

*Journal of*  
**Interdisciplinary & Multidisciplinary Research**

Volume 2, Issue 1 2008

**Early Journalists and the Evolution of Publicists' Stunts: From Circus Ballyhoo to Professionalism**

Denise E. DeLorme, Associate Professor, University of Central Florida, ddelorme@mail.ucf.edu  
Fred Fedler, Professor, University of Central Florida, ffedler@pegasus.cc.ucf.edu

**Abstract**

This study examines early journalists and public relations publicity practices through an historical analysis of 150 autobiographies, 100 biographies, and 250 magazine articles written by and about newspaper reporters and editors in the United States from about 1800-1940. The results trace seven factors associated with the emergence and evolution of publicists' stunts from the perspective of early US journalists. The findings provide insight into the development of professionalism in the public relations field, enhance understanding of the complex journalist-PR practitioner relationship, and offer a foundation for future inquiry.

**Introduction**

Institutions want favorable and free publicity: businesses, churches, the military, and zoos, for example. Graber, McQuail and Norris explain that politicians, too, want to influence the media's choice of stories and to control the way in which the media frame particular stories.<sup>1</sup> To obtain more free and favorable publicity, institutions create clever stunts, which are "pseudo events" designed solely to generate media attention.<sup>2</sup> Today's military created dubious heroes (Jessica Lynch and Pat Tillman) and showed Iraqis, apparently spontaneously, toppling a statue of Saddam Hussein. Presidential candidates speak in flag factories, ride in tanks, and eat lunch on the front porches of Iowa farmhouses. Sitting presidents act presidential, touring disaster areas and traveling abroad. Zoos with newborns ask the public to name them. All the "events" are carefully contrived to attract the media and influence public opinion. It is a 200-year-old problem and an issue especially relevant this year, the year of a presidential election.

The relationship between journalists and public relations practitioners is riddled with contradictions, many 100 to 200 years old. Journalists seem skeptical, even contemptuous, of PR (public relations) practitioners. Yet increasingly, they depend upon PR practitioners for much of the news. For years, journalists supplemented their incomes by working part-time in PR. Today, half of the men and women who leave the newspaper industry obtain full-time jobs in public relations.<sup>3</sup>

As the field of public relations evolved, its first practitioners used techniques that when judged by today's standards seem crude and unprofessional. The purpose of this article is to explore the evolution of those techniques, especially publicity stunts, from the point of view of early US journalists. The topic deserves investigation because it may help to explain journalists' lingering hostility toward public relations. Once established, negative attitudes were passed from one generation of journalists to the next and became so deeply ingrained that they are difficult to change. While examining the evolution of publicity stunts, this paper also traces PR practitioners' gradual shift toward more professionalism. We will begin with a review of the relevant literature. Comprehensive historical background on the development of public relations is published elsewhere.<sup>4</sup>

**Review of the Literature**

Three streams of research pertinent to the present investigation include: research on the journalist-PR practitioner relationship, research on professional standards and ethics, and research on publicity stunts and hoaxes. Within each of these streams, the most relevant identified work will be summarized.

## ***Research on the Journalist-PR Practitioner Relationship***

Interaction between journalists and public relations practitioners is necessary but complicated. Research has revealed longstanding tension in the relationship, with journalists in particular maintaining negative attitudes toward PR practitioners. A study by Lucarelli provides some background information into journalists' hostility toward public relations practitioners. After World War I, there was a shortage of newsprint and the demand for advertising was breaking records. Earlier, newspapers promoted advertisers by publishing favorable news stories (i.e., puffery) along with their advertisements.

The industry's trade journals advised newspaper editors and publishers that they could save space by discarding press agents' handouts and by eliminating all puffery. The trade journals called publicists "space thieves" and accused them of trying to fool editors into publishing propaganda disguised as news. Lucarelli concluded that, "At least some of the antagonism between journalism and public relations had an economic basis."<sup>5</sup> Readers were originally the primary profit source for newspapers and advertising was a byproduct. However, after the Civil War, advertisements became increasingly important to papers financially and journalists complained that publicists tried to obtain free ads for their clients.<sup>6</sup>

We believe that college textbooks can also serve as an insightful literature source on this topic. Our findings indicate that early textbooks may have contributed to journalists' skepticism, warning students about past problems and the need for continued vigilance. For example, Lee declared that publishers "lament the rise of the press agent." In a history textbook published in 1937, the author explained:

The insertion of special pleadings and other interested bits of reading matter in the press by persons not employed by newspapers...dates back to the beginnings of periodical journalism. The problems involved, the methods used, and the names applied to these procedures and their practitioners have been modified, but what is now called press-agentry evolved from a long series of similar practices gradually developed in response to similar needs.<sup>7</sup>

To gain further understanding of the relationship, some studies have compared the attitudes and values of these two groups of practitioners. For instance, a recent survey by Kopenhaver, Martinson, and Ryan of 101 newspaper editors and 100 PR practitioners in Florida found that the editors were critical of PR practitioners, whereas the practitioners viewed their own profession favorably. These scholars also found that the groups shared common news values. Both considered accuracy the most important element of a news story, and both ranked reader interest second. Kopenhaver, Martinson, and Ryan concluded that journalists and PR practitioners agreed remarkably on which elements of the news were most important, yet journalists perceived a non-existent gap.<sup>8</sup> In another study, Sallot, Steinfatt, and Salwen found that journalists and PR practitioners shared similar news values, yet journalists were unaware of the similarity.<sup>9</sup>

Other inquiries regarding the relationship have focused on industry trends. A study by Nayman, McKee, and Lattimore found that PR practitioners in Colorado were better educated and better paid than the state's newspaper reporters and editors. Colorado's public relations practitioners were also somewhat older and more satisfied with their jobs. Moreover, nearly two-thirds of the practitioners had worked for the news media, and nearly half of the journalists said they might seek jobs in public relations if the incentives were great enough.<sup>10</sup>

In sum, this stream of research documents the longstanding tension in this necessary but complex relationship, and offers some possible explanations of how journalists' negative attitudes toward PR practitioners have been perpetuated. However, a more complete understanding of the relationship and its historical environment is needed.

## ***Research on Professional Responsibility and Ethics***

Though not focused specifically on stunts and hoaxes, there is a plethora of scholarly work on public relations professionalism and ethics.<sup>11</sup> Both academics and practitioners have studied and discussed the field's current state regarding professionalism and have debated the effectiveness of various approaches

toward continued improvement. The literature on journalists' professional responsibility and ethics is also substantial. Singletary provides a concise summary of the key research in this area.<sup>12</sup> Other well-documented discussions on the subject include books by Johnstone, Slawski, and Bowman and by Weaver and Wilhoit that profile the typical American journalist.<sup>13</sup>

An investigation by Hohenberg in 1973 recognized that it was almost impossible for journalists to avoid PR practitioners and that every reporter had a responsibility to determine if anyone had tampered with the news. "Wherever he finds distortion, half-truths, or no truth at all, it is his job to get the story right before passing it on to the public," he concluded. Although Hohenberg noted that publicists' handouts could be extremely useful, he also warned that, "The day of the journalistic hoax is not over."<sup>14</sup> Scholars Rivers and Schramm explained that, for too long journalists had accepted gifts from public relations practitioners including Christmas presents, free tickets, free transportation, and occasionally cash. They said early publicists tried to control the media through favors, and newspapers cracked down on their staffs. To eliminate the problem, responsible newspapers separated their news and business departments and insisted that their reporters and editors accept nothing of value.<sup>15</sup>

Other research revealed journalists' need for skepticism while handling stories of all types. As recently as the 1990s, a study by Bridges and Bridges found that city editors continued to be misled. Results of this investigation revealed that 67.4% had received bogus letters to the editor and 28.3% had published them; 34.8% had received bogus obituaries and 16.0% had published them; 28.9% had received bogus engagement announcements and 13.4% had published them; 14.4% had received bogus wedding announcements and 5.3% had published them; 13.9% had received bogus local birth announcements, and 5.3% had published them; and 9.6% had received bogus sports results and 8.0% had published them. City editors also received bogus stories about accidents, college graduations, awards, honors, and organizations' officers.<sup>16</sup>

### ***Research on Publicity Stunts and Hoaxes***

The literature on publicity stunts and hoaxes can be categorized into books and articles about: these techniques in general, including descriptions of various examples,<sup>17</sup> particular cases that have generated great attention and controversy,<sup>18</sup> the application of stunts and hoaxes within a certain industry,<sup>19</sup> the lives of those who gained notoriety by their creation and involvement in these techniques,<sup>20</sup> and how practitioners can implement stunts and hoaxes successfully.<sup>21</sup> However, scholarly attention to this topic from a mass media perspective has been limited.<sup>22</sup> Further, there have been no studies to our knowledge that have traced the emergence and evolution of publicists' stunts from the point of view of early journalists. Thus, our article makes a unique contribution to this stream.

### **Method**

Historical research was deemed appropriate for the goals of our study.<sup>23</sup> We took an historical analysis approach, which aims to go beyond merely reconstructing the past to identifying, explaining, and interpreting change over time.<sup>24</sup> In particular, we relied on a perspective that has often been overlooked by historians -- insiders' view of their field. Despite reporters' importance, historians have tended to focus on leading newspapers, editors, and publishers. Our article, in contrast, presents the perspective of reporters who dealt with PR practitioners directly. As part of a larger project, the historical analysis reported here focuses on a time period from roughly 1800 to 1940. Before the 1800s, there were few, if any, paid publicists. By 1940, public relations practitioners and their techniques were becoming more sophisticated, respectable, and professional.

Conventional sources for data were limited. That is, most of the men and women who worked for newspapers during that time period no longer exist. Moreover, few reporters saved all the stories they wrote, maintained diaries, or turned all their work over to a library. Similarly, historians cannot effectively study journalists' relationship with PR practitioners by examining the content of old newspapers or magazines since they cannot determine how or why their stories were written. The only comprehensive source of information about early reporters' lives, work, and attitudes is their self-produced books and articles.

We collected as much relevant material as possible. Multiple data sources were consulted including approximately 150 autobiographies, 100 biographies, and 250 magazine articles written by and about early reporters and editors. Twenty books written about specific newspapers and 180 books about related topics were also examined. The latter books described early journalists and newspapers in general, focused on certain geographic areas, or highlighted journalists who fell into specific categories (e.g., “women journalists,” “fighting editors”).

These data sources were selected because they have been preserved, and thus provide an opportunity to study people who no longer can be observed or interviewed. Additionally, these sources document specific events in journalists’ careers and their introspective reflections about experiencing these events.<sup>25</sup> Many of the books are described in annotated bibliographies devoted to journalism.<sup>26</sup> Some of the magazine articles were written for an audience of fellow journalists (i.e., published in trade journals such as *The Writer* and *The Journalist*). Others were written for the general public (i.e. published in consumer magazines) and are listed in *Poole’s Index to Periodical Literature* and *Reader’s Guide to Periodical Literature*.<sup>27</sup> The Appendix outlines the background characteristics for a portion of our sample of journalism’s insiders (the newspaper reporters who have been quoted in this paper).

The sample was combined and analyzed as a whole. The analysis process involved evaluating the authenticity of the sources; immersion in the materials; and interpreting, categorizing, and synthesizing the data while searching for common patterns and themes.<sup>28</sup>

## Results

Because there was little consistency in definitions among the materials examined, this section begins with a clarification of terminology. While referring to the same events, some reporters called them “stunts” while others called them “fakes” or “hoaxes.” The present paper discusses every stunt that publicists concocted to promote a client regardless of its previous label. There was also inconsistency in the use of the words “advertising” and “public relations,” especially as reporters described stunts concocted to promote commercial products. Our article treats all of publicists’ stunts as public relations. Journalists were even more inconsistent in their use of titles. At first, publicists were labeled, “press agents.” Later titles included “publicity men” and “publicity writers,” for example. The evolution in names reflects changes in the field, especially after World War I. In quotations, whether direct or indirect, we generally use the titles printed in books and articles.

Analysis identified seven factors associated with the emergence and evolution of publicists’ stunts including: the importance of free publicity, circuses and their heritage, Hollywood motion picture publicity, journalists’ ambivalent attitudes, newspapers’ own stunts, journalists’ shift to public relations work, and World War I and public relations’ transformation. Each factor will be discussed in turn, supported by illustrative examples and direct quotations from our sample of early journalists.

### ***The Importance of Free Publicity***

Americans craved recognition, yet few wanted to pay for it. As early as 1884, *The Journalist* observed that, “Newspaper men are constantly importuned by two classes of people. One seeks to suppress information and the other urges its publication”.<sup>29</sup> Congdon complained that people wanted to advertise for free either their goods and property or their opinions. The worst offenders, he said, were actors, politicians, and authors who thought newspapers were printed entirely for their benefit.<sup>30</sup> Dickinson also found that individuals, especially politicians, tried to use the press. “Theodore Roosevelt secured his popularity through publicity,” Dickinson said. “He has retained, extended, and strengthened it through publicity...Above all the men of his time he understands the power and necessity of publicity if one would achieve great results.”<sup>31</sup>

Vanderbilt entered the business in 1919 and found daily newspapers besieged by, “all kinds of agents seeking space for the photographs and news items of their respective clients.” While some concocted stunts, others offered reporters large sums of money. “Newspaper offices are the constant prey of all sorts and kinds of publicity stunts,” Vanderbilt continued. “The flagrant, matter-of-fact department store pamphlets, down to the mysterious ‘tip,’ are all part and parcel of the same game. Sometimes the editors

see through the game, but occasionally they are also caught in the trap so carefully laid by these seekers after the golden fleece of free publicity."<sup>32</sup>

Advertisements were expensive so publicists learned to concoct stunts that attracted free publicity.<sup>33</sup> The stunts, sometimes called "pseudo events" were not spontaneous but occurred because publicists planned or planted them.<sup>34</sup> The stunts were created primarily for the purpose of being reported and therefore, could be arranged for the convenience of journalists. Moreover, their success was measured primarily by how widely they were reported.<sup>35</sup> Early stunts were crude and included faked disappearances, stolen jewelry, miraculous escapes, dangerous or freakish animals, and staged elopements.

### ***Circuses and Their Heritage***

Early publicists were typically flamboyant individuals who represented circuses or vaudeville shows. To minimize the cost of advertising, they depended on their personalities, free passes, and stunts, but perfected other techniques as well. For instance, they submitted pre-written stories to newspapers, flattered journalists, and offered gifts. When a problem arose, they presented their favorable interpretation or spin. In addition, they created the types of stories that journalists liked -- bizarre stories about spectacular events.

Cooper said anyone who ever worked for a newspaper recalled circus press agents. They talked in extravagant adjectives and submitted extravagantly worded copy about the greatest show on earth. They carried pockets full of passes, and editors used their stories because readers were indeed interested in circuses. "In other words," Cooper said, "what the press agent has to tell about his circus is news, and his utterances are usually interesting, even if exaggerated."<sup>36</sup> One of the best press agents that Mencken encountered represented a wild animal show. The press agent bombarded newspapers with stories about battles between tigers and boa constrictors and about the birth of giraffes and kangaroos.<sup>37</sup>

Two of the emerging field's greatest publicists, P.T. Barnum and Harry Reichenbach, began their careers at circuses or similar attractions. Barnum was called a "charlatan," a "humbug," and an "impostor," but also "the father of publicity."<sup>38</sup> He owned a museum of freaks and oddities in New York City and sought new ways to promote them constantly. While some historians concluded that Barnum created the publicity stunt, Fuhrman disagreed, insisting "that many great stunts had been executed before his time."<sup>39</sup> Still, Barnum seemed to have refined and perfected publicists' emerging techniques, using them more frequently and effectively than any of his predecessors.

During his lifelong career that started during the 1830s, Barnum exploited newspapers "which seemed in those days to be naive in the extreme."<sup>40</sup> He wrote letters to editors and signed fictitious names and arranged bogus arrests or lawsuits. Also, to excite the public after obtaining a new exhibit, he manufactured a series of sensational stories -- a barrage of information, much of it fictitious that remained in the news for weeks.<sup>41</sup> "Barnum cared little whether editors attacked or praised him so long as they spelled his name correctly," Lee said. "He knew that attention and especially controversial attention created gate receipts."<sup>42</sup>

### ***Hollywood Motion Picture Publicity***

In Hollywood's early years, publicity for movies was often sparked by the efforts of Harry Reichenbach. Reichenbach was born in 1882 and at the age of 13 ran away from home to join a circus. After learning circuses' promotional techniques, he applied them to the entertainment industry. His clients included Rudolph Valentino, Gloria Swanson, Ethel Barrymore, and Charlie Chapin.<sup>43</sup> Reichenbach called his evolution from a circus barker into a public relations counselor, "the story of ballyhoo." He bragged, "I could fool 100 editors into accepting bits of fancy as front-page news and get 100,000 columns in headlines and news stories for things that never happened."<sup>44</sup>

Reichenbach's most famous stunts promoted movies, with the most successful remaining on newspapers' front pages for days. For example, to promote *Tarzan of the Apes*, he dressed a giant orangutan in a tuxedo and high silk hat then released it in a fashionable hotel's lobby.<sup>45</sup> Reichenbach became the best-paid publicity man in the country, and later "was regarded by many as the founder of the motion picture

publicity technique."<sup>46</sup> Columnist Walter Winchell said newspapers published Reichenbach's stories because they were news -- spellbinding and readable.<sup>47</sup>

Jim Moran, another influence on motion picture publicity, also earned a living by staging preposterous stunts through the 1930s and '40s. He was called a "screwball," a "rebel," an "eccentric," "America's No. 1 prankster," and "the last great bunco artist in the profession of publicity."<sup>48</sup> One of his many zany stunts involved returning from Alaska with 200 pounds of ice that he said had been taken from a glacier where it had been aging for three million years. He claimed that the ice was the purest in America and sold a 10-pound chunk to an actress who used it in facial treatments, "which garnered her publicity such as she couldn't buy." Explaining Moran's success, Fuhrman stated, "When reporters heard from Jim Moran they knew they were in for a publicity stunt, but they went because they knew they would get a great story. His antics were the bane, however, of the burgeoning profession of sober-sided public relations counselors, whose influence continued to grow as the century wore on."<sup>49</sup>

### ***Journalists' Ambivalent Attitudes***

By the early twentieth century, journalists seemed ambivalent. They were becoming more dependent on publicists' contributions to content for economic reasons, yet stunts remained common and journalists resented being fooled. They called publicists "propagandists" and accused them of misleading readers and of stealing papers' space. Lewis summarized journalists' attitudes in 1927 when he described the typical "public relations man" as follows:

He is looked on as a somewhat seedy individual, usually a discard from the city room of some newspaper, who leads a hand-to-mouth existence by attaching himself to a succession of notoriety-seeking celebrities. His stock in trade is sensation; he captures his victories by dangling before them the magic bait of publicity, and he makes his living by selling property that does not belong to him -- newspaper space and printer's ink. He is the connecting link between the publicity seeker and his, or her, heart's desire, and he accomplishes his ends by devious means that will not always bear close scrutiny as to their ethics.<sup>50</sup>

Lewis feared that readers were easily and unfairly misled when the publicists' propaganda appeared as news since their defenses were down and suspicions disarmed.<sup>51</sup>

Newspaper executives complained that they were tricked into printing as news material that should be appearing as paid advertisements.<sup>52</sup> Edward McKernon of The Associated Press charged in 1928 that news fakers and publicity crooks created artificial situations "in the hope that they will be mistaken by the newspapers for matters of legitimate interest, and so permit [them] to foist on the public advertisements or publicity for his clients in the guise of 'news.'" McKernon estimated that nine times out of ten, the news fakers failed. When they succeeded, they misled the public and undermined the public's confidence in the press, McKernon said.<sup>53</sup>

Journalists and publicists also clashed over some (but not all) news values. Journalists insisted on accuracy, and Congdon explained "that the most ardent desire of the honest journalist is to be right."<sup>54</sup> As managing editor of the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, McCullagh, too, insisted upon accuracy.<sup>55</sup> Journalists felt publicists, on the other hand, were liars and fakers. In 1925, Flint warned, "newspapers must be wary if they would not fall victims to the clever press agent who is seeking free publicity for an employer. Faking seems to be an essential part of press agency."<sup>56</sup> Similarly, Clough said, "The American publicity man is uniquely cynical. Unlike other advertising men, he hardly makes a bow in the direction of sober truth."<sup>57</sup>

While insisting upon accuracy, journalists also liked stories that were sensational. At the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* even McCullagh "looked for the colorful, the entertaining, the dramatic." More specifically, he liked stories about "disasters, crime, sex, violence, the odd, the religious, the mystical, the different."<sup>58</sup> Publicists who understood journalists' news values manufactured the types of stories they wanted. Although sometimes fictitious, their stories were always entertaining. Many continued to originate in Hollywood and were so good-humored that journalists reported even the most transparent. Our analysis revealed no obvious differences between the performance of large and small dailies. Although larger dailies presumably had greater resources that might enable them to resist manipulation by publicists,

publicists often targeted larger and more influential dailies and succeeded in their efforts.

By the 1920s and '30s, journalists were also acknowledging and regretting their dependence on publicists. In 1934, Walker estimated that the hand of the publicity man, often carefully disguised, "may be found in perhaps one-third the news items in many issues of a New York newspaper."<sup>59</sup> Another editor found that, of 64 local stories in a New York daily, 42 (a little more than 60%) had originated with press agents. Similarly, of 162 stories in the *New York Sun* on Jan. 14, 1926, only 87 "were not obviously obtained from publicity sources".<sup>60</sup>

### ***Newspapers' Own Stunts***

While criticizing publicists' stunts, journalists created thousands of their own<sup>61</sup> Weisberger said the stunts began after the 1870s, providing, "second-hand color and excitement to city dwellers whose jobs and lives were becoming ever more routinized."<sup>62</sup> For example, Nellie Bly, a daredevil reporter employed by Joseph Pulitzer, went underwater in a diving bell; flew in a balloon; was arrested; and posed as an invalid, a lunatic, and a beggar. She obtained jobs as a servant, a shop girl, and a factory worker, and wrote about every adventure.<sup>63</sup> The decade from 1890 to 1900 became an era of stunt journalism, with reporters engaged in a series of actions considered daring, especially for women who were becoming more aggressive in their search for jobs.<sup>64</sup>

Journalists created more stunts through the 1940s. The editor of the *New York Graphic* said his staff had to create news to maintain its circulation. "We could no longer wait for calamities to happen," editor Emile Gauvreau insisted. "Characters were built up and paraded. Hot news became the wild, blazing, delirious symptom of the time."<sup>65</sup>

For instance, when submarine warfare was at its height during World War II, the *Philadelphia Record* dressed two reporters in the uniforms of German U-boat officers and sent them out on a Sunday morning to parade around a square. Other editors sent reporters out to fry eggs on sidewalks on hot summer days, to scatter dollar bills, and to start write-in campaigns to elect a resident of their zoo mayor. "Good, clever stunts attract attention, amuse readers, lighten up dull news routine," Free explained. However, these stunts ended. While some journalists enjoyed them, others felt stunts made newspapers appear frivolous and hurt their credibility. Also, journalism was becoming more dignified, restrained, respectable, and professional.<sup>66</sup>

### ***Journalists' Shift to Public Relations Work***

Despite their industry's hostility, growing numbers of journalists became part-time publicists while still being employed by newspapers. After abandoning the newspaper industry altogether, many found full-time jobs in public relations, disgusting former colleagues.<sup>67</sup> To supplement newsroom salaries, reporters sought, "outside work." For example, reporters wrote advertisements, served as court stenographers, and freelanced for other publications. To make ends meet, Hartt agreed, reporters and editors would write books and magazine articles, manage suburban weeklies, or "cheerfully act as 'passionate press agents' for theaters."<sup>68</sup>

Jobs in public relations grew common. After working at the *Boston Transcript* nearly half a century, Edgett said, "It is customary for newspaper editors and reporters, with the approval of their employers, to amplify their salaries by engaging in outside work, especially as publicity writers or press agents, as they are customarily designated -- for theaters and other amusement enterprises." Each of the theaters in Boston had its own press agent, and Edgett worked for several.<sup>69</sup> In Atlanta, Rogers agreed that, "It was not unusual for modestly paid journalists to augment their meager incomes by accepting other employment in their off hours or serving as press agents for various enterprises and institutions."<sup>70</sup> In Savannah in 1916, Morehouse handled the publicity for two or three theaters.<sup>71</sup>

Because of their poor salaries and working conditions, most journalists eventually left the newspaper industry. In 1889, *The Journalist* found that the best staff in New York City included two or three reporters under the age of 21, 20 reporters under 25, 10 under 35, and only half a dozen beyond that age. Why? *The Journalist* explained, "The young fellows of age 21 to 30 may not have so developed and finished a

style in composition as the men of 35, but they are more useful than the better writers. At their age they can stand the strain of the reporter's life, can go without sleep, endure irregular meals, and can bear exposure to every sort of condition and weather better than their elders."<sup>72</sup> Some reporters moved up in the newspaper industry becoming editors, correspondents, copyreaders, or proprietors. Julian Ralph knew other reporters who became theater managers, actors, playwrights, authors, politicians, professors, lawyers, and press agents.<sup>73</sup> Williams said many former journalists doubled or tripled their salaries by becoming publicists.<sup>74</sup>

The men and women who remained on newspapers' staffs scorned those former colleagues. Salisbury, for example, declared that some former journalists became great poets, artists, novelists, statesmen, explorers, financiers, and physicians. However, he ranked the journalists who became publicists with other failures, including the former journalists who became gamblers, blackmailers, drunkards, opium fiends, paupers, and lunatics.<sup>75</sup>

### ***World War I and Public Relations' Transformation***

As the field of public relations matured, its practitioners became more sophisticated and professional. "There was a time when a press agent was less respectable than a [traveling salesman]," Bixler said. "His successor, the publicity expert or public relations counsel, belongs to a profession excelling the reporter's in dignity, in remuneration, and in total membership."<sup>76</sup> World War I contributed to public relation's transformation. Commenting on publicity's role during the war and its aftermath, Blythe stated:

The use of propaganda for war purposes was so effectual that the use of propaganda after the war became a universal practice instead of an emergency enterprise. What began as press agenting and developed into publicity securing expanded into propaganda circulation that now embraces us all in its folds, and a good deal of the matter that appears in our media of public information, with some notable exceptions, is organized, expedited ulterior matter, disguised, camouflaged, standardized or sugar-coated to make its impression and divert public opinion in desired directions.<sup>77</sup>

Blythe said publicity work also developed enormously after the war because journalists became more receptive to handouts, and because publicists became so skillful that even the most skeptical editor was fooled by their presentations frequently.<sup>78</sup> Edward L. Bernays agreed that World War I demonstrated the power of propaganda, astonishing big business with its effectiveness.

So there developed a new profession which Bernays called the "public relations counsel." There continued to be some abuses, but he said there were quacks and mal-practitioners during the development of every business or profession. In 1928, Bernays added that the ethical or modern PR counselor would: not represent or plead a cause that the counselor believed to be unsound socially; would not accept the cases of conflicting clients; and when dealing with any of the media, would "do so as the representative of his client, maintaining the same standards of truth with them as govern the morals and habits of the world he lives in."<sup>79</sup> At the same time, PR practitioners were given more dignified titles including: "publicity expert," "publicity engineer," "publicity counsel," and "director of publicity." Moreover, they found new and more respectable clients. Whereas the nation's first publicists represented circuses and chorus girls, the field's new counsels represented politicians, civic and charitable organizations, and business and financial interests.<sup>80</sup>

By 1941, Sontheimer found that stunts were disappearing.<sup>81</sup> Kent Cooper of The Associated Press agreed that the press agent was a product of the twentieth century and that his evolution had been rapid.<sup>82</sup> The field's new practitioners wanted to do more than get on a newspaper's front page with a stunt. Fuhrman stated, "Nowadays, most public relations people disown any connection with publicity stunts, referring grandiloquently to their more comprehensive role in creating a client's 'total image.'"<sup>83</sup>

### **Conclusion**

Public relation's first practitioners created spectacular stunts that attracted free publicity. Judged by today's standards, the stunts seem misleading, dishonest, and unprofessional. Yet the stunts were effective. For over 100 years, publicists continued to believe that fooling the media was a part of their job.

Publicists also believed that when stunts succeeded, the resulting stories were more noticeable and credible than any advertisement they might buy. The stunts were also more effective than journalists admitted.

Why were journalists so easily fooled? There was no simple way to avoid being fooled. In an intensely competitive environment, there was little time to verify every detail. Also, publicists' stunts shared no obvious characteristics. Good stunts appeared fantastic, yet plausible. Publicists tried to create a false sense of urgency, claimed that the only source was unavailable, or found people willing to confirm a story's details. In addition, publicists worked hard to conceal their stunts' true origins. Further, publicists understood journalists' definitions of news and manufactured the types of stories journalists wanted to report. Publicists' best stories may have seemed so good that journalists wanted them to be true, and their enthusiasm clouded their judgment.

Despite a few isolated threats, there was no legal penalty for misleading journalists. Journalists might criticize the publicists responsible for stunts, but other Americans seemed to enjoy the stunts (and may have laughed at the journalists fooled by them). Publicists insisted that, although sometimes fictitious, their stories were interesting, never involved serious matters, and never caused any harm. However, journalists disagreed. In addition to hurting journalists' pride, publicists' stunts may have hurt their credibility, misled readers, and deprived newspapers of some advertising revenue.

MacDougall called publicity stunts "the crudest form of public relations," and he explained that the stunts' effects were immediate but temporary.<sup>84</sup> While criticizing publicists' stunts, journalists created thousands of their own. To help fill newspapers' pages and attract more readers, editors wanted interesting stories and when necessary, created them. That was only one of journalists' inconsistencies, however. While complaining about publicists, journalists became dependent upon them and coveted their jobs. As the field of public relations matured during the early twentieth century, its practitioners abandoned their predecessors' earliest and crudest techniques. At the same time, they adopted new titles and represented new and more respectable clients, thus distancing themselves from their circus-trained predecessors.

Some problems have been solved. While stunts continue to be used today, they are less frequent and their nature and role has changed in a number of ways. Modern stunts tend to be planned and orchestrated carefully by knowledgeable, well-trained, and ethical professionals who are committed to their clients and sensitive to stakeholders' perspectives and concerns. The emphasis is on helping to promote worthy causes in a truthful and meaningful way and to build long-term relationships instead of using simple short-term gimmicks to fool the media. Rather than being isolated events, contemporary stunts are typically used in conjunction with an array of other promotional tools as part of a broader marketing communications campaign.<sup>85</sup> Journalists also are better educated than ever before, more professional, and more responsible. They have adopted stricter codes of ethics, so that anyone who accepts a gift from a source or becomes involved in a serious conflict of interest is likely to be fired on the spot.

Other problems remain, however. These improvements may not always be readily apparent to outside observers and stunts have not totally ended. While less common in the US, stunts have spread to other countries such as China and also to the Internet.<sup>86</sup> For example, as recently as 2003, a self-styled "legal terrorist" attracted worldwide publicity by demanding that fast food companies post signs warning their customers that fast food can be addictive. Critics called the threat of litigation a PR stunt.<sup>87</sup> Advances in technology (e.g., the Internet) raise new challenges and opportunities for stunts, stemming from the enhanced value of visual components (e.g., photo ops), accelerated speed and reach of message dissemination, and capability of facilitating greater stakeholder involvement in the publicity process.

Further, journalists rarely are in control. Rather, their sources act, and journalists react. While covering a story, journalists have no way of determining a source's primary motive. When members of Congress conduct a hearing, is it because they want to solve a problem or because they want more free and favorable publicity? When a president attends church, with cameras rolling, it is because he is truly religious or because he is running for re-election? Americans in the midst of a presidential campaign seldom realize how many of the candidates' activities, too, are designed primarily to captivate the media, especially television.

The problems can never be eliminated, only minimized. A key lesson to be learned from the past is the importance of reputation. It seems stunts should be used selectively and with caution as these tactics can be risky not only for the image of individual clients and practitioners but also for the credibility of the industry as a whole. When implemented, stunts should be truthful, considered in the context of other promotional tools, and directed toward long-term relationship-building as deemed appropriate.

As is the case with all studies, our study has limitations. In particular, we acknowledge the potential problem of reliability associated with use of biographies and autobiographies as source material. Like other Americans, journalists often wrote their life stories after retiring and may have embellished, forgotten, or been mistaken about some details. Also, they may have considered the reactions of their families, friends, and co-workers as well as the demands of the marketplace. There are exceptions, however. Some journalists consulted diaries, news stories, and other records. While the journalists who wrote their autobiographies also seemed to be the most successful, not all became famous and glorified the profession. Some simply covered exciting stories. Others were disillusioned by their experiences. Despite the possible limitations of individual sources, common patterns were identified across our large sample.

In sum, our study's findings from the perspective of early US journalists document the evolution of publicity stunts, contribute insight into the development of public relations professionalism, and enhance understanding of the complex journalist-PR practitioner relationship. We offer our findings as a foundation for further inquiry. Several recommended avenues include historical analyses of publicity stunts and industry relationships in other countries, from other points of view (e.g., editors, audiences, PR practitioners), and with other media (e.g., magazines, radio, the Internet); tracking and comparing the processes and outcomes of these different publicity techniques; and more closely examining continuities and changes in professional standards, ethics, and interactions as related to this topic over time.

## Appendix: Background Characteristics of Sample

**Blythe, Samuel G.** Blythe was the son of a newspaper editor and started in a small town at \$10 a week. After serving as a city newspaper editor, he moved to New York and also wrote magazine articles. He describes his career in an autobiography titled *The Making of a Newspaper Man*.

**Congdon, Charles T.** Congdon joined Horace Greeley's staff at the *New York Tribune* after working as an editor. He wrote an autobiography titled *Reminiscences of a Journalist*.

**Edgett, Edwin Francis** Edgett worked for the *Boston Transcript* for almost 50 years and sometimes supplemented his salary by handling the publicity for local theaters and writing magazine articles. His autobiography is titled *I Speak for Myself: An Editor in His World*.

**Gauvreau, Emile** An editor at New York's sensational tabloids, Gauvreau also was a novelist and a playwright. He served as an editor at the *Graphic*, then at William Randolph Hearst's *Mirror* and wrote an autobiography titled *My Last Million Readers*.

**Mencken, H. L.** Mencken was born in Baltimore in 1880. He began as a reporter for the *Baltimore Morning Herald* and then joined the *Baltimore Sun*'s staff where he remained for most of his life. He also co-founded a magazine, *The American Mercury* in 1923. Mencken became famous as a journalist, columnist, humorist, and magazine editor. His autobiography is titled *A Choice of Days*.

**McCullagh, Joseph B.** He was born in Ireland in 1842 and after immigrating to the United States became a printer and then a reporter. McCullagh served as a correspondent for the *Cincinnati Gazette* during the Civil War. In 1872 he moved to St. Louis and worked there for 25 years, all but four as an editor at the *Globe-Democrat*. McCullagh became one of the foremost editors in America. His career is described in the biography *Little Mack: Joseph B. McCullagh of The St. Louis Globe-Democrat* by Charles C. Clayton.

**Morehouse, Ward** Morehouse started in Savannah in 1915. Hoping to become a playwright, he moved to Atlanta and then New York. In New York, Morehouse began at the *Tribune*, moved to the *Sun*, then to the *World-Telegram*. He wrote an autobiography titled *Just the Other Day*.

**Ralph, Julian** After the Civil War, Ralph was employed by the *New York Sun* where he worked as a police reporter, legislative reporter, Washington correspondent, foreign correspondent, and war correspondent. He also contributed articles to magazines. His career is described in the biography *Gentleman of the Press: The Life and Times of an Early Reporter, Julian Ralph of the Sun* by Paul Lancaster.

**Rogers, Ernest** A newspaperman, Rogers worked for *The Journal* in Atlanta and wrote *Peachtree Parade*, a book about his career.

**Sontheimer, Morton** Sontheimer worked in several big cities from Philadelphia to New York. Later he became an editor. He also wrote an autobiography titled *Newspaperman: A Book about the Business*.

**Vanderbilt, Cornelius** Finding employment in New York was only a dream for most journalists. However, in 1919 Vanderbilt began his career there as a cub reporter. His autobiography is titled *Experiences of a Cub Reporter*.

**Walker, Stanley** One of New York's great editors, Walker worked for the *New York Herald Tribune*, serving as its city editor from 1928 to 1935. He later worked for other newspapers and magazines in New York and Philadelphia. Walker describes his career in an autobiography titled *City Editor*.

**Winchell, Walter** A controversial columnist, Winchell began writing for New York's sensational tabloids during the 1920s. After starting at the *Graphic*, he moved to the *Mirror* published by William Randolph Hearst and also wrote for Hearst's *King Feature Syndicate*. Winchell became a popular radio commentator, broadcasting sensational details about celebrities' private lives.

## Endnotes

1. Doris Graber, Denis McQuail, and Pippa Norris, *The Politics of News: The News of Politics*, Washington, DC: CQ Press, 1998.
2. Daniel J. Boorstin. *The Image: A Guide to Pseudo-Events in America*, New York: Harper & Row, 1964.
3. Fred Fedler, Tom Buhr, and Diane Taylor. "Journalists Who Leave the News Media Seem Happier, Find Better Jobs." *Newspaper Research Journal*, Vol. 9, No. 2 (Winter 1988), p. 20.
4. Scott M. Cutlip. *The Unseen Power: Public Relations, A History*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1984; Scott M. Cutlip. *Public Relations History: From the 17<sup>th</sup> to the 20<sup>th</sup> Century: The Antecedents*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1995; Karen S. Miller, "Public Relations 1900-Present," in Wm. David Sloan and James D. Startt, eds. *The Media in America: A History*. Northport, Alabama, Vision Press, 1999.
5. Susan Lucarelli. "The Newspaper Industry's Campaign against Spacegrabbers, 1917-1921." *Journalism Quarterly*, Vol. 70, No. 4 (Winter 1993), pp. 888-889.
6. Alfred Lee. *The Daily Newspaper in America*. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1937, pp. 434-435.
7. Alfred Lee. *The Daily Newspaper in America*. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1937, p. 428.
8. Lillian Lodge Kopenhaver, David L. Martinson, and Michael Ryan. "How Public Relations Practitioners and Editors in Florida View Each Other." *Journalism Quarterly*, Vol. 61, No. 4 (Winter 1984), pp. 860-884.
9. Lynne Sallot, Thomas Steinfatt, and Michael Salwen. "Journalists' and Public Relations Practitioners' News Values: Perceptions and Cross-Perceptions." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, Vol. 75, No. 2 (Summer 1998), p. 372.
10. Oguz Nayman, Blaine McKee, and Dan Lattimore. "PR Personnel and Print Journalists: A Comparison of Professionalism." *Journalism Quarterly*, Vol. 54, No. 3 (Autumn 1977), pp. 492-497.
11. Elaine Englehardt and DeAnn Evans. "Lies, Deception, and Public Relations." *Public Relations Review*, Vol. 20, No. 3 (1994), pp. 249-267; John P. Ferre and Shirley C. Willihnganz. *Public Relations & Ethics: A Bibliography*. Boston, MA: G. K. Hall, 1991; Kathy Fitzpatrick and C. Gauthier. "Toward a Professional Responsibility Theory of Public Relations Ethics." *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, Vol. 16, (2001), 193-212. Kathy Fitzpatrick. "Evolving Standards in Public Relations: A Historical Examination of PRSA's Codes of Ethics." *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, Vol. 17, No. 2, (2002), pp. 89-111; Cornelius Pratt. "PRSA Members' Perceptions of Public Relations Ethics." *Public Relations Review*, Vol. 17, No. 2, (1991); pp. 145-160; Cornelius Pratt. "Public Relations: The Empirical Research on Practitioner Ethics." *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 10, (1991), pp. 229-236; Donald K. Wright. "Ethics Research in Public Relations: An Overview." *Public Relations Review*, Vol. 15, No. 2, (1989), pp. 3-6.
12. Michael W. Singletary, "Commentary: Are Journalists' Professionals?" *Newspaper Research Journal* 3 (January 1982): 75-87.
13. John W. C. Johnstone, Edward J. Slawski and William W. Bowman, *The News People: A Sociological Portrait of American Journalists and Their Work* (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1976); David H. Weaver and G. Cleveland Wilhoit, *The American Journalist: A Portrait of U.S. News People and Their Work* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1991).
14. John Hohenberg. *The Professional Journalist*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart And Winston, Inc., 1973, pp. 346-358.
15. William L. Rivers and Wilbur Schramm. *Responsibility in Mass Communication*, revised ed. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1969, pp. 116-122.
16. Lamar W. Bridges and Janet Bridges. "Verification Procedures for Non-Staff News Items." *Newspaper Research Journal*, Vol. 12, No. 4 (Fall 1991), p. 75. SEE ALSO: "Uneven Verification

- Invites Hoax” by Lamar Bridges. *Editor & Publisher*, Aug. 28, 1993, p. 44.
17. Alex Boese. *The Museum of Hoaxes*. New York: Dutton, 2002; James W. Cook. *The Arts of Deception: Playing with Fraud in the Age of Barnum*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001; Curtis MacDougall. *Hoaxes*. New York: Dover Publications, 1958; Gerald O’Conner. “The Hoax as Popular Culture.” *Journal of Popular Culture*. Vol. 9, No. 4 (1976), pp. 767-774; N. Ruddick. “Nellie Bly, Jules Verne, and the World on the Threshold of the American Age.” *Canadian Review of American Studies*, Vol. 29. No. 1, (1999), pp. 1-12; Gordon Stein. *Encyclopedia of Hoaxes*. Detroit, MI: Gale Research, 1993.
  18. Ulf Jonas Bjork. “Sweet is the Tale: A Context for *The New York Sun’s* Moon Hoax.” *American Journalism*, Vol. 18, No. 4 (2001), pp. 13-27; W. Cameron Meyers. “The Chicago Newspaper Hoax in the ‘36 Election Campaign.” *Journalism Quarterly*, Vol. 37, No. 3 (1960), pp. 356-364; Steven C. Levi. “P.T. Barnum and the Feejee Mermaid.” *Western Folklore*, Vol. 36, No. 2 (1977), pp. 149-154; Loren Morey. “Mr. Welles and the Martians.” *American History Illustrated*, Vol. 6, No. 10 (1972), pp. 36-42; James Naremore. “Who Caused the Mars Panic.” *Humanities*. Vol. 24, No. 4 (2003), pp. 38-39; Lester Stephens. “The Mermaid Hoax: Indications of Scientific Thought of Charleston, South Carolina in the 1840s.” *Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association*, (1983), pp. 45-55.
  19. Irving Adler. *Stories of Hoaxes in the Name of Science*. New York, Collier Books, 1962; William H. James. “Fraud and Hoaxes in Science.” *Nature*. Vol. 377, No. 6549 (1995), p. 474; Mark McGee. *Beyond Ballyhoo: Motion Picture Promotion and Gimmicks*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1989.
  20. Bluford Adams. *E Pluribus Barnum: The Great Showman and the Making of U.S. Popular Culture*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1997; Phineas T. Barnum. *Barnum’s Own Story*. New York: Dover Publications, 1961; Phineas T. Barnum. *Struggles and Triumphs: Or Forty Years’ Recollections of P.T. Barnum*, 1869; Phineas T. Barnum. *The Life of P. T. Barnum*. New York: Redfield, 1855; Les Harding. *Elephant Story: Jumbo and P.T. Barnum under the Big Top*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Co., 2000; Brooke Kroeger. *Nellie Bly: Daredevil, Reporter, Feminist*. New York: Times Books, 1994; Brooke Kroeger. “Nellie Bly: She Did It All.” *Prologue: The Journal of the National Archives*, Vol. 28, No. 1, (1996), pp. 7-10; Jean Marie Lutes. “Into the Madhouse with Nellie Bly: Girl Stunt Reporting in Late Nineteenth-Century America.” *American Quarterly*, Vol. 54, No. 2 (2002), pp. 217-253; Irving Wallace. *The Fabulous Showman: The Life and Times of P.T. Barnum*, New York: Knopf, 1959; M.R. Werner. *Barnum*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1923; Susan Wildemuth. “Nellie Bly and the Power of the Press.” *Cobblestone*, Vol. 20, No. 1 (1999), p. 16;
  21. Candice Jacobson Fuhrman. *Publicity Stunt! Great Staged Events That Make the News*. San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1989; Joseph G. Vitale. *There’s a Customer Born Every Minute: P.T. Barnum’s Secrets to Business Success*. New York: AMACOM, 1998.
  22. Chris Berdik. “Duped! When Journalists Fall for Fake News.” *Quill Magazine*. May, (2002), 22-26; Gareth Branwyn. *Jamming the Media: A Citizen’s Guide to Reclaiming the Tools of Civilization*; Ann Dowd. “Hoaxes: How a Writer Fooled His Readers.” *Columbia Journalism Review*, Vol. 37, No. 2 (1998), p. 14; Fred Fedler. *Media Hoaxes*. Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1989; John Leo. “Bloopers of the Century.” *Columbia Journalism Review*, Vol. 37, Issue 5, (1999), pp. 38-40; Justin Levine. “A History and Analysis of the Federal Communications Commission’s Response to Radio Broadcast Hoaxes.” *Federal Communications Law Journal*, Vol. 52., Issue, 2 (2000), pp. 273-321; Brian Thorton. “The Moon Hoax: Debates About Ethics in 1835 New York Newspapers.” *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*. Vol. 15., No. 2 (2000), p. 89-100.
  23. Bruce L. Berg. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2001; J. M. Reitzel and B. Lindemann. “Introduction to Historical Analysis.” In Vol 2 of *A Handbook of Social Science Methods*, edited by Robert B. Smith and Peter K. Manning. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing, 1982, pp. 167-196; James D. Startt and Wm. David Sloan. *Historical Methods in Mass Communication*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1989; Gaye Tuchman. “Historical Social Science: Methodologies, Methods, and Meanings.” In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA:

- Sage Publications, pp. 306-323.
24. Ruth Ann Smith and David S. Lux, "Historical Method in Consumer Research: Developing Causal Explanations of Change." *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 19 (March, 1993), pp. 595-610.
  25. Russell W. Belk. "Moving Possessions: An Analysis Based on Personal Documents from the 1847-1869 Mormon Migration." *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 19 (December 1992), pp. 339-361.
  26. Annotated bibliographies the authors consulted include *American Journalism History: An Annotated Bibliography* compiled by Wm. David Sloan. New York: Greenwood Press, 1989. SEE ALSO: *An Annotated Journalism Bibliography 1958-1968* by Warren C. Price and Calder M. Pickett. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1970. SEE ALSO: *The Journalist's Bookshelf: An Annotated and Selected Bibliography of United States Print Journalism*, 8<sup>th</sup> ed. by Roland E. Wolseley and Isabel Wolseley. Indianapolis, Inc.: R.J. Berg & Company, Publishers, 1985.
  27. Books written by and about early journalists use words that, today, are considered sexist: "newsman," "newspaperman," and "cameraman," for example. Other early titles also end in the words "boy" and "man." This paper never changes those words, nor other male nouns and pronouns, when they appear in direct quotations. Elsewhere, this paper uses non-sexist and more modern terms, especially "writer," "reporter," and "journalist."
  28. Bruce L. Berg. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2001, pp. 210-222.
  29. "Difficulties of Journalism." *The Journalist*, Oct. 4, 1884, p. 2.
  30. Charles Congdon. *Reminiscences of a Journalist*. Boston: James R. Osgood and Company, 1880, pp. 219 and 316-17.
  31. J. J. Dickinson. "Theodore Roosevelt: Press-Agent." *Harper's Weekly*, Sept. 28, 1907, p. 1410.
  32. Cornelius Vanderbilt Jr. *Personal Experiences of a Cub Reporter*. New York: Beekman Publishers, Inc., 1974, pp. 54-61.
  33. Lee. *The Daily Newspaper in America*, 1937, p. 429.
  34. Daniel J. Boorstin. *The Image: A Guide to Pseudo-Events in America*, New York: Harper & Row, 1964.
  35. Rivers and Schramm. *Responsibility in Mass Communication*, pp. 113-125.
  36. Kent Cooper. "Corporation Publicity: The Press-Agent and the Associated Press." *The Century Magazine*, December 1928, pp. 177-178.
  37. Ernest Boyd. "Portrait of a Press Agent." *Bookman*, July 1924, p. 561. SEE ALSO: *Ballyhoo: The Voice of the Press* by Silas Bent. New York: Boni And Liveright, 1927, p. 125.
  38. M.R. Werner. *Barnum*. Garden City, N.Y.: Garden City Publishing Company, Inc., 1926, p. 55.
  39. Candice Jacobson Fuhrman. *Publicity Stunt! Great Staged Events That Made The News*. San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1989, p. 9.
  40. Werner. *Barnum*, pp. 54-55.
  41. Neil Harris. *Humbug: The Art of P.T. Barnum*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1973, p. 67.
  42. Lee. *The Daily Newspaper in America*, p. 430.
  43. "H. L. Reichenbach, Press Agent, Dead." *The New York Times*, July 4, 1931, p. 13, c. 3.
  44. Reichenbach. *Phantom Fame*, p. 8.
  45. Reichenbach. *Phantom Fame*, pp. 27-29.
  46. "H. L. Reichenbach, Press Agent, Dead," p. 13, c. 3. SEE ALSO: "District Attorney Active Over Fake Publicity Plant." *Variety*, July 30, 1920, p. 38.
  47. Walter Winchell. "Foreword" in *Phantom Fame* by Reichenbach, pp. 1-2.

48. Maurice Zolotow. "The Great Bamboozler." *The Saturday Evening Post*, December 10, 1949, pp. 22-23 and 102-107. SEE ALSO: "Crazy Like A Fox" by John Greene. *American Magazine*, September 1940, pp. 56-57
49. Fuhrman. *Publicity Stunt!* p. 50.
50. Oscar Lewis. "News and the Press Agent." *The Independent*, Jan. 8, 1927, p. 45.
51. Lewis. "News and the Press Agent," p. 47.
52. Cooper. "Corporation Publicity: The Press-Agent and the Associated Press," p. 181. SEE ALSO: "Journalistic Poison" by Willard Cooper. *The Independent*, March 20, 1926, pp. 329 and 339.
53. Edward McKernon. "News Fakers." *Outlook*, Vol. 149 (May 28, 1928), pp. 130-131 and 151.
54. Congdon. *Reminiscences of a Journalist*, pp. 307-308.
55. Charles Clayton. *Little Mack: Joseph B. McCullagh of The St. Louis Globe-Democrat*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1969, p. 91.
56. Leon Nelson Flint. *The Conscience of the Newspaper*. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1925, p. 40.
57. Ben Clough. *The American Imagination at Work*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1947, p. 641.
58. Jim Hart. *A History of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1961, p. 143.
59. Stanley Walker. *City Editor*. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company, 1934. Reprinted in 1999 by The Johns Hopkins University Press, p. 130.
60. Bent. *Ballyhoo*, pp. 122-123.
61. Clough. *American Imagination at Work*, p. 641.
62. Bernard Weisberger. *The American Newspaperman*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961, pp. 135-136.
63. W. A. Swanberg. *Pulitzer*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967, p. 157. SEE ALSO: *Ladies of the Press* by Ishbel Ross. New York: Arno Press, 1974, p. 52.
64. Ross. *Ladies of the Press*, pp. 14-15.
65. Emile Gauvreau. *My Last Million Readers*. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., Inc., p. 114.
66. Victor W. Free. "Alas, The Goofiness Has Gone Out of the Business" in *Read All About It! 50 Years of ASNE* ed. by Alice Fox Pitts. Easton, Pa.: The American Society of Newspaper Editors, 1974, pp. 312-315.
67. Bob Considine. *It's All News to Me*. New York: Meredith Press, 1967, p. 9.
68. Rollin Lynde Hartt. "Choosing A Life Work: The Profession Of Journalism." *Lippincotts*, Vol. 96, p. 78.
69. Edwin Edgett. *I Speak for Myself: An Editor In His World*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1940, pp. 159-161.
70. Ernest Rogers. *Peachtree Parade*. Atlanta: Tupper and Love, Inc., 1956, p. 19.
71. Ward Morehouse. *Just the Other Day*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1953, p. 91.
72. Julian Ralph. "What Becomes of Reporters?" *The Journalist*, Feb. 23, 1889, p. 11.
73. Ralph. "What Becomes of Reporters?" p. 11.
74. Michael Williams. "Aspects of Publicity." *Commonweal*, Nov. 13, 1929, pp. 42-44.
75. William Salisbury. *The Career of a Journalist*. New York: B. W. Dodge & Company, 1908, p. 519.
76. Paul H. Bixler. "The Reporter's Last Stand." *North American*, January 1930, pp. 113-118.
77. Samuel Blythe. "Pro Bono Publicity." *The Saturday Evening Post*, Aug. 4, 1923, p. 20.

78. Blythe. "Pro Bono Publicity," pp. 21 and 84.
79. Edward L. Bernays. "This Business of Propaganda." *The Independent*, Vol. 121, No. 4083 (Sept. 1, 1928), pp. 198-199.
80. Charles Heaslip. "The Gentle Art of Publicity." *Collier's*, May 7, 1910, p. 17.
81. Sontheimer. *Newspaperman*, pp. 94-95.
82. Cooper. "Corporation Publicity: The Press-Agent and the Associated Press," pp. 177-178.
83. Fuhrman. *Publicity Stunt!* p. 9.
84. Curtis MacDougall. *The Press and Its Problems*. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1963, p. 255.
85. Dirk Gibson and Jerra Leigh Gonzales. "Elegant Understatement: A New Paradigm for Public Relations Practice." Vol. 51 Issue 4, *Public Relations Quarterly*, (2006), 12-16; David Robinson. "Public Relations Comes of Age," *Business Horizons*, Vol. 49 (2006), 247-256.
86. Boese. *The Museum Of Hoaxes*, pp. 198 and 202-206. SEE ALSO: "Cyberhoax!" by David Armstrong. *Columbia Journalism Review*, Vol. 34, Issue 3 (1995), pp. 12-14; "Tales on the Internet: Making It Up As You Go Along," by Chris Frost. *Aslib Proceedings*, Vol. 52. No. 1 (2000), pp. 5-11.
87. Simon English. "Legal warning for burgers." *The Weekly Telegraph*. London: Issue No. 622 (2003), p. 36.