number of applicants to medical schools, making a medical degree more prestigious.⁶⁰ The push by state medical societies to strengthen state licensing laws to make them more restrictive, evident throughout the country in the 1890s, had the same goal, to weed out those who were poorly educated or, in the term used by doctors in this study, “off color,” and bolster the reputation of those who were granted licenses.⁶¹

The AMA’s push for more reputable medical schools went hand in hand with the Association’s long-standing campaign against “irregulars” and quacks, and the hostility of its journal and of the other journals discussed in this article against the newspaper press should be seen in the context of that campaign.[Haber, 332] The mass-circulation newspapers of the late 1800s provided an unprecedented platform for what the AMA regarded as quackery, and the prevalence of patent-medicine advertising was tangible proof of that, as were news stories that distorted facts and sensationalized medicine, favoring astonishing breakthroughs over the slow and deliberate process of scientific discovery.

Samuel Haber suggests in his history of professions in America that doctors, for all their concerns about low status, were still members of the preeminent profession, resting on a foundation of science

and relative autonomy.⁶² It is hardly surprising then, that they would have scant regard for the men (mostly) who produced the content of the newspapers that medical journals attacked. While journalists of the late 1800s may have aspired to professional status, the conditions they worked under were not conducive to that goal, as Ted Curtis Smythe's study of reporters in the 1880-1900 period shows: low pay, long hours and the possibility of being dismissed on short notice all worked against, as did their position as employees in an increasingly corporate industry. The characterization by the *Boston Medical and Surgical Journal* of the typical newspaper reporter as "merely a servant of his paper" who was always haunted by the fact that "the continuance of his connection with it depends upon his obedience" was a far cry from the independent position of a doctor.⁶³

The mistrust of newspapers and their employees discussed in this article did by no means disappear in the 1910s, but it was expressed with less fervor in medical journals, where comments about the press tapered off around 1910. One reason was that physicians to a large extent had succeeded in raising their prestige through licensing laws, higher educational standards and more effective representation by the AMA. The rising prominence of the public health movement also offered doctors clearly defined (and prestigious) roles and officially sanctioned positions.⁶⁴

Moreover, the promotion of public health depended heavily on reaching the public through publicity, and in that context physicians had to come to terms with the role of the daily press in modern society. "There is but one medium through which the people can be taught," wrote Iowa physician E.E. Munger in 1907, "it is the greatest educational medium for the masses extant; it is the cheerful champion and indefatigable criterion of almost every fireside—the newspaper."⁶⁵

Disclosure statement: No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Contact: Ulf Jonas Bjork, jbjork@iupui.edu, Department of Journalism & Public Relations, IUPUI, Cavanaugh Hall, 425 University Boulevard, Indianapolis, IN 46202 USA ORCID ID 0000-0003-3880-0620

Bio: Ulf Jonas Bjork is a professor in the Department of Journalism & Communication at IUPUI. He has a long-standing interest in journalism history and has studied the U.S. ethnic press, early foreign correspondence in American newspapers, and international organization for journalists. He is the co-author of two books and the author of numerous journal articles and book chapters.

Notes

¹"Newspaper Publicity," *Journal of the American Medical Association* [hereafter, *JAMA*], April 18 1908, 1295-96.

²Marion Marzolf, *Civilizing Voices: American Press Criticism, 1880-1950* (New York: Longman, 1991).

³For comparisons of professions, see John Duffy, "American Perceptions of the Medical, Legal and Theological Professions," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 58, no 1 (1984):1-15; Nathan O. Hatch, ed., *The Professions in American History* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988); Samuel Haber, *The Quest for Authority and Honor in the American Professions, 1750-1900* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991); only Hatch's book includes journalism among the professions.

- ⁴ For the history of the IU School of Medicine, see <https://medicine.iu.edu/about/history>; the two state medical journals included in the study were also dictated by the IU School of Medicine library holdings, as only those of Illinois and Indiana go back to the 1800s.
- ⁵ *Rowell's American Newspaper Directory, 1900* (New York: Geo. P. Rowell & Co., 1900), 1351-54; *Rowell's American Newspaper Directory, 1905* (New York: Geo. P. Rowell & Co., 1905), 1436-39; an 1879 survey put the total number of medical journals published since the beginning of the field in the late 1700s at 547; James H. Cassedy, "The Flourishing and Character of Early American Medical Journalism, 1797-1860," *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 38 (April 1983):135-50, 136.
- ⁶ Cassedy, "The Flourishing," 135; for studies of cities and states, see, for instance, Joseph Garland, "The New England Journal of Medicine, 1812-1968," *Journal of the History of Medicine & Allied Sciences* 24, no. 2 (April 1969):125-39; Janet Kinney, "The First Medical Journal in Illinois," *Journal of the History of Medicine & Allied Sciences* 38, no. 2 (April 1983):151-60; John Duffy, "One Hundred Years of the *New Orleans Medical and Surgical Journal*," *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* 40, no. 1 (1957):3-24; 125-139; Irwin Pizer and Harriet Steuemagel, "Medical Journals in St. Louis Before 1900," *Bulletin of the Missouri Historical Society* 20, no 3 (1964):221-56; Velimir Luketic, "Early Medical Journals in Alabama," *Alabama Journal of Medical Sciences* 6, no. 4 (1969):422-24.
- ⁷ "Personal Journalism," *Philadelphia Medical Journal* (hereafter, *PMJ*), August 5, 1899, front page; "The Ethics of Medical Journalism," *New York Medical Journal* (hereafter, *NYMJ*) July 13, 1901, 73; Cassedy, "The Flourishing," 140-41; "The Cost of Publishing a Medical Journal," *PMJ*, August 4, 1900, 178-79.
- ⁸ "The Ethics of Medical Journalism," *NYMJ*, July 13, 1901, 73; "A Word About Journalistic Enterprise," *PMJ*, June 21, 1902, 1079; "Serio-Comic Journalism," *PMJ*, May 21, 1898, 902; the Philadelphia publication may have had cause for bragging, as its circulation was listed in the 1900 *Rowell's* directory as 10,980, as compared with the *Record's* estimated figure of "above 7,500."
- ⁹ "The Task of the Weekly Medical Journal," *Boston Medical and Surgical Journal* (hereafter, *BMSJ*), 14 December 1905. 679.
- ¹⁰ "The Cost of Publishing a Medical Journal"; Cassedy, "the Flourishing," 141-42.
- ¹¹ "The Ethics of Medical Journalism"; Quoted in "Mercenary Medical Journalism," *NYMJ*, August 11, 1900, 246.
- ¹² Garland; Courtney Shah, "The Woman's Department: Maternalism and Feminism in the *Texas Medical Journal*," *The Historian* 64, no. 1 (Fall 2001):81-98, 83.
- ¹³ "Maryland Establishes a State Journal," *JAMA*, July 11, 1908, 146.
- ¹⁴ "Association of State Secretaries and Editors of State Journals," *JAMA*, July 11, 1908, 145-46.
- ¹⁵ "The Renovation of the Advertising Columns of Daily Papers Circulating in the State of Illinois," *Illinois Medical Journal*, August 1906, 173.
- ¹⁶ "Press Corruption," *Journal of the Indiana State Medical Association* (hereafter, *JoISMA*), June 15 1908, 241; "The criminal alliance between newspaper and patent medicines" and "The harm done by advertising quacks," *American Medicine* (hereafter, *AM*), August 26, 1905, 337; "A Credit to Newspaper," *JAMA*, September 23, 1905, 925.
- ¹⁷ E.E. Munger, "The Physician and the Newspaper," *JAMA*, August 24, 1907, 656.
- ¹⁸ "Medical Advertising Again," *AM*, June 4, 1904, 878; *American Medicine* noted, however, that "*Collier's* itself is not above carrying medical advertisements the character of which is of more than dubious honesty even as medical 'ads' go."
- ¹⁹ "The criminal alliance between newspapers and patent medicines."
- ²⁰ "One Newspaper a Friend of the Physician," *PMJ*, April 2, 1898, 568.
- ²¹ "A New Turn in the Newspaper Advertising Business," *AM*, December 24, 1904, front page.

- ²²“Newspaper Advertisements—Abortion and Prevention of Conception,” *JAMA*, April 1, 1905, 1058; *cf.* a similar argument being made by a medical society in Kansas two years earlier, “The Kansas City Academy of Medicine and Criminal Advertisements in the Newspapers,” *AM*, May 3, 1902, 714.
- ²³H. Sheridan Baketel, “The Newspaper and Medicine,” *JAMA*, December 23, 1905, 1981; “Newspaper Medicine,” *JAMA*, 28 November 1903, 1352.
- ²⁴“Newspapers that Deceive,” *JAMA*, October 28, 1905, 1331; Columbus case quoted in “Newspaper Ethics,” *NYMJ*, July 8, 1899, 72.
- ²⁵“The Newspaper Mouth Padlocked,” *AM*, June 27, 1903, front page.
- ²⁶“‘Special’ Press Reports,” *Medical News*, November 4, 1893, 527.
- ²⁷“Scientific Investigation and the newspaper,” *AM*, February 22, 1902, front page; “Medical Reports in the Newspapers,” *PMJ*, May 2, 1900, 1053.
- ²⁸“Newspaper Exaggeration,” *BMSJ*, December 20, 1900, 644.
- ²⁹“Responsibility of the Newspaper,” *JAMA*, December 14, 1912, 2159.
- ³⁰“The Newspaper and Medical Items,” *JAMA*, February 8, 1913, 452.
- ³¹“Suggestive Imitation in Newspaper Reporting,” *NYMJ*, February 2, 1901, 200; “Newspaper reports of Prolificness” *Medical News*, March 30, 1895, 362; “Medical Editors in Newspaper Offices,” *AM*, June 27, 1903, front page; *cf.* comments about a similarly bizarre story—this one about a woman who kept dying and coming back to life—in the *JAMA*, “Death and Resurrection and Newspaper Enterprise,” *JAMA*, November 16, 1907, 1679.
- ³²“Medical Sermonets No. 5. The Newspaper and the Doctor,” *PMJ*, August 19, 1899, 320.
- ³³“Newspaper Notoriety,” *PMJ*, October 27, 1900, 762.
- ³⁴“The Unruly Press,” *JAMA*, April 28, 1906, 1291.
- ³⁵“Newspaper Medicine,” *BMSJ*, November 22, 1900, 537.
- ³⁶“An Example of Newspaper Shamelessness,” *PMJ*, November 10, 1900, 875.
- ³⁷“An Example of Newspaper Shamelessness.”
- ³⁸“An Example of Newspaper Shamelessness.”
- ³⁹Reprinted in Irwin, *The American Newspaper* (Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press, 1969); for a general discussion of press criticism at the time, see Marzolf, *Civilizing Voices*, 7-58.
- ⁴⁰Duffy, “American Perceptions,” 1-2; Marcus, “Professional Revolution and Reform in the Progressive Era: Cincinnati Physicians and the City Elections of 1897 and 1900,” *Journal of Urban History* 5, no. 2 (February 1979):183-207, 202.
- ⁴¹“The Newspaper vs. the Medical Profession,” *PMJ*, February 25, 1899, 403; “One Newspaper a Friend of the Physician”; *cf.* a headline in *American Medicine* three years later, “Why the Yellow Newspaper is Against the Profession,” *AM*, October 11, 1902, 564.
- ⁴²Baketel, “The Newspaper,” 1981.
- ⁴³“Medical Sermonets No. 5,” 321; Rozenkrantz, “Cart Before Horse: Theory, Practice and Professional Image in American Public Health, 1970-1920,” *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 29, no. 1 (January 1974): 55; Duffy, 1-2.
- ⁴⁴“A Plea for United Action Against Quackery,” *JoISMA*, May 15, 1908, 193; “The Public Press Committee,” *JAMA*, January 23, 1904, 250.
- ⁴⁵Munger, “The Physician,” 654-57.
- ⁴⁶“Cards and Notices in Local Newspapers,” *AM*, April 1, 1905, 506.
- ⁴⁷“A Plea for United Action Against Quackery.”
- ⁴⁸Munger, “The Physician,” 655; “The Newspaper vs. the Medical Profession”; “President’s Address,” *JAMA*, October 28, 1905, 1353; “Medical Articles in Newspapers,” *AM*, July 11, 1903, front page; on reading notices and the drive to ban them through the Newspaper Publicity Act of 1913, see Linda Lawson, “Advertising Masquerading as News in Turn-of-the-Century American Periodicals,” *American Journalism*, 10 (1988):81-96.

- ⁴⁹ “Supplying Newspapers with Information,” *AM*, March 11, 1905, 390; “Supplying the newspapers with information,” *AM*, January 15, 1905, front page.
- ⁵⁰ “Signed Newspaper Articles Inexpedient for a Practitioner,” *JAMA*, September 28, 1912, 1205; “Medical Sermonets No. 5.”
- ⁵¹ “Newspaper doctors,” *AM*, February 14, 1903, 243; “Medical Sermonets No. 5”; “Newspaper Notoriety”; according to the *JAMA*, “all honorable physicians” should have a “healthy distaste toward the use of the daily press by practitioners as a means for self advertising,” “Physicians and the Press,” *JAMA*, December 22, 1906, 2096; “Medical Reports in the Newspapers,” *PMJ*, May 12 1900, 1053.
- ⁵² “An Example of Newspaper Shamelessness”; “Supplying the newspapers with information”; “Newspaper Notoriety Condemned,” *JAMA*, June 27, 1908, 2148.
- ⁵³ “Medicine and the Press,” *Illinois Medical Journal*, June 1909, 689-90.
- ⁵⁴ “Should Doctors Appear in the Newspapers,” *PMJ*, March 5, 1898, 395-96.
- ⁵⁵ Baketel, “The Newspaper,” 1980.
- ⁵⁶ “Physicians and the Press”; Munger, “The Physician,” 656; “Need for a Bureau of Publicity,” *JAMA*, November 16, 1907, 1692; “County Society Uses Local Newspaper,” *JAMA*, July 11, 1908, 144; “Scope and Value of the Daily Press and Press Bureaus,” *JAMA*, November 27, 1909, 1846; other journals also addressed the issue, see “The Press Committee of Medical Societies,” *American Medicine*, July 11, 1903; “A Medical Bureau of Publicity,” *JoISMA*, May 15, 1908, 193-94; “A Press Committee,” *JAMA*, April 8, 1905, 1139.
- ⁵⁷ “Medical Editors in Newspaper Offices,” *AM*, June 27, 1903, front page; “The Desirability of a Medical Editor on the Staff of the Daily Newspaper,” *Medical Record*, July 7, 1900, 36; “Medicine and the Press,” *IMJ*, June 1909, 690; . “Medical Reports in the Newspapers,” *PMJ*, May 12, 1900, 1053; “The Public Press Committee,” *JAMA*, January 23, 1904, 250.
- ⁵⁸ “A Credit to Newspapers”; “The Lay Press on Vivisection,” *JAMA*, July 11, 1908, 144-45; “Newspapers Interested in Public Instruction,” *JAMA*, December 4, 1909, 1934; for praise for refraining from certain practices, see “An Unusual Departure in Newspaper Ethics,” *Medical News*, August 10, 1901, 226; “A Praiseworthy Newspaper Example,” *NYMJ*, August 16, 1902, 290; “A Clean Newspaper,” *AM*, August 15, 1903, 259.
- ⁵⁹ “Newspapers and Quacks,” *AM*, November 1906, 508; “The Press and Medical Standards,” *JAMA*, May 30, 1908, 1838-39.
- ⁶⁰ Gerald Markowitz, David Rosner and Susan Reverby, “Doctors in Crisis: Medical Education and Medical Reform During the Progressive Era, 1895-1915,” in Rosner and Reverby, eds., *Health Care in America: Essays in Social History* (Philadelphia: Temple University press, 1979), 185-205; a few years later, the Association formed a committee for the purpose of lobbying Congress, another move intended to raise the professional status of doctors; Jonathan Wirtschafter, “The Genesis and Impact of the Medical Lobby, 1898-1906,” *Journal of the History of Medical & Allied Sciences* 13, no. 1 (January 1958):15-49.
- ⁶¹ Haber, *The Quest for Authority*, 329-31.
- ⁶² Haber, *The Quest for Authority*, 202.
- ⁶³ “Newspaper Medicine,” *BMSJ*; Smythe, “The Reporter, 1880-1900: Working Conditions and Their Influence on the News,” in Jean Folkerts, *Media Voices: An Historical Perspective* (New York: Macmillan, 1992), 214-31.
- ⁶⁴ Duffy, “American Perceptions,” 13; Ronald L. Numbers, “The Fall and Rise of the American Medical Profession,” in Hatch, *The Professions in American History*, 51-73; Rosenkrantz, “Cart Before Horse,” 56-57.
- ⁶⁵ Munger, “The Physician,” 656.