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Macaulay offers us a useful if not sanitised overview of how UK media outlets reported on the junior doctors strike. The media is never a neutral party in what it reports, and how it frames an issue and its key players can shape public perceptions and understandings. It might be worthwhile remembering that before the first day of planned strikes, the tabloid newspaper The Sun ran a story entitled ‘Moet medics: High life of doc’s leaders who are heading up NHS strike’¹. This article laid the charge that many of the leaders of the junior doctor’s strike were ‘champagne-swilling socialists’. Individual junior doctors were named, their age and current occupations were disclosed, as was their residence and an array of personal photographs—from holiday shots to pictures with animals and friends—were strewn across the article. It was clear that this article (and its publisher) clearly set out to discredit the political credentials and professional reputation of these doctors. Thankfully, such cynical reporting has not dominated the reporting of the NHS junior doctor’s strike. Nevertheless, it would be naïve of us to assume that a ‘responsible’ media discourse will persist the longer the strike continues.
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