

Perceptions versus reality? Newspaper coverage on the death of the Prince Imperial
By Luke Diver

‘Terrible, horrible news has fallen us like a thunderclap. The Prince Imperial is dead’
The London Times: 21 June, 1879.

The early months of the Anglo-Zulu War witnessed the British columns facing unparalleled, embarrassing defeats at Isandlwana, with further losses at Ntombe and Hlobane. The defeat at Isandlwana and the heroism at Rorke’s Drift which rescued the image of the redcoat, was immediately overshadowed by an incident in a remote donga with the death of three men. Two were troopers while the other man was heir to arguably the greatest family in military history in the nineteenth century-the Bonaparte’s. The following article will include newspaper coverage from three contemporary newspapers- *The London Times*, *The Irish Times* and *The Illustrated London News*, with a focus on what the Irish and British public knew and understood about the death of the Prince Imperial. In order to achieve this, the article will include background to the death of the prince, along with contemporary and modern critique and see how they related to the issues raised in the newspapers.

In March 1856 the Empress Eugenie, wife to Napoleon III of France, gave birth to the future of the Bonaparte’s Imperial Dynasty- Louis Napoleon. From his birth he was surrounded by the past glories of his great-uncle and of France, and was introduced into the army at the age of nine months, becoming a member of the 1st Imperial Guard Regiment. In his teenage years he became an excellent horseman and swordsman while following his father as an observer to the battlefields of the Franco-Prussian War in 1870. The defeat of the Second Empire of Napoleon led to the family’s exile in England with the future of Imperial France almost destroyed. The family were welcomed enthusiastically by England, despite Queen Victoria viewing the situation as a political embarrassment which greatly annoyed many French. Louis joined the Royal Military Academy at Woolwich with the support of the Duke of Cambridge, and excelled in class and accepted an invitation to join the Royal Artillery at the age of eighteen. When his father died he took the title Napoleon IV and waited for his recall to France to reclaim the family throne. However, his involvement with the British Army was seen as scandalous to many French people.

Following the defeat at Isandlwana, soldiers were being dispatched to Zululand to reinforce the already depleted forces of the centre column. Louis, in a bid to see action, made public his reasons for his decision to volunteer saying it was to show his gratitude to the Queen but, according to the author Morris, he had more pressing reasons. Gaining his first military experience would put further precedent to the French throne and make his claim legitimate and also the Zulus were the perfect adversary which would not cause outrage in comparison to fighting a continental power for the English.(1). In order to calm any problems and distress with his party (2) in France, he would be sent as an observer with no meaningful military role. The Duke of Cambridge wrote a letter to the already burdened Lord Chelmsford with the information pertaining to the prince’s role in the army in Zululand. It reads,

...the Prince Imperial who is going out on his own account to see as much as he can of the coming campaign in Zululand. He is extremely anxious to go out and wanted to be employed in our army...if you show him kindness and tender him a position to see as much as he can with the columns in the Field I hope you will do so. He is a fine young fellow, full of spirit and pluck...My only anxiety on his conduct would be, that he is too plucky and go ahead.(3) The final words in the letter would prove to be fatefully correct.

Louis was permitted to join the forces in Zululand only as an unofficial spectator. He made himself useful in the camp by performing a variety of tasks with enthusiasm. He also joined many of the scouting missions that were being made by the Second Division, in preparation for locating a new camp site closer to the target of the Zulu capital. Louis’ ‘plucky and go ahead’ nature was illustrated early on in his campaign when, on patrol with Colonel Buller, he rode ahead to give chase to some lone Zulus in the surrounding hills without support or knowledge of the ground ahead. Despite Louis returning unharmed after an unsuccessful foray, Buller was outraged by the

actions of the young French prince, and wrote a letter of complaint to Lord Chelmsford. The commander-in-chief agreed and ordered the senior officer Colonel Harrison, who was responsible for identifying suitable routes for transport, to keep Louis in the camp at all times unless strong escort was provided. Louis himself saw these orders expressing the concerns for his safety but he ignored them.

On the first day of June, Louis in his usual eager manner, asked Colonel Harrison to allow him to complete the topographical sketches that he had begun on the new campsite and the regions beyond. According to Ian Knight, the patrol was hardly needed on the justification of military grounds, but on the excuse that Louis was bored with camp life and wished to make himself useful and active. (4) Harrison saw no danger in sending the prince out, as the area that he would visit had been already been searched for Zulus, and was in seeing distance of the original camp site, with mounted men scouting the surrounding areas. Lieutenant Carey, who had formed a strong bond with the prince, volunteered to accompany the escort and to supervise and give guidance on the young man's sketches. However, Harrison failed to appoint someone to command the escort, and this would lead to debate after the death of the prince; 'who was actually was in command during the time the patrol was away from the camp?'

The men who formed the small escort were Carey, Sergeant Willis, Corporal Grubb and Troopers Cochrane, Le Tocq, Abel, Rogers and a Zulu guide. During the journey there was an opportunity to add further troops to the patrol, but Louis declined, believing that the patrol was strong enough. They rode for some hours until arriving at an abandoned kraal where the prince dismounted to continue the maps he had begun and drink coffee with the men. Carey decided that the area was a poor choice, due to the fact there was decent cover surrounding the area that would allow a swift ambush. Louis overruled him. After some time, a lone Zulu was spotted in the nearby hills and this persuaded Louis to order the men to saddle up and mount. However, the horses were off grazing and it took ten minutes to assemble. While the men had been relaxing in the area, other Zulus who were aware of their position had crept around the kraal in a bid to surround them. While there would be a debate of who was in charge of the patrol, responsibility would fall on Carey for not ordering or at least, suggesting that a picket should have been in place. A man of his experience and usual vigilance would not be excused for his indecision which proved fateful. Just as the prince and Carey issued the order to mount, shots rang out and...

I saw the black faces of Zulus about twenty yards off, rushing towards us...I thought that all were mounted...I judged better to clear the long grass before making a stand. Knowing from experience the bad shooting of the Zulus, I did not expect anyone was injured...a man said to me 'I fear the Prince is killed, Sir.' I paused looked back, and, seeing the Prince's horse galloping on the other side of the donga, asked if it was any use returning.(5)

The prince, unable to mount his horse, met his end making a brave stand with his face to the enemy. He received seventeen assegai wounds in the cause of British imperialism. Abel and Rogers were also killed and disembowelled as Carey and the men fled from the scene. The men galloped for miles until meeting Buller's patrol in the vicinity. After telling the unbelievable truth that the prince was dead, Buller replied, 'You ought to be shot and I hope you will be. I could shoot you myself'.(6) When news reached the camp, it was first thought as a joke but the seriousness soon dawned on the men. The war had been plagued with bad luck since Isandlwana, and as soon as the new invasion was gaining momentum, a single death occurred causing important political ramifications. Chelmsford, who had suffered so much in the campaign, 'is awfully cut up about it as he will be blamed for letting him go with so small an escort'.(7)

Due to the failing light, it was thought advisable to wait until reveille next morning before beginning the search for the body, so as not to lose any more lives. While the camp settled down for the night, Carey wrote a letter to his wife, deeply depressed and shocked at the day's ordeal. However the content of the letter, would soon back-fire and disgrace him for life. He wrote...

I am a ruined man, I fear, though from my letter which will be in the papers you will see I could not do anything else. Still the loss of the Prince is a fearful thing...Our camp was bad, but then, I have been so laughed at for taking a squadron with me that I have grown reckless and would have gone with two men...As regards leaving the Prince, I am

innocent...I shall be blamed but honestly between you and me, I can only be blamed for the camp...(8)

The following day, Chelmsford sent out a recovering party to retrieve the young prince. The party found the body of the prince and the two other men badly mutilated which followed Zulu custom.(9) Chelmsford had also sent his staff surgeon, Surgeon-Major Scott to inspect the body, and the following lines are from his report at the scene. He explained...

He was lying on his back, with his left arm across him, in the position of self defence. I counted eighteen assegai wounds all in front...There were no bullet wounds on the body...There was a patch of blood, underneath the head and the neck, which appeared to me to be caused by wounds received on the side of the neck, and also a wound through the right eye-ball. The prince's body was entirely stripped.(10)

After that fateful Sunday, Carey tried to continue his duties but due to the continuing pressure from his colleagues who placed the blame on him, he requested an inquest to exonerate himself. His request was accepted. Carey was tried by general court martial. The court charged him with deserting the Prince and misbehaving in front of the enemy and, despite his good defence, he was found guilty and sent home. To his surprise, when he arrived home he was received by the public with great enthusiasm who saw him as a hero. The Queen and several royal members were disgusted by Carey abandoning Louis to his fate, yet surprisingly they were in the minority.

The main question to be asked at this point in the eyes of the public and the media was who was to blame for the death of the Prince Imperial of France? Scholarly research into the event over the years have made several attempts to understand who was responsible for the incident, with the blame being firmly rested on the shoulders of Carey, but noted discrepancies against Louis himself, Harrison, and even Lord Chelmsford. Author Saul David, believes that the flight of Carey and his men from the kraal was poor judgement and should have attempted to rally his men and head back to the prince.(11) On the question of rallying the men, Ian Knight says that the attempt to rally would have been useless to those who had fallen, and would have probably caused the death of the rest of the patrol needlessly.(12) Yet as Knight explains that 'the appearance of courage was sometimes more important than courage itself',(13), which holds much truth as the pride that the British soldier took in demonstrating bravery and honour in the face of the enemy, disregarding their own safety. Carey's court martial was overturned due to lack of evidence and he was allowed to return to the army. However, due to his persistence in trying to rid himself of the guilt in the eyes of the prince's mother, he kept writing letters to persuade her to hold an audience with him. Being tired of the insensitivity of Carey, she published the letter that he wrote to his wife on the night the Prince died. It showed that Carey was guilty of cowardice which disgraced him. He died a lonely man, obscure within his own regiment in 1883. The death of the prince was a sad, tragic event, yet it did nothing to hamper the increasing momentum of British victories. Despite its huge media attention, it was, as Charles Newman said 'the death of the Prince Imperial...can only be regarded as a minor episode of the campaign, especially from a military point of view'.(14)

After the defeat at Isandlwana, the war took on national interest, with many correspondents sent to report on the conflict to satisfy the demands of public curiosity. Within the camp that Louis had been attached, there were numerous war correspondents from *The London Times*, *The Evening Standard*, *The Illustrated London News* and the French paper *Le Figaro*. These writers could never have imagined the story that was about to break and yet they were granted the biggest media story of the year.(15) The night the body was brought back into the camp, *The Illustrated London News* artist, Melton Prior, was busy by candle-light drawing the first images of the death of Louis.

As already mentioned, the death of the prince, heir to the French Imperial throne, was a media sensation throughout the civilised world. The death was a shock to the French people, and a major embarrassment for the British. The three papers that are the basis for the article will be discussed presently, to illustrate how the media handled the affair, and more importantly who they held accountable for such an avoidable incident. *The Illustrated London News* provided the first images to the world of the final moments of Louis's life, yet more importantly to the research it embodied much written accounts and analysis that can now be outlined and discussed. The first reports came in on 28 June, nearly a month after the incident, and similar to the other two papers the death of the prince's was met with sincere grief. As expected the first intelligence surrounding the prince's

death is vague so more attention is focused on the views of British and European statesmen and monarchy. The paper is quick to point out that the War Office and Horse Guards had no part to play in encouraging Louis to go on the expedition, but went 'on his own account'.(16) This is mentioned again in the next paragraph, which shows clearly to the reader that the paper is trying to distance any thought of conspiracy by the government or the Queen, which was believed by some.

While researching Isandlwana, the same paper questioned the validity of the war by the British and *The Illustrated London News* pushes forward that argument again with the prince as an example. It reads that 'the tragical [sic] death of the Prince Imperial in an insignificant foray...seems to be read by little profit...such manliness, modesty, gentleness, and high-trained intelligence snatched from this life by the hands of a few barbarians'.(17) The paper is illustrating that the death of the prince was insignificant in the sense of the cause for which he was involved for. The proud prince 'was the most inglorious casualty'.(18) The paper took great effort to show how they perceived the prince, by giving detailed background to Louis and his family. They noted the great rivalry that existed between the two nations, but there was an honour in the fact that Louis represented himself so well in British military tradition. The stories of the grieving Empress would have really touched the nation, supported by Queen Victoria. The images that are shown in the paper give a sense of how the prince was perceived by the press, with pictures of him in his mother's arms and his final days. He was on the cover of many issues of the paper, and with the continued interest lasting until his funeral; the public were certainly gripped by the death of the prince.

While it is important and interesting to give more insight on how the death of the prince was perceived, the real focus of the following paragraphs is on the opinions of *The Illustrated London News* and their readers on who was to blame? At the beginning of the press coverage and before detailed reports became available, there was the popular opinion that it was just a misfortune of war and purely an accident. Yet the paper was quick to establish that the War Office and Horse Guards could not be held responsible for the death. So who was to blame?

On the fifth of July, *The Illustrated London News*, reported details of the death of the Prince, with accounts from the participants at the court-martial. The evidence was from Lieutenant Carey, Sergeant Willis, Corporal Grubb, Trooper Cochrane, and Trooper Letocq. The evidence supplied by Carey can be seen as a man trying to shift the responsibility of command to the prince, reinforcing his earlier opinion that the prince was in charge of the patrol. Throughout he mentions in several cases that it was the prince's decision and ideas that shaped the patrol's movement and safety. Carey said that he asked the prince should they wait for a stronger escort to join them, and Louis replied, 'Oh no; we are quite strong enough'.(19) In another incident, Carey says that he suggested to the prince that the group should off-saddle in a location but Louis wished to choose the kraal as an area to rest. Before the attack, Carey said he suggested that they should saddle-up and move on but the prince said to 'wait another ten minutes'.(20) He admits that there were no precautions by placing a guard in the area, but he fails to mention that this was his duty. With the information given that the prince gave orders to the patrol, the reader may assume that precautions were Louis's responsibility, and Carey did his best to prevent any danger occurring.

From the other evidence recorded, they all mentioned that the prince was giving orders to the men, yet Corporal Grubbs in answering the question who was leading the retreat, said it was Lieutenant Carey. It shows a similar trait to Lieutenant Harward at Ntombe, that Carey, who neglected the safety of the men, was now leading the retreat. The story hardly portrays the heroics that fill the British annals. The evidence from Letocq further expresses that nothing was done to help the prince and the other two men left behind. He was asked 'Were any orders given to stop or rally, or try to save the Prince? He answered 'no'.(21) Carey believed that, due to the bad shooting of the Zulus, he did not think anyone was injured and continued the retreat for some time. While it was clear from their testimonies that they believed that the prince was probably killed at the beginning, no one is critical of their own actions. Yet it was heard from Letocq that Carey said 'lets us make haste, and go quickly', (22) which sums up the reality of their escape, as no attempt was made even to recover the body or show some defiant defence at a different position. While it may have been useless to do something, an act of bravery may have made the situation a bit more bearable for Carey and something the army and the public would like to hear.

The following week, the paper includes the verdict of the court martial on the actions of Carey. The information is accurate so the readers now had the chance to read a full account of the findings of the court compared to the evidence given in the paper the week before. The main findings read ‘the court is of the opinion that Lieutenant Carey did not understand the position in which he stood to the prince’ and that ‘the court deeply regrets that no effort was made to rally the escort’.(23) While the evidence is against Carey, including testimony given by Harrison, the paper does not condemn the actions of him. Immediately after the information is published on the court findings, the paper goes straight into a short narration of Carey’s life in the military and speaks very highly over him. However the position of *The Illustrated London News* is highlighted on the death of the prince on the thirtieth of August. The paper believes that the acquittal of Carey for the responsibility of the death of the prince is fair but makes no attempt to establish who was to blame. They publish some words from the Duke of Cambridge, expressing that Chelmsford did all he could for the safety for the Prince, but Harrison failed to explain the orders to Carey thus leading Carey to misinterpret them. The paper does little to express their opinions on the incident, with more interest in the funeral of the young man than his actual death. They clearly believed that Carey was innocent but no mention is made if Harrison was also innocent. The words expressed by the Duke put Harrison in the frame, yet the paper makes no attempt to point any finger and leaves it entirely up for the reader to decide.

The Irish Times, from the beginning of their first reports on the incident, reflected the same opinion and material as *The Illustrated London News* published. They released vague reports of the event with more of an emphasis on the great legacy of the Bonaparte family and the effect the death of Louis would have in politics in France and the rest of Europe. Yet a key difference emerges in the Irish paper, as unlike *The Illustrated London News*, it has a more personal element involving the public readers. A poem was written a day after the first announcement of the death of Louis, and it is clear that his death had a strong effect on the Irish public. The poem is rather long so the last few lines are as follows, and express the deep regret the public held. It reads...

And France doth weep, Republic through see be
Whilst Britain mourns him martyr’d in her cause
E’eu thoughtless natures mid their pleasures pause
And eyes regretful tremble feelingly
That he so hopeful and young should die. (24)

Throughout the paper, there are letters and messages of condolences from European statesmen and monarchy, with church services held in the great cities including Rome. Yet this was not lost on the Irish public. The people of County Cork and Cork Corporation had a meeting to vote whether they should express their condolences to Empress Eugenie for her loss, as ‘the feeling in Cork and its neighbourhood is one of widespread regret at the melancholy fate which has befallen the Prince Imperial’.(25) From that it reinforces the idea that the public at large felt great sympathy for the young man and his mother.

As to where the blame should be placed, *The Irish Times* did not hide from revealing information and opinions that may have affected the reader’s judgement. Unlike *The Illustrated London News* the Irish paper released information from French papers and correspondents on the death of the prince, on who was to blame. The less jingoistic paper illustrated the opinion of the French, with blame resting on Chelmsford and the soldiers that accompanied the prince. The French ‘are daily becoming more trenchant in their criticism of the conduct of Lord Chelmsford in allowing the prince to expose his life the way he did and especially of his companions of the reconnaissance expedition in leaving him to his fate’.(26) Another article expresses that the prince died ‘whether by the unpardonable negligence of Lord Chelmsford or by the cowardice, unworthy of English soldiers of which those composed the reconnaissance’.(27) It is a strong judgement, yet it can be understood that tensions and grief were running high and criticism would be expected. It seems harsh though to blame Chelmsford as, from the beginning, he did not want the extra burden of a royal celebrity to control. The criticism that is expressed on the actions of the soldiers’ ‘cowardice’ can be seen as legitimate. The evidence supplied to the media shows that the men did not make a stand and left the Frenchman to his death, even though by that stage nothing could have been done. Yet the French people could have seen it as convenient that the English would leave

behind a man of a higher order in life to 'savages' in a remote donga. Suspicions within France believed a conspiracy was at hand resulting in his death.

While the French may have been eager for swift justice towards Carey, the Germans took a different view. *The Irish Times* published a statement from the German Military Press believing that nothing could have been done to save the prince. Their take on the incident is quite blunt as it reads that if the men stayed behind it would have been 'uselessly dying with him' for the reason 'bearing in mind that this was a case of a foreign spectator in a position of peril which he had voluntarily sought'.(28) They believed that the court-martial of Carey should not be harsh as it should take into consideration that if the prince had not fallen but others had, prosecution would have not followed. It has to be considered that relations between France and German were extremely poor after the Franco-German War, and it seems the Germans were taking the side of a British man over a member of the Imperial Family for spite. Their assessment of the death of Louis's was that he volunteered to join the army and he must therefore be 'prepared to meet a soldier's fate. Rank and position must look for no distinction there'.(29) It is certainly bleak and direct on the matter, yet it does hold some strong truths within their judgement.

The contrasting opinion between these two countries is very interesting. The French grieved by the death of their prince, following the Queens Colour's, was perceived as a grave injustice, for which someone needed to be blamed. While the Germans were more direct in their opinion, it may be due to their animosity towards the French, or quite simply, the German military hierarchy were men of great tradition from the ideals of Prussia, and death is simply a part of war and one needs to accept that. However, for the Irish there were questions to be asked and answered as the paper believed it was vastly important for the honour of the country. The writer states that while they are expecting information from Chelmsford, they are more eager to hear from Carey as he is said to be an Irishman. The reason he was proposed to be Irish is unclear as Carey was born in Leicestershire and his father was also English. Yet his supposed country of origin was 'anxious for the proof they feel assured...that he did his duty like a soldier...for the hope of a great people'.(30) Throughout the text, there seems to be a sincere fear from the writer, that Carey may have been a coward and let the country and Empire down. Despite this the writer is professional and does not let any bias interfere with his work. He asks many questions regarding the incident. He speaks of the sheer neglect of the patrol for the choice of area, and not sending any guard to scout the area. The writer is bemused by the fact that the patrol was in utter panic, in which he relates it to a stampede, did nothing to 'attempt to help a follow officer in distress'.(31) He worries about the effect that this will have on the reputation of the British military, its officers and the Empire.

Another article that appears in *The Irish Times*, shows clear resolution in the fact that Carey should be exonerated from blame for the incident and also supports the writings of the *Army and Navy Gazette*, 'for its manly defence of the abused Captain Carey'.(32) The Irish paper clearly supports their fellow Irishman Carey and believes that the case before him is wrong and unjust.(33) It signals out that *Army and Navy Gazette* is the only paper that unfortunate officers can rely on to state facts and remain unbiased. The journal 'is capable of keeping a clear head when all others go in to a frenzy, directly a soldier is guilty of error, or imaginary error'.(34) The support of such a strong journal in Britain, and the main paper in Ireland, would have brought welcome relief to burdened Carey, which he would exploit. The defence of Carey shows other clear indications that *The Irish Times*, were going to publish opinions that were to show their support for the man, as well as 'their appreciation of his gallantry as an officer'.(35) The sheer amount of encouragement expressed in the paper, coinciding with the article that had some doubts and reservations of the action of Carey, illustrates that *The Irish Times*, were entirely within the influence of the British Empire. The writers for the paper show how many of the ideals of being British and their prestige was being absorbed into Irish culture, with a sincere fear of an Irishman betraying the honour of Ireland and Britain in the face of the world.

The London Times reporting on the death of Louis, began in similar fashion with little information on how the death occurred but more on the international grief that was being expressed as well as the political aftermath that would ensue. While reports began to appear from Carey on his explanation on the events that unfolded, it was not until the question of court-martial, that the paper began to surpass the other papers in analysis and opinion. On 23 August, the paper released the statement of the court findings of the case against Carey, with words expressing that he was in

'command' of the patrol. *The London Times* immediately begins to dissect the information in a direct and sensible manner. The paper builds up a defence for Carey, not on the grounds of being a scapegoat or unfairly convicted by superiors, but on military regulations. It reads that Carey was in command only because he was the senior officer in charge, yet because he did not understand the position he was in during the patrol, 'he would be free from blame both morally and legally'.(36) It goes on to say that Carey was placed in this position due to unclear orders of Harrison in organising the party but also due to Carey's ignorance that he was a junior officer to the prince. Unlike the other papers it is clearly using the evidence to help to generate a coherent appraisal of the situation without being biased to any particular aspect or person.

With regards misbehaviour in front of the enemy, the paper asks the question, Did Captain Carey's conduct reasonably fall within this description? The writer believes that had Carey gathered his patrol after the attack and went back looking for the prince, it would have resulted in their death. He makes the sensible argument that the idea of the patrol is not to fight, but to remain alive and bring back information. Had Carey returned to the kraal immediately 'he might have surrounded his memory with undying fame; but he would have achieved no useful result'.(37) The paper is in full confidence that Carey should not have been found guilty, but unlike the other papers, that conclusion was founded on excellent analysis of the situation coinciding with in-depth military rules and regulations to form a strong argument that some modern historians believe in today. A letter by Adjutant-General to the General Officer in South Africa, C.H Ellice, shows his opinions on the situation with blame resting more on the shoulders of Harrison who began 'that train of events'(38) for not following strict orders on the duties of Louis. He writes that Chelmsford gave strict orders that he must be contacted before Louis underwent any expedition to distant regions with a strong escort and accompanied by an officer. Blame begins to be placed on Harrison for not seeking Chelmsford's permission in allowing Louis out of the camp, and also 'his orders to Lieutenant Carey were not sufficiently explicit, and he failed to impress upon the prince the duty of deferring to the military orders of the officer who accompanied him'.(39) As mentioned, the actions of Harrison, in the writers' opinion, had a knock-on effect on the conduct of Carey, who believed that Louis held a military superior rank to his own, yet the writer is correct to mention that even though there were defective orders given, Carey's vast military experience should have guided him to do his duty. The Adjutant-General is unscrupulous in his criticism of Harrison, which was an aspect missing from most reports of the three papers researched. While he is critical of the conduct of Carey, he refrains in giving the opinion that he is wholly to blame for the disaster. This may be due to a clear analysis of the evidence for which he obtained, or perhaps maybe due to the increasing support for Carey in wider public circles, that made him hold his reservations on the issue.

During these debates on the death of Carey, the conservative papers and the wider public sphere, held the opinion that Carey should be free of all charges and any guilt. Yet, as expected, there were some aspects that were in total contrast to the educated debates of the media. *The Irish Times* reported that in England there were several death threats made on the life of Carey, with even societies formed to deal out their justice on him. The threats were made through several letters posted to him, which were then handed over to Scotland Yard for further investigation. From this evidence, it was clear that a minority held Carey to blame for the incident which may have come from French Bonaparte's supporters living in England wanting to exact revenge for the death of their prince.

As mentioned, it was clear that the majority of the public were in full support of Carey, to his surprise. Yet from the research provided by *The London Times*, he became extremely accustomed to the media spotlight, with several newspaper interviews and speeches that he made to express thanks to the people. However, from the information in the paper, he tries to force the issue of his innocence with constant mention of his hard struggle since June. Several examples are seen with a bid to increase public sympathy. In a letter which was published in *The London Times*, voicing thanks to the public for supporting him, and repeatedly mentioning the hardship that he had been through in his ordeal, he says, 'I felt sorrow, not for anything I had done or left undone, but for the unhappy position in which I found myself placed through no fault of my own...I have done nothing to be ashamed of'.(40) He believes the confidence of the people helped him to be vindicated and

remain honourable to his country and army. The public support undoubtedly helped Carey from the beginning and the increasing support allowed him to attempt his own public relations campaign.

His campaign took the role of mentioning his innocence repeatedly to force the issue into the public mind, and even though he had majority support, it is clear that he needed everyone to believe him. This is illustrated when he writes ‘I regret that there is still some censure resting on me, as the supposed commander of the escort but I assure you, Sir, that I feel it unmerited, though hard to explain away, and I hope yet to exculpate myself’.(41) He also mentions God many times, suggesting that divinity helped the public see that he was innocent. With this in mind, he was a religious man, but focusing on God, may help him seem faithful and truthful in the eyes of the Christian community in England. The sheer amount of media presence led him to believe that he was free from guilt in the public’s eyes, yet one person still would not hold an audience with him, the one that he wanted so much. The popularity that he received in the public made him misjudge that the establishment was also of the same opinion. He was wrong. His continuous request to see the Empress, and his tasteless public campaign led to his ultimate downfall.

The press coverage of the death of the Prince Imperial surpassed all other media stories of that year. Of the three papers, while conveying mostly of the same information, it was *The London Times*, which benefited the readers the most. While all the papers agreed the conclusion that Carey was innocent, *The London Times* was able to give detailed analysis of the events that led to an educated decision. The paper was able to take advantage of the evidence and decide the outcome in a knowledgeable manner. *The Illustrated London News* main contribution to the death of the prince was the first images produced on the event, but other than that, they offered the basic information *The London Times* and *The Irish Times* contained. The Irish paper was interested in the international opinions of Britain and Europe, yet it exposed fully how incorporated they were with the British and Empire’s attitude to bravery and courage.

What did the article portray about Ireland during the time of the Anglo-Zulu War? The research illustrates how far Ireland had become attached to Britain and its Empire, by adopting many of the features such as bravery, prestige, honour, the idea of the hero and the pride of dying for the sacrifice of Empire. Throughout many of the reports it was clear that there was no cultural barrier between Britain and Ireland, with expressed regret when a member of their country dishonoured their ‘parent’ nation. Considering during these years the ever growing political movement of Irish Home Rule, the information that was gathered from *The Irish Times* would have indicated that Ireland was in no mood for self-governance and wished to remain a part of the expanding Empire.

Index.

1. Donald R. Morris, *The washing of the spears: the rise and fall of the great Zulu nation* (London, 1966) p 518.
2. After the Prince’s death there was great uncertainty over the future of the Imperialists Party in France which had its power uprooted after the Franco-Prussian War. With Louis’ death ‘the possibility of a return of the Empire must appear more and more shadowy...the Republic may thus gain in stability by the partial disappearance of one competitor’. *The London Times*, 20 June, 1879.
3. Letter taken from Morris, *The washing of the spears*, pp 516-517.
4. Ian Knight, *With his face to the foe: the life and death of Louis Napoleon, The Prince Imperial, Zululand 1879* (Kent, 2001) p 186.
5. *The Illustrated London News*, 5 July, 1879.
6. Saul David, *Zulu: the heroism and tragedy of the Zulu War of 1879* (London, 2004) p 326.
7. Morris, *The washing of the spears*, p 531.
8. Letter taken from, Morris, *The washing of the spears*, pp 532-533.
9. The custom of a Zulu warrior was if he killed he was permitted to slit the victim’s stomach to allow its soul to escape. This was seen terribly at the battle of Isandlwana with severe

mutilation of corpses that would shock the Victorian public and further reinforced their 'civilised' ideology.

10. *The National Army Museum*, Surgeon-Major F.B Scott, Army Medical Staff (6807-386-11-6312/180).

11. David, *Zulu: the heroism and tragedy of the Zulu War of 1879*, p 325.

12. Knight, *With his face to the foe*, p 261.

13. *Ibid*, p 207.

14. Charles Norris-Newman, *In Zululand with the British Army: The Anglo-Zulu War of 1879 through the first-hand experiences of a special correspondent* (London, 1880) p 206.

15. The death of the Prince Imperial was the highest ranking press coverage of the year 1879, with the marriage of the Duke of Connaught to Princess Louise of Prussia in second, and in third place the defeat at Isandlwana.

16. *The Illustrated London News*, 28 June, 1879.

17. *Ibid*.

18. *Ibid*.

19. *Ibid*, 5 July, 1879.

20. *Ibid*.

21. *Ibid*.

22. *Ibid*.

23. *Ibid*, 12 July, 1879.

24. *The Irish Times*, 21 June, 1879.

25. *Ibid*, 28 June, 1879.

26. *Ibid*, 5 July, 1879.

27. *Ibid*.

28. *Ibid*, 31 July, 1879.

29. *Ibid*.

30. *Ibid*, 28 June, 1879.

31. *Ibid*.

32. *Ibid*, 16 August, 1879.

33. Carey was promoted to Captain due to good conduct days before the death of the prince. His promotion was mentioned in dispatches but he did not realise this until he arrived back in England, with the press calling him by his new title.

34. *The Irish Times*, 16 August, 1879.

35. *Ibid*, 21 August, 1879.

36. *The London Times*, 23 August, 1879.

37. *Ibid*.

38. *Ibid*, 27 August, 1879.

39. *Ibid*.

40. *Ibid*, 29 August, 1879.

41. *Ibid*.

