Public Relations *avant la lettre*:

PRESS ACCREDITATION IN WARTIME DURING THE 19TH CENTURY

Colonel Valentin VASILE

Information and Public Relations Directorate, Ministry of National Defence

This study highlights how military-press relations evolved in the 19th century towards institutionalising press accreditation during the armed conflicts with the aim of gaining the public trust and promoting the reputation of military organisations by managing the information release to audiences. A special focus is on the nascent press accreditation practices used by the military when interacting with correspondents sent by European and North American publications to cover, first-hand, the Eastern Question events unfolding on the battlefields of the Russo-Turkish War (1877-1878), in which Romania fought to win its national independence.

The study reveals the crystallisation of Public Relations techniques and procedures in wartime – press officers' appointment, written regulations on the terms and conditions for the press accreditation, ground rules for correspondents' access to press briefings, interviews and documentation activities at combat units as members of press pools or as embedded journalists. These practices are enshrined nowadays in the Public Relations policies on media relations, and their emergence deserves better recognition in the history of communication sciences.

Keywords: press accreditation; war correspondent; PR history; Russo-Turkish War; public information;

The information in the present article was disseminated by the author at the annual EUPRERA – European Public Relations Education and Research Association Congress in Brussels, 19 November 2020.

Following the presentation, the author became the recipient of an award for originality and for the effort made to reconstruct the public relations history having as focus the Russo-Turkish War (1877-1878).

INTRODUCTION

The history of journalism and periodical press in the 19th century reveals the emergence of public communication practices used by commercial companies and government institutions for spreading their messages to reach a wider range of diverse audiences. Because of their increase in circulation and accessibility, newspapers and magazines imposed themselves as the ideal tools for sourcing public information. Thus, both private and public organisations discovered the mechanism to address internal and external audiences by collaborating with journalists in a formal setting – press accreditation.

The public information management implemented by state bodies is attestable in the history of journalism and periodical press with factual data, and it is equally important for the history of public relations. Surprisingly, as opposed to recording the establishment of press services by private companies Krupp (1870) and Westinghouse (1889), PR history does not pay due attention to the moments when the public organisations began to use feasible options for communicating with their audiences and to promote themselves through publications (Bentele and Junghänel, 2004; Newsom *et al*., 2010).

Symbiotically linked with the states they belong to, military organisations became interested in exploiting the press to inform and influence domestic and foreign audiences – troops, leaders, governments, and populations.

Symbiotically linked with the states they belong to, military organisations became interested in exploiting the press to inform and influence domestic and foreign audiences – troops, leaders, governments, and populations. Applied to meet various armed forces objectives such as cohesion, morale and credibility, these practices are embraced nowadays by corporate communication and PR theories as internal information, public information, media relations and reputation management. Their use indicates the presence of incipient PR practices in the second half of 19th century, facilitated by pioneering the press accreditation during the Mexican-American War (1846-1848), First Schleswig War (1848-1851), Crimean War (1853-1856), American Civil War (1861-1865), Franco-Prussian War (1870-1871), Russo-Turkish War (1877-1878), Second Anglo-Afghan War (1878-1880), Boer Wars (1880-1881, 1899-1902), Spanish-American War (1898) and Philippine Insurrection (1899).

The nascent public information techniques used by the military organisations are attested by studies on war reporting, centred mainly on events and characters, and less on formalising the press accreditation within the military-press relationships. Since the specialised bibliographies do not explicitly look at the press correspondents' activity from the perspective of military headquarters, the study of organising the press accreditation during wartime is a promising field of research for PR historians. It reveals that the well-established practices of nowadays public relations have their origins in the procedures applied by the military to manage the press relations during the military campaigns in the second half of the 19th century. Press accreditation was one of the emerging procedures.

The main line of investigation in this research is unveiling the use of press accreditation by the military in the 19th century, with a particular focus on the Russo-Turkish War (1877-1878). This interest is justified by the analysis of bibliographies accessible so far, which shows how the Tsarist General Headquarters introduced the rules for granting the press accreditation to war correspondents. Those rules were also adopted by the cobelligerent Romanian Army.

Therefore, the main line of investigation in this research is unveiling the use of press accreditation by the military in the 19th century, with a particular focus on the Russo-Turkish War (1877-1878). This interest is justified by the analysis of bibliographies accessible so far, which shows how the Tsarist General Headquarters introduced the rules for granting the press accreditation to war correspondents. Those rules were also adopted by the cobelligerent Romanian Army for managing the relationship with the special envoys of Romanian and foreign publications – journalists, photographers, graphic artists and painters.

Press accreditation, as a specific technique to work collaboratively with journalists, was later developed in the media relations practices of other armed forces, public and private organisations, as well as the use of formal and informal meetings, press briefings, interviews, *press pools* and *embedded journalists*. The significance of these military-media relations techniques and procedures is still to be properly highlighted in the PR history.

REFERENCES ON PRESS ACCREDITATION IN THE 19TH CENTURY

In most cases, the press correspondents' activity during wartime in the 19th century was summarised by themselves. It is attested by collections of periodicals containing numerous articles, which are genuine after-action reports regarding the military operations on the battlefields, as well as by books and memoirs published in the following years. They usually describe in detail the unfolding of war events, and particularly in the case of the Russo-Turkish War contain

comprehensive references to the military-press relations and to the press accreditation system implemented by the military headquarters of the warring parties (Boyle, 1877; Lachmann, 1877; de Belina, 1878; Nemirovich-Danchenko, 1878; Drew Gay, 1878; Kohn-Abrest, 1879; Pain, 1879; Huyshe, 1894; Forbes, 1894).

A special contribution goes to *The Daily News* war correspondence volumes, published in 1878, which contain articles signed by renowned journalists – Archibald Forbes, Januarius MacGahan, Francis Millet, Edwin Pears, Edmund O'Donovan, among several other correspondents, seventeen in total.

Other primary sources, which provide information about the war correspondents' activity and their relations with the armed forces, consist of official documents, articles, books and memoirs written by officers responsible for organising the press accreditation (Hasenkampf, 1908), who professionally observed the war as military attachés (Greene, 1879, 1880), provided medical assistance (Ryan, 1897) and counselling to the combatant sides as advisers (Pfeil, 1893) or even as commanders (Baker, 1879). However, despite the abundant references on war reporting in a series of books analysing this subject in relation to the Russo-Turkish War (Furneaux, 1958; Roth and Olson, 1997; Knightley, 2004; Patton, 2015; McLaughlin, 2016; Williams, 2020), the use of press accreditation by Tsarist military is not highlighted in the history of journalism, periodical press, and public relations. In the Soviet era, the studies on the history of Russian journalism have not considered the press accreditation during Tsarist wars. Investigation of this topic has only begun in recent years by Russian researchers (Muminova, 2008; Gokov, 2011; Manakhova, 2018), who evaluate the war reporting during Tsarist conflicts in connection with the developments of domestic and foreign press. After scrutinising the archives, war veterans and journalists' memoirs, several articles have been published highlighting that the press accreditation was practiced during the Russo-Turkish War in accordance with the orders issued by the Tsarist General Headquarters, No. 87, on 22 April 1877, and No. 131, on 7 June 1877.

The Turkish authors (Kaplan, 2016; Yürükçü, 2018) note the Tsarist efforts to develop viable procedures with Russian and foreign journalists, which were in a marked contrast to the inhibited attitude of the Ottoman authorities toward the press.

Regarding the activity of war correspondents, which consisted of dispatches, letters and background articles, sketches, and photographs, an important source is represented by the collections of newspapers and illustrated magazines from 1877 to 1878. Due to the commendable efforts of state libraries and the private initiatives in the countries where they were published, some of the most relevant ones are accessible in digital format, as follows: the Austrian *Die Presse*, *Neue Freie Presse*, *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*, *Neue Illustrirte Zeitung*, *Pester Lloyd*; the French *Le Figaro*, *Le Monde Illustré*, *Le Temps*; the German *Berliner Tageblatt* and *Die Gartenlaube*; the Italian *Fanfulla*, *L'Illustrazione italiana, L'Opinione*; the Romanian dailies *Telegraful*, *România liberă*, *Românul*, *Timpul*; the Spanish *La Ilustración española y Americana*; the Swiss *Journal de Genève*; the English *The Daily News*, *The Illustrated London News*; the American *The New York Herald*, *Harper's Weekly* and *Chicago Daily Tribune*.

Regarding the activity of war correspondents, which consisted of dispatches, letters and background articles, sketches, and photographs, an important source is represented by the collections of newspapers and illustrated magazines from 1877 to 1878. Due to the commendable efforts of state libraries and the private initiatives in the countries where they were published, some of the most relevant ones are accessible in digital format.

WAR REPORTING AND PRESS ACCREDITATION IN THE 19TH CENTURY

The 19th century wars were increasingly covered by the press because of the innovative methods in typography and photography, with the expansion of railway, telegraphy, and news agencies, which accelerated the transmission of dispatches and enlarged the intercultural communication. Those accumulations enabled the press to assume a key role in moulding the public opinion, becoming a real power in society. Under such conditions, the war correspondent established himself as the central figure of press reporting from the front lines.

The war reporting in the early 19th century contains William Hicks' description of the Battle of Trafalgar (21 October 1805) for *The Times*, followed by Henry Robinson writing correspondences along 1807-1809 about Napoleon's campaigns in Germany and Spain.

The Mexican-American War (1846-1848) revealed the shaping of the political and commercial interests of the publications in New Orleans, Philadelphia, Boston, and New York to provide their readers with the latest news received from their special envoys accompanying the US troops during the campaign. The military operations were reported by at least 13 press correspondents, including George Kendall, James Freaner, William Tobey, John Warland and Jane McManus Storms.

As a world premiere it was then recorded the use of daguerreotype to take the first photographic images during a war, with US General John E. Wool passing through Mexican town Saltillo, captured by his troops in 1847. Another premiere of that war was the partnership of several newspapers in New York settled in 1846 to share the costs of telegraphic correspondence sent by their reporters from Mexico, a salutary initiative leading to the establishment of the Associated Press (Reilly and Witten, 2010).

However, it was not until the second half of the 19th century that a new type of journalist claimed his place in the history of the press – the war correspondent, described as a member of a *"luckless tribe"* by its self-proclaimed *"miserable parent"*, William Howard Russell (Knightley, 2004, p. 1). He entered the scene of war reporting in 1850 recounting the Battle of Idstedt (25 July 1850) as the envoy of *The Times*, eyewitness in the hot spots of the First Schleswig War (1848-1851).

In 1854 and 1855, Russel was accredited by *The Times* to follow the British military fighting alongside the Ottoman, French, and Sardinian troops against the Tsarist Empire in the Crimean War. Russell did not have the status of an *embedded journalist*, and his dispatches were not censored. Those two conditions amplified Russell's dilemma: whether he should write about his findings living alongside the soldiers – incompetent leadership, poor logistics and deficient medical assistance affecting the British combat power.

Asserting his professional creed that the journalist has the fundamental responsibility to the general public, and that in all his reporting he must respect the truth regardless of the consequences this might have for himself, Russell decided to make widely known his findings on the poor condition of British troops in Crimea. To John Delane's credit, the editor of *The Times,* who perfectly understood and unreservedly supported Russell's approach, his dispatches from Crimea were published. They generated hostility in government circles against the magazine and his Crimean envoy, in conjunction with public discontent on the way the British troops were led in war, finally forcing the Aberdeen cabinet resignation in January 1855.

The power of the press proved to be real. Its exercise had positive effects on reorganising the British army, reinforcing the public support for the military. It was confirmed by the readers of *The Times*

through a fundraising campaign aimed at improving the situation of the British troops on the Crimean front, and by the governmental assistance given to Florence Nightingale for the reorganisation of British military medical service in Constantinople (McLaughlin, 2016). Therefore, *"after the Crimea, governments and military chiefs went to great lengths to manage the reporting of conflicts"* (Hood, 2011, p. 12), from this point on the state authorities understanding that the press can no longer be ignored without losing their reputation.

The power of the press proved to be real. Its exercise had positive effects on reorganising the British army, reinforcing the public support for the military. It was confirmed by the readers of The Times through a fundraising campaign aimed at improving the situation of the British troops on the Crimean front, and by the governmental assistance given to Florence Nightingale for the reorganisation of British military medical service in Constantinople.

Henceforward, the journalist would be accompanied by the photographer for a more accurate recording of the war. As a result, the documentation of the Crimean War includes photos taken by Carol Popp de Szathmari on the Danubian front in 1853-1854, portraying Russian and Ottoman officers, military formations, fortifications and battle scenes. Szathmari, the owner of a photo studio in Bucharest, achieved his international reputation as one of the first war photographers in the world presenting his album on the Crimean War to Queen Victoria, Napoleon III, Franz Josef I, as well as at the 1855 International Exhibition in France (Ionescu, 2002).

Russell's dispatches, unappreciated by the British executive, determined Roger Fenton's photographic mission in Crimea, the first attempt of state authorities to influence the public opinion through photos. Commissioned by the British government as an official campaign photographer, Fenton spent three months in Crimea, from March to June 1855, portraying the actions conducted by Her Majesty's Armed Forces in a positive light. Fenton's work was continued by James Robertson and Felice Beato. Unlike Fenton, who avoided to take pictures reflecting the horrors of war, they photographed the destruction and human suffering on the battlefield.

Concurrently, on the other side of the Atlantic the press already proved to be a growing industry and a factor of influence in the political and social life of the United States of America, amounting to a total of about 3,700 publications by the midpoint of the 19th century. The rapid and large dissemination of information was facilitated by the expanding coverage of the American press, sustained by the highly performance of news wire services which multiplied to feed the national and local publications with news collected and distributed using the telegraph lines.

After the outbreak of the American Civil War in 1861, to cover the readers' information needs about the military operations, the publications from both sides sent their journalists, photographers, illustrators, all known as *specials*, to report from the front. The number of *specials* is estimated at 500, of whom 350 wrote for Northern publications, and 150 for Southern ones.

The fear that sensitive information might be disclosed to the enemy, the attempts to enforce censorship since 1862 and the outcomes on the battlefield led the military commanders to adopt widely varying attitudes towards *specials*. They ranged from the denial of any relations and banning their access in the area of military operations to full support (Patton, 2015).

The arbitrary management of the military-press relations is exemplified by William Russell, who joined the *specials* in 1861. Initially he was warmly welcomed to the Union side, being appreciated for his independent reporting during the Crimean War. It was generally accepted that Russell's correspondence would present the Union cause in a favourable light, primarily in Britain. It did not happen. After *The Times* published Russell's article describing the panicked retreat of Northern troops following the First Battle of Bull Run (19 July 1861), his access to the Union army was denied, and he was later expelled from the United States.

The French authorities primarily banned the journalists from following the troops, and even issued an order to forbid the publication of any information regarding the military movements. Later on, the war correspondents were accredited, provided that they respected a set of severe restrictions.

The studies on military-press relations during the American Civil War do not reveal specific regulations regarding the journalists' activity, the permission to enter the warzones being usually granted on the spot. The correspondents were requested to pledge not to jeopardise the operational security by disclosing sensitive information (locations, strength, movements), and to assume their reports aimed for publication with a byline mentioning the author's name, pen name or initials (Roth and Olson, 1997, p. 5).

The press accreditation was implemented in a more articulate manner during the Franco-Prussian War, even though the warring parties initially considered prohibiting the journalists' access to the front.

The French authorities primarily banned the journalists from following the troops, and even issued an order to forbid the publication of any information regarding the military movements. Later on, the war correspondents were accredited, provided that they respected a set of severe restrictions.

The Ems Dispatch, which became *casus belli* in the Franco-Prussian War, attests the ability of Prussian Chancellor, Otto von Bismarck, to use the power of the press. His approach toward press relations included not only the journalists' accreditation and release of official communiqués, but also censorship and placement of articles promoting his views in independent journals. Thus, while the French were transmitting the official information in a late and often unusable fashion, the Prussians were responding as quickly and thoroughly as possible to the correspondents' information requests. Even more, when the French refused the accreditation required by William Russell, Bismarck seized the opportunity by inviting him to report on the war from the Prussian side. Aware of Russell's fame, Bismarck favoured his access to information, including through personal meetings, thus promoting the Prussian view on the war through *The Times*.

The participation of the Romanian Army in the military operations against the Ottoman Empire is substantiating the assertions of the historians who state that Romania won its national independence on the battlefield, later on recognised internationally by the Treaty of San Stefano (3 March 1878) and at the Congress of Berlin (13 June-13 July 1878).

Several other journalists encountered the same experience, their access to the troops being denied by the French. Instead, their press accreditation was granted by the Prussian General Headquarters, whose procedures for working with the journalists were simple and efficient, according to another British correspondent, on his way to becoming famous, Archibald Forbes (Dietrich, 2012, p. 26).

PRESS ACCREDITATION DURING THE RUSSO-TURKISH WAR (1877-1878)

One of the greatest wars in the 19th century Europe, the armed conflict between the Tsarist Empire and the Ottoman Empire emerged as a new stage in the succession of political and military crises generically known as the *Eastern Question*.

Romania's total commitment to this geopolitical endeavour, by allocating all its political, economic, and military resources in the war effort alongside the Tsarist Empire, was perhaps decisive for facilitating the final victory of Russo-Romanian co-belligerents.

On its own, the participation of the Romanian Army in the military operations against the Ottoman Empire is substantiating the assertions of the historians who state that Romania won its national independence on the battlefield, later on recognised internationally by the Treaty of San Stefano (3 March 1878) and at the Congress of Berlin (13 June-13 July 1878). For these reasons, the Romanian historians are frequently referring to the 1877-1878 military conflict as the Romanian War

of Independence, sometimes calling it also the Russo-Romanian-Turkish War, especially when focusing on the Romanian participation in the Russo-Turkish War.

From the very beginning, on 12 April 1877, the Russo-Turkish War was widely reflected in the European and North American press which regularly published dispatches, photos and graphics sent by correspondents from the battlefields in the Balkans and in the Caucasus. The journalists' access to the theatre of war became of very high concern for Tsarist military commanders, aware of the press growing influence. The effect was compounded as they had seen the results of press reporting on the British government during the Crimean War, and the active journalism during the American Civil War, Franco-Prussian War, Serbian, Montenegrin, and Bulgarian uprisings against the Ottoman Empire.

This concern is confirmed in a letter addressed in 1876 by the Minister of Internal Affairs, A.E. Timisev, to the Minister of War, D.A. Milyutin: *"Thanks to the railways and the telegraph, it became a well-established rule the possibility of receiving rapidly detailed news from the theatre of war. From the beginning of the war, Russian and foreign newspapers will be filled with extensive correspondences from the area of operations, so that Russian newspapers will receive mostly inappropriate and contradictory reports, and foreign newspapers, hostile to Russia"* (Manakhova, 2018, p. 33).

On 19 April 1877, Grand Duke Nikolai Nicolaevich the Elder, the Commander in Chief of Tsarist armies on the Balkan front, held a meeting with highest imperial officials to analyse the issue of banning or allowing the journalists in the theatre of war.

On 19 April 1877, Grand Duke Nikolai Nicolaevich the Elder, the Commander in Chief of Tsarist armies on the Balkan front, held a meeting with highest imperial officials to analyse the issue of banning or allowing the journalists in the theatre of war. It was attended by the Minister of War, D.A. Milyutin, Chief of Staff, Adjutant-General A.A. Nepokoichitsky, Head of the Third Department of His Majesty's Chancellery, A.F. Hamburger, with responsibilities regarding censorship and foreign nationals, former Ambassador to Constantinople, Adjutant-General N.P. Ignatiev, member of the State Council, and Chief of Civil Affairs of His Imperial Highness, Prince V.A. Cherkassky (Hasenkampf, 1908, p. 6). They agreed that denying the journalists' access cannot eliminate the risks of sensitive information being disclosed. If implemented, such a decision would reduce the possibilities of using the press to inform and influence domestic and foreign audiences by disseminating their own messages about the war

effort. To meet the publishers' demands, granting the access to the frontlines for press correspondents, and even providing them with official information about the progress of military operations, were considered opportune. That approach was regarded as effective in strengthening the social stability, the cohesiveness, and the morale of the troops, concurrently with fostering the reputation of the Tsarist Empire (Collection, Vol. 2, 1898, p. 36; Manakhova, 2018, p. 34).

At the meeting, Colonel Mikhail Alexandrovich Hasenkampf presented a memorandum on the press accreditation. He specified that it was preferable to work closely with journalists as their reports in influential publications might improve the state's image, increasing the popularity of its organisations and the leaders' credibility, and gaining the public's trust and support. Hasenkampf asserted that even if journalists were forbidden from documenting and transmitting their dispatches from the front, it would be impossible to ban them from writing about the war. Consequently, their articles will be insufficiently motivated or biased, multiplying the echo of *"false rumours and malicious fictions, which will disturb the Russian public opinion and incite against us the readers of foreign newspapers"* (Hasenkampf, 1908, p. 4).

To meet the publishers' demands, granting the access to the frontlines for press correspondents, and even providing them with official information about the progress of military operations, were considered opportune.

To avoid the negative consequences of such a development, Hasenkampf argued that *"it is necessary to allow the presence of both Russian and foreign correspondents at the General Headquarters, as well as at the headquarters of army corps and independent detachments, under the following conditions:*

1) The access of Russian correspondents to be allowed based on the requests made by publishers.

2) The access of foreign correspondents to be allowed based on the recommendations made by our embassies and high dignitaries of the state.

3) Preliminary censorship should not be established in any form, but only the permanent obligation of all correspondents to not communicate any information about the movements, disposition, and strength of our troops, nor about future operations; correspondents will be warned that non-compliance with this obligation will lead to their expulsion from the army.

4) In order to supervise the exact fulfilment of the obligations, the editorial offices will be asked to send all the issues of the newspapers,

in which the dispatches from the theatre of war are published, to the staff officer appointed to lead the activity with correspondents.

5) Correspondents will be offered such information from the same person, whom the Chief of Staff considers useful and communicable. To this end, a schedule with certain days and hours shall be clearly established. At these meetings it will even be possible to influence the correspondents in an indirect manner, without harming their professional pride" (Hasenkampf, 1908, p. 5).

Although initially Grand Duke Nikolai advocated *"introducing preliminary censorship, in general, for all dispatches, as well as preventing the access of correspondents sent by hostile newspapers"* (Hasenkampf, 1908, p.7), finally he accepted Hasenkampf's arguments that censoring the journalists' articles was not only worthless, but also counterproductive. Hasenkampf asserted that the readers will inevitably learn about the Tsarist military *"sanitising"* the dispatches sent from the front, concluding that censorship undermines both the correspondent's credibility and the Tsarist authorities' reputation.

Hasenkampf considered that in no way should journalists be asked to write positive articles about Russia. Such an approach, like censorship, will lead the readers to question the correspondent's credibility.

Hasenkampf considered that in no way should journalists be asked to write positive articles about Russia. Such an approach, like censorship, will lead the readers to question the correspondent's credibility. Even when negative articles about Russia were published by the newspapers whose representatives were accredited in theatre of war, *"this could be neglected, because the articles that are favourable to us will be even more trustworthy for public opinion"* (Hasenkampf, 1908, p. 5). After weighing the advantages and disadvantages of working with the Russian and foreign press, the Tsarist General Headquarters decided that the press accreditation provided the formal framework to ensure the controlled access for correspondents to the theatre of war.

THE PRESS ACCREDITATION: RULES AND ORGANISATION

The method of organising the press accreditation during the Russo-Turkish War can be decrypted based on Hasenkampf's memoirs, and on the orders of the Tsarist General Headquarters. The Order No. 87, enforced on 22 April 1877 by the Chief of Staff, General A.A. Nepokoichitsky, resumes Hasenkampf's rules on working with journalists, as follows:

"1) If the heads of the detachments, after analysing the military situation and depending on the position of the detachment, consider

that it is possible, there will be accepted in the area of operations only those correspondents who: a) have a special external sign on the left sleeve – a round bronze plate embossed with the imperial double-headed eagle, the number and the inscription «Correspondent», and the seal of the Headquarters of the Army of Operations; b) may present their photographic portrait, as an identity card, having printed on the reverse the authorisation granted by the Headquarters of the Army of Operations.

2) The presence in the area of operations of persons who do not hold both identification signs shall not be tolerated. The possession of the external identification sign, without the certified photographic portrait, will not have the value of an authorisation.

In general, all officers performing command functions will be responsible for monitoring the correspondents' activity. In the case of suspicious actions and relationships and even more so in the case of attempts to move to the enemy side, send them to the headquarters, explaining the reasons for the detention.

3) In general, all officers performing command functions will be responsible for monitoring the correspondents' activity. In the case of suspicious actions and relationships and even more so in the case of attempts to move to the enemy side, send them to the headquarters, explaining the reasons for the detention.

4) Without restricting their freedom of movement, the correspondents shall be required to notify each time they change their position by sending written notes to the headquarters:who, where and when they are travelling.

5) In case of conversations with correspondents, be generally attentive and do not inform them in any way about the composition, manpower, direction, purpose of the movement of our convoys and the disposition of military units" (Collection, 1900, Vol. 28, pp. 248-249).

Colonel Hasenkampf was appointed to organise and lead the activity with the envoys of the Russian and foreign publications accredited by the Tsarist General Headquarters. A fluent speaker of French and German, efficient and polite, Hasenkampf proved to be the right man in the right place. His tasks included: correspondents' accreditation; establishing functional rules with journalists; providing them with information, advice and support, including as well guidance on how to use the post and telegraph free of charge; monitoring their activity; withdrawal of accreditation for non-compliance with the established rules; dissemination of official communiqués using the news agencies. The correspondents were regularly welcomed at the Headquarters for press briefings, from 09.00 till 11.00, Hasenkampf providing them with official information approved by Grand Duke Nikolai.

In order to receive permission to enter the warzones, the correspondents were requested to appear in person at the Tsarist General Headquarters to be registered. They had to present their recommendations and three portrait photos. On the back of the photo, the correspondent's name was to be written, the name of the publication represented by him and the authorisation of free passage in the theatre of war. Following that, a seal of confirmation would be stamped. The result was a genuine press card, used by them to prove their accreditation. The second photo was to be kept in the album of the Tsarist General Headquarters, the third one being sent to the archives of the Ministry of War.

As another condition to get the accreditation, correspondents were asked to make a commitment to not include in their dispatches any details of military interest about combat readiness, positions, movements, equipment, and troops condition.

Because of its weight, the identification sign was not much appreciated by correspondents. Therefore, by order No. 131, issued on 7 June 1877, it was replaced with a silk brass in the colours of the Tsarist imperial house, black, yellow and white, embroidered with the imperial coat of arms, the word *"Correspondent"*, as well as the journalist's registration number.

Because of its weight, the identification sign was not much appreciated by correspondents. Therefore, by order No. 131, issued on 7 June 1877, it was replaced with a silk brass in the colours of the Tsarist imperial house, black, yellow and white, embroidered with the imperial coat of arms, the word "Correspondent", as well as the journalist's registration number.

Francis Vinton Greene, First Lieutenant in the Corps of Engineers of the US Army, nominated by the War Department to observe the military operations on the Balkan front as military attaché to the United States Legation in Saint-Petersburg, confirms the Russian approach to the relationship with the war correspondents, as follows: *"At the beginning of the war, the Russian military authorities received the press in a way that it had probably never been received before. Regulations were drawn up, which permitted any regularly accredited correspondent of a responsible journal to accompany the army, provided he agreed in writing to a few simple rules. The principal of these were that he should always carry on his person his photograph, on the back of which was written his authority to accompany the army, as a sort of passport by which he might at any time be identified; that he should wear a band around his arm bearing the word «Correspondent» in Russian letters, and his number, and that he should give his word of honor not to report the number of troops, the intended movements of the army, or any other information which might compromise its success"* (Greene, 1880, p. 163).

PRESS CORRESPONDENTS ON THE FRONTS OF THE RUSSO-TURKISH WAR

The imperative to meet the public opinion information needs, the access requests made by influential publications and the increasing influx of journalists in the theatre of operations led the military to adopt working procedures with the special envoys of newspapers and magazines interested in covering events from the war zones first-hand.

Among the correspondents accredited by Tsarist, Romanian and Ottoman headquarters, there were many famous journalists, photographers and painters – Januarius MacGahan, Archibald Forbes, Francis Millet, Frédéric Kohn-Abrest, Mlochowski de Belina, Melton Prior, Irving Montagu, Johann Schönberg, Frederic Villiers, Dick de Lonlay, Vasily Nemirovich-Danchenko, Vasily Vereshchagin, Vasily Polenov, Nicolae Grigorescu, Carol Popp de Szathmari, Jose Luis Pellicer y Fener, to mention only a few among others.

Along the hostilities on the Balkan and Caucasus fronts of the Russo-Turkish War, for shorter or longer periods of time, there were about 125 active press correspondents, representing around 100 publications and news agencies from Austria-Hungary, France, Germany, Italy, Romania, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States of America, Tsarist and Ottoman Empires.

Along the hostilities on the Balkan and Caucasus fronts of the *Russo-Turkish War*, for shorter or longer periods of time, there were about 125 active press correspondents, representing around 100 publications and news agencies from Austria-Hungary, France, Germany, Italy, Romania, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States of America, Tsarist and Ottoman Empires.

This estimate was determined by analysing, comparing, and summarising the data offered by the primary sources, the most important being Hasenkampf (1908), Collection (Vol. 2, 1898,), Greene (1881), Boyle (1877), Mlochowski de Belina (1878), Drew Gay (1878), Nemirovich-Danchenko (1878), Kohn-Abrest (1879), Pain (1879), Forbes (1894), Huyshe (1894), Ryan (1897), and *The Daily News* 1877-1878 war correspondence volumes (1878).

The secondary sources, Furneaux (1958), Gal *et al*. (1977), Ștefan (1989), Ionescu (2002), Knightley (2004), Muminova (2008), Gokov (2011), Patton (2015), McLaughlin (2016), Manachova (2018), Yürükçü (2018), Williams (2020), focus on the progress of political and military events through the lens of the press coverage provided by the correspondents that were active on the Balkan and Caucasian fronts of the Russo-Turkish War, without considering the analysis of military-press relations from the perspective of PR history.

The tertiary sources, Roth and Olson (1997), Rosetti (1897), Österreichisches Biographisches Lexicon – ÖBL (online), Oxford

Dictionary of National Biography – ODNB (online), presented additional data about some correspondents, which proved helpful in correctly mentioning the correspondents' names or in confirming their working relationships with one or more publications which were not mentioned by primary or secondary sources.

The evidence provided by Russian primary sources, Hasenkampf (1908), Collection (1898), Nemirovich-Danchenko (1878), and secondary sources, Muminova (2008), Gokov (2011), Manakhova (2018), pointed only to the journalists, publications and news agencies that had been accredited by Tsarist military authorities in charge to the General Headquarters and to the Army of operations.

Therefore, it was necessary to complete the estimate of newspapers, illustrated magazines, news agencies and their special envoys that covered the Russo-Turkish War with publications and correspondents' names that were not accredited by Tsarist military authorities or even those that did not request to be accredited by them.

It was necessary to complete the estimate of newspapers, illustrated magazines, news agencies and their special envoys that covered the Russo-Turkish War with publications and correspondents' names that were not accredited by Tsarist military authorities or even those that did not request to be accredited by them.

In this situation, there were journalists and graphic artists, Austrian, English, French, German, Romanian and even Russian, whom were not mentioned by Russian sources as being accredited by Tsarist military authorities, but reported on war events when finding opportunities to travel north and south of the Danube, as well as from their offices located in Bucharest or elsewhere.

Excepting Carol Popp de Szathmari and Franz Duschek, the official photographers of Prince Carol I, the Russian sources do not mention the activity south of the Danube of other Romanian war correspondents, among the most famous being Alexandru Ciurcu, journalist, and Nicolae Grigorescu, Sava Henția and George Demetrescu Mirea, painters. Despite it, their activity as war correspondents is attested by their press dispatches, articles, letters, and graphic works, published by Romanian and foreign publications.

The estimated number of correspondents resulted from the analysis of the Russian sources is acknowledged by F.V. Greene. In his book, *The Russian Army and Its Campaigns in Turkey in 1877-1878*, published right after the war, in 1879, Greene mentions that on the Russian side *"about seventy-five correspondents began the campaign"* (Greene, 1879, p. x). In his next book, *Sketches of Army Life in Russia*, published in 1880, Greene describes the war correspondents' activity accredited by the Tsarist General Headquarters during campaign,

raising that *"something over eighty correspondents joined the army..., about one-third of whom were Russians"* (Greene, 1880, p. 164).

The aspects related to the use of press accreditation, correlated with their own activity as war correspondents, are also mentioned by other special envoys of Romanian and foreign publications – Archibald Forbes, Januarius MacGahan, Frederich Lachmann, Frédéric Damé, Johann Schönberg, Alexandru Ciurcu.

There are also references to a Romanian officer, Colonel Alexandru Lipoianu, who was dealing with military-press relations (Hasenkampf, pp. 126-128), a fact that could attest to the existence of incipient procedures for press accreditation used by the Romanian army. An example in support of this assertion is given by Sava Henția, painter, who made an extensive battlefield documentary south of the Danube having on him a free passage travel document issued by the Romanian General Headquarters with No. 465 on 5 August 1877, and signed by General Carol Davila (Ionescu, 2002, p. 196).

The use of *embedded journalists* within the units of the Romanian Army is confirmed by Frederich Lachmann, the correspondent of the dailies *Der Bund* (Swiss), *The Chicago Gazette* (USA) and *Pester Lloyd* (Austria-Hungary). In a letter dated Grivitza, 29 August 1877, addressed to the Romanian dailies *Românul*, *România Liberă* and *Telegraful*, Lachmann stated that he had just completed a five-week stage as an *embedded journalist* to the 4th Infantry Division, commanded by Colonel Alexandru Anghelescu. In this letter Lachmann emphasised that he thus had the opportunity to observe the combat actions carried out by the Romanian troops at Grivitza redoubt, and that as a former officer he highly appreciated the bravery of the Romanian troops, the intensity of the fighting, the precision of infantry manoeuvring and the accuracy of artillery fire. Describing a combat action carried out on 27 August 1877, Lachmann mentioned: *"I even joined the 5th Company of the 5th Regiment, going with the line of tirailleurs. After a few moments we received such a fire like I had not seen in Solferino or Custozza, but the line of tirailleurs remained steady. Perfect order reigned in all the columns that advanced step by step towards the great redoubt... I would never have thought to see so much bravery in a troop that has never known the fire before. Today I am firmly convinced that the Romanian Army deserves to be placed next to any other army of Europe, and anyone can be proud of its soldiers*

and officers who have given such brilliant evidence of bravery" (*Telegraful*, 4 September 1877, p. 2; *România Liberă*, 4 September 1877, pp. 2-3).

Organised in small groups, currently defined in the PR policies on military-media relations as *press pools*, war correspondents can be identified in the imagery, graphic sketches and photographs, published by newspapers and illustrated magazines of that epoch. They are shown while witnessing the events or preparing their press reports on the major operations of the Russian and Romanian troops on the Balkan front – crossing the Danube, the battles of Nikopol, Shipka Pass and Grivitza, the siege of Pleven and Vidin, and the advance of Russian troops to Constantinople.

As a member of a *press pool*, observing the Russian preparations to cross the Danube at Brăila, *The Daily News'* special envoy noted in an article dated on 24 June 1877: *"Colonel Hasenkampf was detached for the service of the Press, for the purpose of giving information to journalists"*, continuing caustically *"the information obtained from him in the course of the last month might be written by a skilful calligraphist on one's thumb nail"* (*The Daily News*, 5 July 1877, p. 5).

Proud of the professional conduct shown by the American special envoys during the war, F.V. Greene provides an overview of how the journalists accredited by the Russian Headquarters tracked the course of military operations south of the Danube: *"Of these eighty correspondents about half were at the front throughout the summer, and the greater part of them exposed themselves with the utmost fearlessness in battle and endured the greatest hardships without flinching. One of them, Mr. Millet, received a decoration for extraordinary bravery in aiding the wounded under a very hot fire. For the other half, the comforts of Bucharest possessed the greater attraction. They came to the army occasionally, visited the camps and hospitals, studied the Russian character, and went back to Bucharest to digest their studies. But when the winter came on, the ardour of nearly all was benumbed, and their interest began to flag. Some went back to Paris and London, others remained in Bucharest. But only four of them, MacGahan, Grant, Millet, and Villiers – the latter representing the London Graphic – trudged through the snow in the Balkans and arrived at Constantinople with the troops. Of these four, the first three were Americans"* (Greene, 1880, pp. 166-167).

ROMANIAN MILITARY THINKING

Organised in small groups, currently defined in the PR policies on military-media relations as press pools, war correspondents can be identified in the imagery, graphic sketches and photographs, published by newspapers and illustrated magazines of that epoch. They are shown while witnessing the events or preparing their press reports on the major operations of the Russian and Romanian troops.

In the attempt to supplement the data on the press correspondents who were active in the Balkan theatre of war, either on the Russo-Romanian or on the Ottoman side, the investigated sources proved to be very useful, as well as the 1877-1878 Romanian and foreign publications. They confirm the presence in the Balkan warzone of some press correspondents, who are not recorded by the Russian sources.

The number of war correspondents in Romania and Bulgaria as well as the duration of their presence in the warzones was variable. Thus, there are cases of correspondents who ceased their activity as a consequence of their press accreditation being refused or withdrawn, followed by expulsion from Romania (V. Howard, F. Boyle), or they needed hospitalisation due to illnesses or injuries suffered in the front lines (N.V. Maximov), or simply they were replaced by other envoys of the publications they represented.

The number of war correspondents in Romania and Bulgaria as well as the duration of their presence in the warzones was variable. Thus, there are cases of correspondents who ceased their activity as a consequence of their press accreditation being refused or withdrawn, followed by expulsion from Romania, or they needed hospitalisation due to illnesses or injuries suffered in the front lines, or simply they were replaced by other envoys of the publications they represented.

If some journalists were refused accreditation by Tsarist authorities, the typical excuses consisted of suspicions regarding their involvement in espionage or the attitude of their publications, considered hostile towards Russia. Examples of such a circumstance are those of *The Daily Telegraph*, the Viennese *Neue Freie Presse* and *Kölnische Zeitung*.

The extensive research of periodicals will lead to a more accurate understanding of the way the Russo-Turkish War was reflected in the contemporary press. It will also allow filling the incomplete personal data and profiles, updating the information about the war correspondents' activity and affiliations, as well as about the publications that have benefited from dispatches, articles, photos and sketches sent by them from the front lines.

The publications, especially the illustrated ones, which were being released in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, were best represented in the theatre of operations in the Balkans, by journalists accredited to Tsarist and Ottoman military headquarters, as well as in Bucharest and Constantinople. The very large number of British correspondents and publications demonstrates the interest of the public opinion in Great Britain as well as of the British authorities in the political and military developments of the *Eastern Question*.

Table no. 1: Publications and war correspondents from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland

No.	PUBLICATION	CORRESPONDENT	ACTIVE ON / ACCREDITED BY
1.	*The Daily News*	Archibald Forbes, Januarius MacGahan, Francis Davis Millet	Balkan Front / Russo-Romanian side
		Edmund O'Donovan, Edwin Pears J.H. Skinner V. Julius	Balkan & Caucasian Fronts / Turkish side
2.	*The Times*	C. B. Brackenbury, Sir Henry Havelock, Herbert -, E. M. Grant	Balkan Front / Russo-Romanian side
		R. Conigsby, Charles Austin, Antonio Gallenga, Dobson	Balkan Front / Turkish side
3.	*The Illustrated London News*	Edward Hale, Johann N. Schönberg, Irving Montague, William H. Overend	Balkan Front / Russo-Romanian side
		Richard Caton Woodville	Balkan Front / Turkish & Russo-Romanian side
		Melton Prior	Balkan Front / Turkish side
		Joseph Bell	Caucasian & Balkan Fronts / Turkish side
4.	*The Graphic*	Frederick Villiers	Balkan Front / Russo-Romanian side
		J. Ananian	Balkan Front / Turkish side
5.	*The Standard*	Frederick Boyle	Balkan Front / Russo-Romanian side
		Fitzgerald	Balkan Front / Turkish side

No.	PUBLICATION	CORRESPONDENT	ACTIVE ON / ACCREDITED BY
6.	*The Manchester Guardian*	Francis Stanley, Neocles Mussabini	Balkan Front / Russo-Romanian side
		Camille Barrère	Balkan Front / Turkish side
7.	*The Scotsman*	D.L. Carrick, William Rose	Balkan Front / Russo-Romanian side
		David Christie Murray	Balkan Front / Turkish side
8.	*The Daily Telegraph*	George A. Sala, John Drew Gay, William Kingston, Campbell Clarke, James Dow, Paul Franke, Nicholas Leader, Frank Power	Balkan Front / Turkish side
9.	*Sheffield Daily Telegraph*		
10.	*The Morning Post*	Wasborough -, Alexandru Ciurcu	Balkan Front / Russo-Romanian side
11.	*Freeman's Journal* Irish daily, Dublin	Francis Stanley	
12.	*The Pall Mall Gazette*	Camille Barrère	Balkan Front / Turkish side
13.	*The Pictorial World*	-	
14.	*The Economist*	-	
15.	*The Globe*	-	
16.	*The Echo*	-	

Some British journalists sent correspondence to American newspapers and illustrated magazines and vice versa. One of them is Edwin Pears, the special envoy of The Daily News, who sent correspondence to The New York Herald, while some American correspondents transmitted correspondence to British and even Russian newspapers.

Some British journalists sent correspondence to American newspapers and illustrated magazines and vice versa. One of them is Edwin Pears, the special envoy of *The Daily News*, who sent correspondence to *The New York Herald*, while some American correspondents transmitted correspondence to British and even Russian newspapers (J. MacGahan and F. Stanley to *Golos*).

Table no. 2: Publications and war correspondents from the United States of America

No.	PUBLICATION	CORRESPONDENT	ACTIVE ON / ACCREDITED BY
1.	*The New York Herald*	John P. Jackson, Francis Davis Millet, Januarius MacGahan,	Balkan Front / Russo-Romanian side
		Edward Hale, Dokankoz -	
		Wentworth Huyshe	Balkan Front / Turkish side
2.	*The Boston Journal*	Edward King	Balkan Front / Russo-Romanian side
3.	*Harpers' Weekly*	Richard Caton Woodville	Balkan Front / Turkish & Russo-Romanian side
4.	*The Chicago Gazette*	Friedrich Lachmann	Balkan Front / Russo-Romanian side

The publications which were being released in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy also followed with great interest the evolution of political and military events in the Balkan Peninsula, sending press correspondents to Bucharest and Constantinople.

The publications which were being released in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy also followed with great interest the evolution of political and military events in the Balkan Peninsula, sending press correspondents to Bucharest and Constantinople.

Table no. 3: Publications and war correspondents from Austro-Hungarian Monarchy

No.	PUBLICATION	CORRESPONDENT	ACTIVE ON / ACCREDITED BY
1.	*Neues Wiener Tagblatt*	Johann Lukeš, Alexandru Ciurcu	Balkan Front / Russo-Romanian side
2.	*Die Presse*	Johann Lichtenstadt	
3.	*Neue Freie Presse*	Alexandru Ciurcu	
		August Baron Schluga von Rastenfeld	Caucasian Front / Turkish side
4.	*Neue Illustrirte Zeitung*	Johann N. Schönberg, Mathes Koenen	Balkan Front / Russo-Romanian side
5.	*Neue Militär-Zeitung*	not identified	

No.	PUBLICATION	CORRESPONDENT	ACTIVE ON / ACCREDITED BY
6.	*Pester Lloyd* Budapest, German daily	Friedrich Lachmann	Balkan Front / Russo-Romanian side
7.	*Die Politik* Prague, German daily	Tammenbach-Reinschtein, Friedrich Lachmann	
8.	*Národní Listy* Prague, Czech daily	Heller	

The unfolding of military operations during the Russo-Turkish War was largely reflected in the newspapers and illustrated magazines published in Germany as a result of the dedicated work of their special envoys – journalists and graphic artists, some of them having a military background as active or reserve officers.

The unfolding of military operations during the Russo-Turkish War was largely reflected in the newspapers and illustrated magazines published in Germany as a result of the dedicated work of their special envoys – journalists and graphic artists, some of them having a military background as active or reserve officers.

Table no. 4: Publications and war correspondents from Germany

No.	PUBLICATION	CORRESPONDENT	ACTIVE ON / ACCREDITED BY
1.	*Die Post*	von Brauchitsch	Balkan Front / Russo-Romanian side
2.	*Neue Militärische Blätte*		
3.	*Militär-Wochenblatt*	Dannhauer	
4.	*National Zeitung*		
5.	*Hamburger Nachrichten*		
6.	*Ausburger Allgemeine Zeitung*	von Marees, Alexandru Ciurcu	
7.	*Űber Land und Meer*	von Marees, Johann N. Schönberg	
8.	*Illustrirte Zeitung*	Mathes Koenen, Themistocles von Eckenbrecher, Carol Popp de Szathmari	

No.	PUBLICATION	CORRESPONDENT	ACTIVE ON / ACCREDITED BY
9.	*Die Gartenlaube*	Heinrich Trenk, Wilhelm Camphausen, Frédéric Kohn-Abrest	Balkan Front / Russo-Romanian si
10.	*Berliner Tageblatt*	not identified	
11.	*Kölnische Zeitung*	von Huyn	
		Carl Schneider	Balkan Front / Turkish side

The publications in France and Belgium showed a similar great interest in the developments of political and military events in the Balkan Peninsula, proved by the extensive press coverage of the war events.

The publications in France and Belgium showed a similar great interest in the developments of political and military events in the Balkan Peninsula, proved by the extensive press coverage of the war events.

Table no. 5: Publications and war correspondents from France and Belgium

No.	PUBLICATION	CORRESPONDENT	ACTIVE ON / ACCREDITED BY
1.	*XIX Siècle*	Philibert Bréban	Balkan Front / Russo-Romanian side
2.	*National*	Philibert Bréban Emile Galli	
3.	*Le Figaro*	Ivan de Woestyne	
4.	*Moniteur Universell*	Dick de Lonlay (Georges Hardouin's pseudonym), Paul A. Kauffmann, Jean Bergue, Daniel Vierge, Filip Montoreanu	
5.	*Le Monde Illustré*		
6.	*Estafette*	Mlochowski de Belina	
7.	*Le Temps*	Henri de Lamothe, Alexandru Ciurcu	
8.	*L'Illustration*	Auguste Lançon, Ladislaus E. Petrovitz	
9.	*Le Siècle*	Frédéric Kohn-Abrest	
10.	*Le Rappel*		
11.	*La France*	Camille Farcy	

No.	PUBLICATION	CORRESPONDENT	ACTIVE ON / ACCREDITED BY
12.	*Republique Française*	Granet	Balkan Front / Russo-Romanian side
		Camille Barrère	Balkan Front / Turkish side
13.	*Journal des Débats,*	Lucien Le Chevalier	
14.	*Le Bien public*	Olivier Pain	
15.	*La Lanterne*		
16.	*L'Indépendence Belge*, Brussels daily / Belgium	Frédéric Kohn-Abrest	Balkan Front / Russo-Romanian side

The Italian publications regularly provided rich information, news, articles and narratives, often illustrated with graphic works on the war events, which were transmitted from the battlefields by their own correspondents, accredited either on the Russo-Romanian side or on the Ottoman side.

The Italian publications regularly provided rich information, news, articles and narratives, often illustrated with graphic works on the war events, which were transmitted from the battlefields by their own correspondents, accredited either on the Russo-Romanian side or on the Ottoman side.

Table no. 6: Publications and war correspondents from Italy

No.	PUBLICATION	CORRESPONDENT	ACTIVE ON / ACCREDITED BY
1.	*L'Opinione*	M.A. Canini, Luigi Cazzavillan	Balkan Front / Russo-Romanian side
2.	*Pungolo di Napoli*		
3.	*Gazetta Piemontaise*		
4.	*Corriere della Sera*		
5.	*Fanfulla*	Marcotti	
6.	*Gazzetta di Roma*	Nicola Lazzaro	
7.	*L'illustrazione italiana*		

The Spanish magazine *La Illustracion Española y Americana* was represented by Jose Luis Pellicer y Fener. Colonel Hasenkampf, writing at his desk, became the subject of a sketch signed by Pellicer. Their meeting took place on 1 June 1877. It is recollected by Hasenkampf as follows: *"Don Jose Luis Pellicer, correspondent and painter of a Spanish illustrated magazine, arrived today, but without any recommendation. With his honest open face, he inspired such confidence in me that I asked Grand Duke to approve his accreditation*

on my responsibility. Grand Duke gave his consent" (Hasenkampf, 1908, p. 34).

In Sweden as well the conduct of military operations within the Balkan theatre of war was a subject that aroused public interest, the Swedish General Staff sending to Romania and Bulgaria an officer, Lieutenant Björlin, as correspondent of the daily *Stockholms Dagblad*.

To cover the war events, Swiss publications were represented by frontline journalists who were accredited at the Russian and Romanian military headquarters or at the Ottoman ones.

Table no. 7: Publications and war correspondents from Spain, Sweden, and Swiss Confederation

No.	PUBLICATION	CORRESPONDENT	ACTIVE ON / ACCREDITED BY
1.	*La Ilustracion Española y Americana*	Jose Luis Pellicer y Fener	Balkan Front / Russo-Romanian side
2.	*Stockholms Dagblad*	Björlin -	
3.	*Der Bund* (Bern)	Friedrich Lachmann	
4.	*Journal de Genève*	Olivier Pain	Balkan Front / Turkish side

The Romanian publications were fed with correspondence, news, and reports, illustrated with photographs and drawings prepared in the front lines by journalists, photographers and painters accredited at the Tsarist and Romanian headquarters. Among them was the journalist Alexandru Ciurcu, who could be successfully considered the first Romanian journalist of European reputation (Ștefan, p. 23). The illustrations for Romanian publications and for some publications from abroad were provided by photographers Carol Popp by Szathmary and Franz Duschek who were in the service of Prince Carol I, accompanied by Andreas D. Reiser, as well as by a team of painters and graphic artists, the best-known being Nicolae Grigorescu, Sava Henția, George Demetrescu Mirea and Filip Montoreanu (Ștefan, 1989; Ionescu, 2002).

The Romanian publications were fed with correspondence, news, and reports, illustrated with photographs and drawings prepared in the front lines by journalists, photographers and painters accredited at the Tsarist and Romanian headquarters. Among them was the journalist Alexandru Ciurcu, who could be successfully considered the first Romanian journalist of European reputation.

Table no. 8: Publications and war correspondents from Romania

No.	PUBLICATION	CORRESPONDENT	ACTIVE ON / ACCREDITED BY
1.	*Românul*	Alexandru Ciurcu, Carol Popp de Szathmari, Franz Duschek, Andreas D. Reiser, Nicolae Grigorescu, Sava Henția, Filip Montoreanu, Henri Trenk, George D. Mirea, Hipolit H. Dembitzki, Isidor Selagianu	Balkan Front / Russo-Romanian side
2.	*România Liberă*		
3.	*Telegraful*		
4.	*Timpul*		
5.	*Resboiul*		
6.	*Dorobanțul*	-	
7.	*Gazeta Transilvaniei*	Alexandru Ciurcu	
8.	*Familia*		
9.	*L 'Orient*	Alexandru Ciurcu, Frédéric Damé	
10.	*L'Indépendence Roumaine*		

The special envoys of the publications from the Tsarist Empire, journalists, photographers, painters and graphic artists, accredited to accompany the troops, are mentioned in the Collection of Materials on the 1877-78 Russo-Turkish War in the Balkan Peninsula (vol. 2, 1898) and by Colonel Hasenkampf in his memoirs, published in 1908.

The special envoys of the publications from the Tsarist Empire, journalists, photographers, painters and graphic artists, accredited to accompany the troops, are mentioned in the *Collection of Materials on the 1877-78 Russo-Turkish War in the Balkan Peninsula* (vol. 2, 1898) and by Colonel Hasenkampf in his memoirs, published in 1908. This information is supplemented by the memoirs, books and articles of war correspondents, journalists and painters, N.V. Maximov, V.V. Krestovski, V. Alushkin, V.I. Nemirovich-Danchenko, A. Kuropatkin, L.V. Shachovkoy, V.V. Vereșciaghin, accessed indirectly through the researches published by Muminova (2008), O.A. Gokov (2011), E.M. Muminova and A.V. Manakhova (2018). Information on the activity of Russian war correspondents appears also in the articles and memoirs of foreign journalists (Kohn-Abrest, Ciurcu), advisers and military attachés (Pfeil, Greene).

Table no. 9: Publications and war correspondents from the Tsarist Empire

No.	PUBLICATION	CORRESPONDENT	ACTIVE ON / ACCREDITED BY
1.	*Birzhevyye vedomosti*	N.V. Maximov	Balkan Front / Russo-Romanian side
2.	*Vsemirnaya illyustratsiya*	N.N. Karasin, M.P. Feodorov	
3.	*Golos*	P.P. Sokalsky	
4.	*Moskovskiye vedomosti*	L.V. Schchovskoy, M.F. Metz, Ilovaisky	
5.	*Nash vek*	G. Stambolov V.I. Nemirovich-Danchenko	
6.	*Novoye vremya*	A.A. Suvorin, N.P. Feodorov, V.P. Burenin, N.N. Karasin, P.P. Sokalsky, A.D. Ivanov, N.N. Rossolovsky, V.I. Nemirovich-Danchenko, Maslov -	
7.	*Odesskiy vestnik*	P.P. Sokalsky	
8.	*Pravitelstvennyy vestnik*	V.V. Krestovsky	
9.	*Russkiy mir*	E.K. Rapp, Gheorghievici -,	
10.	*Sankt-Peterburgskiye vedomosti*	M.P. Feodorov, N.V. Maximov, A. Teoharov, Modzolevsky -, Komarov -	
11.	*Severnyy vestnik*	D.K. Gyrs, Baikov -,	
12.	*Tiflisskiy vestnik*	N.Y. Nikoladze	
13.	*Russkoye obozreniye*	-	
14.	*Russkiy invalid*	M.P. Feodorov, Suhotin -,	
15.	*Russkiye vedomosti*	A. Teoharov	
16.	*Journal d'Odessa*	Philibert Bréban	
17.	*Sankt-Peterburger Zeitung*	N.V. Maximov	

News agencies were routinely used to disseminate the official communiqués of the Tsarist General Headquarters as well as the information provided by Romanian authorities. By order, when sending the public information reports, Hasenkampf prioritised Léon Pognon, the chief of *L'Agence Havas* office in Bucharest, thus ensuring that the French news agency received valuable data a few hours earlier than its competitors.

Accredited at the Tsarist General Headquarters, Poggenpohl, the head of the *Agence Genérale Russe*, provided correspondences about war operations to *Havas*, *Reuters*, *Associated Press*, *Wolffs Telegraphisches Bureau* (Berlin) and *Telegraphen Korrespondenz Bureau* (Corrbureau/Vienna). This fact indicates the existence of agreements between the news agencies for sharing the information in order to cover as best as possible the war events (Hasenkampf, 1908, p.25; Collection, 1898, Vol. 2, p.174; Palmer, 2019, p.53, Frédérix, p. 146).

News agencies were routinely used to disseminate the official communiqués of the Tsarist General Headquarters as well as the information provided by Romanian authorities. By order, when sending the public information reports, Hasenkampf prioritised Léon Pognon, the chief of L'Agence Havas office in Bucharest, thus ensuring that the French news agency received valuable data a few hours earlier than its competitors.

Table no. 10: News agencies and their correspondents

No.	PUBLICATION	CORRESPONDENT	ACTIVE ON / ACCREDITED BY
1.	*L'Agence Havas* / Bucharest office	Léon Pognon	Balkan Front / Russo-Romanian side
2.	*Agence Genérale Russe*	Poggenpohl	
3.	*Wolffs Telegraphisches Bureau*	Alexandru Ciurcu	
4.	*Agence Reuters*	Sigismund Engländer	Balkan Front / Turkish side
5.	*L'Agence Havas* / Constantinople office	Chateau -,	

The restrictive rules imposed by the 1876 Ottoman press law and the decision to make the access to the front conditional in accordance with the Sultan's written approval (ferman) limited the journalists' possibility to cover the war in the Balkan Peninsula and in the Caucasus. The censorship affected the activity of Ottoman newspapers *Basiret*, *Hayal Gazetesi*, *İstikbal Gazetesi*, *İttihad Gazetesi*, *Medeniyet Gazetesi*, *Sabah Gazetesi*, *Şark Gazetesi*, *Tercüman-ı Hakikat Gazetesi*, *Takvim-i Vakayi*, *Tercüman-ı Şark Gazetesi*, *Vakit Gazetesi* and *Zaman Gazetesi*,

whose journalists are not mentioned in the examined bibliographies. This fact might be explained by the fact that the Ottoman publications were frequently executed by compiling the articles printed in foreign ones.

Similar rules were applied to foreign publications and correspondents accredited in Constantinople: *The Daily Telegraph*, *The Times*, *Pall Mall Gazette*, *Manchester Guardian*, *Republique Française*; *Kölnische Zeitung*, *The Daily News*, *The New York Herald*, *The Illustrated London News*, *Journal des Débats*.

In July 1877, the presence of the foreign press at Shumen, in the area of the Ottoman forces, is attested by a report signed by C. Fitzgerald, Emerick Bulkovics, J. W. Saterger, August Jacquot, Charles Winter, Henry Dimone, Harry Suter, Jules Zukab, Wentworth Huyshe, Senanian Camille, Borthwick, Camille Barrère, Drummond, Carl Mayers, Melton Prior, without any reference to their publications (Yürükçü, 2018, p. 422).

The Caucasian front attracted far less press coverage at the time. In this regard, the bibliographies mention the exceptional war photos taken in the Russian part, and the presence of foreign correspondents in the Ottoman part, as Edmund O'Donovan, the special envoy of *The Daily News*, Joseph Bell, graphic artist, sent by *The Illustrated London News*, and August Baron Schluga von Rastenfeld, envoy of the Viennese newspaper *Neue Freie Presse* (*The War Correspondence of the Daily News 1877-78*, vol. 2, p. 311, Charalambous, 2014, p. 34).

PRESS ACCREDITATION IN THE MILITARY: PRACTICAL AND DOCTRINAL IMPLICATIONS

The way of regulating the military-press relations during the Russo-Turkish War through orders and procedures applied by Tsarist and Romanian military headquarters was not without practical and doctrinal significance. Thus, it was established the formal framework for dialogue and cooperation between the representatives of military organisations and the war correspondents and their publications, objectified by the press accreditation. Its acceptance and implementation demonstrated the increasing understanding among the military commanders and political leaders of the power of the press, whose possibilities

The way of regulating the military-press relations during the Russo-Turkish War through orders and procedures applied by Tsarist and Romanian military headquarters was not without practical and doctrinal significance. Thus, it was established the formal framework for dialogue and cooperation between the representatives of military organisations and the war correspondents and their publications, objectified by the press accreditation.

to address large audiences became subject of reflection on the ways and means to strategically spread the information to support the armed forces in achieving their objectives.

The press accreditation and the procedures used by the military to interact with publications' special envoys – journalists, photographers, graphic artists, painters – responded to the immediate needs to regulate their access to the area of military operations. It was conditioned by the correspondent's commitment to comply with the rules laid down by the military, which aimed primarily at reducing the risks of disseminating, through the publications, of data and information that could have compromised the secrecy of military operations.

Proving its usefulness during the subsequent armed conflicts, the press accreditation allowed the organisation of military-press relations predictably, based on mutual trust and benefit. This approach led to the implementation of rules and procedures aimed at supporting the achievement of operational and strategic goals by valorising the military- press relations and the activity of accredited correspondents included in press pools or acting as embedded journalists.

The correspondents' accreditation at the military headquarters and their access to the troops, either grouped in *press pools* or as *embedded journalists*, attached to the combat units, will spread as a standard practice of the military-press relations, being gradually introduced by the end of the 19th century in the armed forces of other states, initially in wartime only.

Proving its usefulness during the subsequent armed conflicts, the press accreditation allowed the organisation of military-press relations predictably, based on mutual trust and benefit. This approach led to the implementation of rules and procedures aimed at supporting the achievement of operational and strategic goals by valorising the military- press relations and the activity of accredited correspondents included in *press pools* or acting as *embedded journalists*.

These rules and procedures have stood the test of time, and they are reflected nowadays in all military policies and doctrines on information and public relations, influencing to a certain degree, as an example to follow, the public communication practices of other state authorities or private companies.

For the Romanian military, the practice of military-press relations during the Romanian War of Independence remains a page not yet fully completed, that still requires research, evaluation, and interpretation of national and, especially, foreign sources. The Romanian experience of military-press relations including the use of press accreditation, *press pools* and *embedded journalists* was depicted in valuable articles and memoirs, photo albums, sketches, graphic works and famous

paintings dedicated to Romanian Independence and to all those who made it possible on the battlefields – the Romanian Army and its brave soldiers.

TOWARDS INSTITUTIONALISATION OF THE PRESS ACCREDITATION

By adopting and improving the working rules with the war correspondents, the military headquarters gradually introduced the press accreditation within the armed forces, initially during the war campaigns and, subsequently, in peacetime. The progressive institutionalisation of press accreditation was an essential part of the process of adopting and perfecting the set of permanent practices, rules and procedures used by the military organisations to manage military-press relations. It was determined by the right understanding, at the level of military command groups, of the importance of running mutually beneficial relations with the publications interested in reflecting the activity of the armed forces.

The institutionalisation of press accreditation can be defined as the adoption of suitable principles, ground rules and working procedures, and the appointment of press officers in charge to liaise with publications and their envoys, which are described in written regulations approved by military decisions as distinct policies for managing the military-press relations with the aim to support journalists to inform the public about the activities of the armed forces.

The institutionalisation of press accreditation can be defined as the adoption of suitable principles, ground rules and working procedures, and the appointment of press officers in charge to liaise with publications and their envoys, which are described in written regulations approved by military decisions as distinct policies for managing the military-press relations with the aim to support journalists to inform the public about the activities of the armed forces.

On the way towards the institutionalisation of press accreditation in the military, Major General Sir Frederick Roberts, successfully leading his troops during the Second Anglo-Afghan War (1878-1880), used to say that the best approach when working with press correspondents is the truth strategy. By this he meant to underline how important it is to build mutual trust between the society and its armed forces by an open communication, telling the truth to the press. However, this conviction did not prevent him from introducing censorship and reducing the number of accredited journalists, when protecting the operational secrecy made it necessary (Williams, 2020, p. 8).

The interest of journalists in the First Boer War (1880-1881) prodded the British military to consider measures for preventing

the threats to operational security by disclosure of sensitive information through the press. Thus, in 1881 the British War Office formally warned the editors to not publish any data relating to locations, troop movements, strength, weapons, equipment, and logistical support.

In the British Armed Forces, the press accreditation procedure was attested in 1889, when the headquarters *"introduced a system of registration for war correspondents, which allowed them to draw food and fodder rations, gave them tacit permissions to use the military telegraph for censored dispatches and entitled them to campaign medals"* (Hood, 2011, p. 19).

By the end of the 19th century in the Romanian Armed Forces there were not recorded new approaches towards the organisation of military-press relations, a responsibility of the Great General Staff in peacetime, respectively of the Great General Headquarters in wartime, which were considering the accreditation of press correspondents, among whom again Alexandru Ciurcu, during the Second Balkan War (1913).

In the United States, the press-military relations became subject to the specific regulations of the War Department during the Spanish-American War (1898) and the Philippine Insurrection (1899).

At the same time, the Second Boer War (1899-1902) was attracting many correspondents, already famed, or pursuing fame, like Winston Churchill. Benefiting from more extensive press coverage than the previous wars, it was sometimes called *"the first media war"* (McLaughlin, 2016, p.74). This situation encouraged the British War Office to refine its regulations regarding press accreditation, imposing severe restrictions on using the photographic and cinematographic equipment in areas of military operations.

By the end of the 19th century in the Romanian Armed Forces there were not recorded new approaches towards the organisation of military-press relations, a responsibility of the Great General Staff in peacetime, respectively of the Great General Headquarters in wartime, which were considering the accreditation of press correspondents, among whom again Alexandru Ciurcu, during the Second Balkan War (1913).

The interaction between the war correspondents and the military on the battlefields led also to the acknowledgment of the journalist's condition in relation not only to the military authorities that granted him the press accreditation, but especially to those of the enemy.

Thus, the end of the 19th century brought the first recognition of the war correspondent's professional and legal status in an international document, the Hague Convention of 1899, whose Article 13 states that: *"Individuals who follow an army without directly belonging to it,*

such as newspaper correspondents and reporters, sutlers, contractors, who fall into the enemy's hands, and whom the latter think fit to detain, have a right to be treated as prisoners of war, provided they can produce a certificate from the military authorities of the army they were accompanying".

The mentioned provisions will be taken over and developed in Article 4 of Title I in the *Third Geneva Convention on the Treatment of Prisoners of War* (12 August 1949) and in Article 79 of *Protocol additional (I) to the Geneva Conventions, relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts* (6 June 1977), which state that the correspondents who accompany the armed forces to report on the conduct of military operations will be treated as war prisoners and will benefit from protection provided they do not take actions that contravenes their status as civilians and journalists.

CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of military-press relations in the last decades of the 19th century reveals the military effort to control the journalists' reporting from warzones by imposing ground rules, procedures and even penalties.

The press accreditation procedures were established and gradually improved by military headquarters through standardised documents, orders, and regulations, and by nominating competent personnel to liaise with journalists and their publications – press officers. Their duties involved defining the working rules with the press to provide the accredited journalists with access to current information on the conduct of military operations during official meetings held regularly (press briefings, interviews) or informal ones (working lunches).

To facilitate their documentation, the press officers were authorised to provide the war correspondents with documents for free passage and access to the troops in the area of military operations. The press officers' responsibilities also included to organise the visits of journalists to the front lines on an itinerary and according to a pre-arranged schedule or even, by request, to attach some of them to the combat units for longer periods of time. These practices are familiar to current military PR officers, who regularly appeal to *media pools* or *embedded*

journalists in wartime or in peacetime, during various missions in theatres of operations and major exercises.

The efforts towards the institutionalisation of press accreditation within the practices of military headquarters have evolved from the Crimean War to this day as a standard PR procedure.

Press accreditation proves its usefulness for managing the military-media relations, for granting correspondents' access to public information by providing them constantly with press releases, newsletters and media packages, and by inviting them to attend the press conferences or to join the troops in theatres of operations as members of *media pools* or as *embedded journalists*.

Press accreditation proves its usefulness for managing the military-media relations, for granting correspondents' access to public information by providing them constantly with press releases, newsletters and media packages, and by inviting them to attend the press conferences or to join the troops in theatres of operations as members of media pools or as embedded journalists.

The war correspondents' accreditation resulted in determining that the press relations should be treated in the military organisations as being a responsibility of the command group, as a managerial function, with the aim of informing and influencing internal and external audiences alike.

To clarify the origins of press accreditation in wartime, the military orders No. 87 and No. 131, issued by the Tsarist General Headquarters on 22 April 1877, respectively on 7 June 1877, should be considered among the first official documents regulating the military-press relations. Although they were not negotiated to best express the interests of both the military and the press, the mentioned orders reflect the progress of PR practices in the 19th century.

The bibliographic testimonies on war correspondents' activity underline the interdependencies between the development of the press, journalism, war reporting and the institutionalisation of the press accreditation by military organisations. Altogether, they certify the use of internal information, public information, press relations and reputation management, that would later be subsumed under PR theories.

Hence what was to be proved. Namely that in the second half of the 19th century the *PR triad* had already been made up by its founding elements – *the Organisation* (represented by the press officer), *the Media* (publications and press correspondents) and *the Public* (internal and external audiences of the organisation), all connected

by the common interest of sharing information and meanings to create mutual understanding, trust and consensus.

These facts are of great significance not only to the history of journalism and periodical press, but also to the history of public relations, and require further interdisciplinary studies conducted by historians and theorists of communication sciences.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES:

1. Bentele, G., Junghänel, I. (2004). *"Chapter 10: Germany"*, in Ruler, van B., Verčič, D. (Ed.), *Public Relations and Communication Management in Europe. A Nation-by-Nation Introduction to Public Relations Theory and Practice*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
2. Baker, V. (1879). *War in Bulgaria. A Narrative of Personal Experiences*. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington.
3. Boyle, F. (1877). *The Narrative of an Expelled Correspondent*. London: Richard Bentley & Son.
4. Charalambous, V. (2014). *La Guerre Russo-Turque de 1877-78, vue par la presse française et anglaise de l'époque*, https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/, retrieved on 1 May 2020.
5. Coope, J.W. (1878). *A Prisoner of War in Russia: My Experiences amongst the Refugees, with the Red Crescent*. London: Gilbert and Rivington.
6. Dietrich, S. (2012). *Embedded Journalism: Ursprünge, Ziele, Merkmale, Probleme und Nutzen von "Embedding" am Beispiel des Irak-Krieges 2003 [Origins, goals, characteristics, problems and benefits of "embedding" using the example of the 2003 Iraq war].* Saarbrücken: Akademikerverlag.
7. Drew Gay, J. (1878). *Plevna, the Sultan, and the Porte: Reminiscences of the War in Turkey.* London: Chatto and Windus.
8. Forbes, A. (1894). *Czar and Sultan. The Adventures of a British Lad in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
9. Frédérix, P. (1959). *Un siècle de chasse aux nouvelles: de l'Agence d'information Havas à l'Agence France-presse (1835-1957)*. Paris: Ed. Flammarion.
10. Furneaux, R. (1958). *The Breakfast War. The Siege of Plevna, 1877*. New York: Crowell.
11. Idem (1964). *News of War: Stories and Adventures of the Great War Correspondents.* London: M. Parrish.

12. Gal, I., Hurmuzache, Ș., Spiridonescu, M., Socol, G. (1977). *Independența României. Documente. Presa străină [The independence of Romania. Documents. Foreign press]*. București: Editura Academiei.
13. Gokov, O.A. (2011). *Корреспонденты в Российско-Турецкой войне 1877-1878 гг. на Балканском полуострове [Correspondents on the Balkan Peninsula during the Russo-Turkish War 1877-1878]*, http:// ricolor.org/history/voen/bitv/xix/20_01_2011/, retrieved on 3 May 2020.
14. Greene, F.V. (1879). *The Russian Army and Its Campaigns in Turkey in 1877-1878*. London: W.H. Allen & Co.
15. Idem (1880). *Sketches of Army Life in Russia.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
16. Hasenkampf, M.A. (1908). *Мой дневник. 1877-78 гг*. *[My diary. 1877-78].* St. Petersburg: V. Berezovsky.
17. Hood, J. (2011). War Correspondent. Reporting under Fire since 1850. Guilford: Lyons Press.
18. Huyshe, W. (1894). *The Liberation of Bulgaria. War Notes in 1877*. London: Bliss, Sands and Foster.
19. Ionescu, A.S. (2002). *Penel și sabie [Paint brush and sword]*. Biblioteca Bucureștilor.
20. Kaplan, K.A. (2016). *Bazi rus subay ve komutanlarin günlüklerinde ve hatiratinda 1877-1878 osmanli-rus savaşi'na dair izlenimleri [The 1877-1878 Ottoman-Russian War in diaries and memoirs of some Russian officers and commanders].* In *Journal of Historical Studies*. Izmir Ege University, vol. XXXI, no. 1, https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/ download/article-file/220182, retrieved on 8 May 2020.
21. Knightley, P. (2004). *The First Casualty: The War Correspondent as Hero and Myth-Maker from the Crimea to Iraq*. 3rd edition. Baltimore: JHU Press.
22. Kohn-Abrest, Fr. (1879). *Guerre d'Orient. Campagne de 1877. Zig-Zags en Bulgarie.* Paris: Ed. Charpentier.
23. Manakhova, A.V. (2018). *Проблема допуска корреспондентов на балканский театр русско-турецкой войны 1877-78 гг. [The problem of correspondents' access to the Balkan theatre of the Russo-Turkish War 1877-78]*. In Moscow State University Journal, no. 3, https://vestnik.journ.msu.ru/upload/iblock/2b1/vest-03-18_sverka-31-46.pdf, retrieved on 3 May 2020.
24. McLaughlin G. (2016). *The War Correspondent*. 2nd edition. London: Pluto Press.
25. Mlochowski de Belina, A. (1878). *De Paris à Plevna. Journal d'un journaliste. De mai à décembre 1877.* Paris: Chez tous les libraires.

26. Muminova E.M. (2008). *Деятельность российских и иностранных корреспондентов на Балканах в годы русско-турецкой войны 1877-1878 гг. [Activity of Russian and foreign correspondents on the Balkans in the years of the Russo-Turkish War 1877-1878]*. In St. Petersburg University Journal, no. 80-1, https://www.elibrary.ru/ item.asp?id=11692534, retrieved on 3 May 2020.
27. Nemirovich-Danchenko, V.I. (1878). *Год войны, Дневник русского корреспондента, 1877-1878 [Year of war. Journal of a Russian correspondent].* St. Petersburg: N. Vremeni.
28. Pain, O. (1879). *Histoire inédite de la vie de Henri Rochefort*. Paris: Périnet.
29. Palmer, M.B. (2019). *International News Agencies: A History*. Palgrave MacMillan, Cham.
30. Patton R. (2015). *Hell before Breakfast: America's First War Correspondents*. New York: Pantheon Books.
31. Pfeil, R. (1893). *Experiences of a Prussian Officer in the Russian Service during the Turkish War of 1877-78*. London: Stanford.
32. Reilly, T., Witten, M. (2010). *War with Mexico!: America's Reporters Cover the Battlefront.* University Press of Kansas, Lawrence.
33. Rosetti, D.R. (1897). *Dicționarul contimporanilor [The dictionary of contemporaries].* București: Editura Lito-tipografiei *«Populara»*.
34. Roth, M.P., Olson, J.S. (1997). *Historical Dictionary of War Journalism.* Westport: Greenwood Press.
35. Ryan, C.S, Sandes, J. (1897). *Under the Red Crescent. Adventures of an English Surgeon with the Turkish Army at Plevna and Erzurum 1877-1878*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
36. Storey, G. (1951). *Reuters' Century 1851-1951*. London: Ed. Max Parrish.
37. Ștefan, I.M. (1989). *Alexandru Ciurcu. Inventatorul, ziaristul, omul [Alexandru Ciurcu. The inventor, the journalist, the man]*. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Dacia.
38. Williams, K. (2020). *A New History of War Reporting*. London: Routledge.
39. Yürükçü, A. (2018). *How South Eastern Europe Map is Changing by Russian Propaganda and Deeds of European War Correspondents During the 1877-78 Turkish-Russian War?* In Proceedings of the 1st Congress of International Eastern European Studies, Kiev, Ukraine, 2018, http://www.piees.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/ B%C4%B0LD%C4%B0R%C4%B0-K%C4%B0TABI-ciees-2018-SONWEB.pdf, retrieved on 9 May 2020.

40. Collection *Сборник материалов по русско-турецкой войне 1877-78 гг. на Балканском полуострове [Collection of materials on the 1877-78 Russo-Turkish War in the Balkan Peninsula],* vol. 2 (1898) & vol. 28 (1900). St. Petersburg: General Staff, https://runivers.ru/lib/book8944/, retrieved on 3 May 2020.
41. *Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon (ÖBL)*. Austrian Centre for Digital Humanities and Cultural Heritage, https://www.biographien.ac.at/oebl?frames=yes, retrieved on 12 October 2020.
42. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (ODNB)*, https://www.oxforddnb.com/, retrieved on 12 October 2020.
43. *The War Correspondence of the Daily News, 1870, on the War between Germany and France* (1871). London: MacMillan and Co.
44. *The War Correspondence of the Daily News, 1877, with a connecting narrative forming a continuous history of the war between Russia and Turkey to the fall of Kars,* vol. 1, and *1877-8, from the fall of Kars to the signature of the preliminaries of Peace*, vol. 2, (1878). London: MacMillan and Co.

COLLECTIONS AND PUBLICATIONS (1877-1878) AVAILABLE ONLINE:

1. *Berliner Tageblatt* and *Die Gartenlaube*, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, http://zefys.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/list/title/zdb/27646518/-/1877 and https://de.wikisource.org/wiki/Die_Gartenlaube_(1877), last visited on 23 June 2020.
2. *Fanfulla, L'Illustrazione italiana, L'Opinione (1878)*, Biblioteca di Storia Moderna e Contemporanea, http://digiteca.bsmc.it/#, last visited on 14 June 2020.
3. *Le Figaro, Le Monde Illustré, Le Temps*, Bibliotheque nationale de France, https://gallica.bnf.fr/, last visited on 12 June 2020.
4. *La Ilustración española y americana*, Biblioteca virtual Miguel de Cervantes, http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/partes/234931/la-ilustracion-espanola-y-americana/35, last visited on 23 May 2020.
5. *Journal de Genève*, Le Temps archives, https://www.letempsarchives.ch/, last visited on 13 October 2020.
6. *Die Presse, Neue Freie Presse, Neues Wiener Tagblatt, Neue Illustrirte Zeitung, Pester Lloyd*, Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, http://anno.onb.ac.at/, last visited on 12 October 2020.
7. *Telegraful, Românul, România liberă* and *Timpul*, Biblioteca Digitală a Bucureștilor and Biblioteca Județeană Neamț, http://www.digibuc.ro/colectii/publicatii-periodice-c1574 and https://bibgtkneamt.ebibliophil. ro/crw, last visited on 6 May 2020.

8. *The Daily News, The Illustrated London News,* British Newspaper Archive, https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/ and HathiTrust Digital Library, https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/mb, last visited on 6 June 2020.
9. *The New York Herald, Harper's Weekly* and *Chicago Daily Tribune*, Library of the Congress, https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/, last visited on 12 June 2020.