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Abstract

Ernst Lissauer’s “Haßgesang gegen England” is an Anglophobic German poem, written in the early weeks of the First World War. This thesis examines the poem’s reception in the German and English-speaking worlds, the imitations it inspired, the opposition it provoked, and the enduring discourse it instigated. The study begins by outlining Lissauer’s biography, and places his “Haßgesang” within the context of contemporary German poetry of hate. It discusses the changing reception of the poem in the German-speaking world over time, and the many and varied German works it inspired. The “Haßgesang” is shown to have captured the Zeitgeist of Germany at the beginning of the First World War, but to have been later rejected by the German public and renounced by its author, while the war still raged. The poem also established a discourse on hatred and hatefulness as motivating factors in war, sparking debate on both sides. In the English-speaking world, the “Haßgesang” was viewed by some as a useful insight into the national psyche of the Germans, while for others it merely confirmed existing stereotypes of Germans as a hateful people. As an example of propaganda in reverse the poem can hardly be bettered, inspiring parodies, cartoons, soldiers’ slang and music hall numbers, almost all engineered to subvert the poem’s hateful message.

The New Zealand reception provides a useful case study of the reception of the poem in the English-speaking world, linking reportage of overseas responses with new, locally produced ones. New Zealand emerges as a geographically distant but remarkably well-informed corner of the British Empire. Regardless of the poem’s literary quality, its role as a vehicle for propaganda, satire and irony singles it out as a powerful document of its time: one which cut across all strata of society from the ruling elite to the men in the trenches, and which became an easily recognised symbol around the globe.
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Introduction

Carrots or beets, we hate them not,
We love them not, we hate them not.
Of all the things that land on our plate
There’s only one that we loath [sic] and hate;
We love a hundred, we hate but one,
And that we’ll hate till kingdom come—

Sauer Kraut.¹

Newspaper readers of today might be surprised to encounter this verse on page six of their morning’s paper. They might be further surprised to learn of the connection this culinary doggerel has with German poetry of the First World War. By contrast, readers of the Christchurch Sun newspaper in July 1915 would have immediately recognised this (and the two stanzas which followed it) as a parody of Ernst Lissauer’s provocative anti-English poem “Haßgesang gegen England” (hereafter simply “Haßgesang”). Such parodies, and responses to his poem in other forms, were strategies to subvert its hateful message.

In his survey of war poetry: Fighting Songs and Warring Words: Popular Lyrics of the Two World Wars, Brian Murdoch identifies Lissauer’s poem as having had “a particularly powerful effect.”² He notes that it “was one of the most significant poems of the First World War, although it rarely appears in anthologies.”³ Remarkably, for a German poem of the First World War, the “Haßgesang” became known around the world soon after its publication early in the conflict, and Lissauer himself achieved a rare degree of international notoriety because of this work. However, “unlike other poems of a similar nature it was not revived under the Nazis, because Lissauer (who by then regretted the work, and who died in 1937) was a Jew, but it was recalled with some frequency on the Allied side in the Second World War.”⁴ Indeed, the poem’s use as propaganda on both sides is one of the striking features of the work investigated in this thesis. Its notoriety during the First World War and the interwar


³This is certainly true of English language anthologies, but the poem was frequently anthologised in German language anthologies both during and after the First World War.

⁴Murdoch, Brian. Fighting Songs and Warring Words. 33.
years contrasts with its neglect in the post-World War Two period. After 1945 Lissauer and his oeuvre were largely forgotten, apart from occasional mentions in the few scholarly appraisals of German poetry of the First World War.

Patrick Bridgwater, author of The German Poets of the First World War, assesses the “Haßgesang” as worthless in poetic terms, though interesting as a document. By contrast, Murdoch has a more nuanced view. He argues that “the sentiment is hardly admirable, but as a war poem it manifests a sustained attitude, albeit an hysterical one, in an undeniably functional way. Its reception as a war poem on both sides in its own time, and by a modern reader merit consideration. It remains one of the most important pieces of the First World War.” The present thesis aims to make precisely this examination of the poem’s reception in the German and English-speaking worlds, concluding with a close consideration of its reception in New Zealand.

The approach taken in this project has involved examination of a wide variety of English and German-language periodicals and newspapers dating from the beginning of the First World War until the beginning of the Second, including material from Austria-Hungary, Germany, Great Britain, the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. In particular, references to Lissauer’s poem, responses to it (articles, editorials, letters to the editor), and evidence of productive responses (other poems inspired by the “Haßgesang,” or composed in opposition to it; parodies, cartoons and musical settings) have been sought. In addition to establishing the international reach of the poem, the changing responses over time to both the poem and the poet have been plotted, particularly in the German-speaking world.

Much of this thesis consists of original research made possible through online access to primary sources in digital archives around the world. Commemorations of the centenary of the First World War have resulted in many archives digitising large volumes of First World War material. Many major newspapers and magazines from the early years of the twentieth century have been digitised recently and made available online to researchers, in many cases for the first time. The Leo Baeck Institute – Center for Jewish History in New York has digitised and published online much of Lissauer’s unpublished literary estate, including many handwritten biographical notes, lists of works and diaries. Much of the material presented in

---


6 Murdoch, Brian. Fighting Songs and Warring Words. 35.
this thesis would have been impossible to gather as recently as ten years ago without leaving New Zealand and visiting these archives in person.

The approach to the topic of Lissauer’s “Haßgesang” uses primary sources to gauge the contemporary reaction to the poem from German and Allied sides, and secondary sources to determine the scholarly assessment of its place in poetic production of the First World War, and its broader role in public discourse during the war.

Surprisingly little research has been done on German poetry of the First World War. There are only two substantial English-language studies: Bridgwater’s *German Poets of the First World War* and Elisabeth Marsland’s *The Nation's Cause: French, English, and German Poetry of the First World War*. Bridgwater approaches the subject through an analysis of the work of a narrow selection of major poets. Marsland offers a broader view, comparing French, English and German poetry of the war, including popular and occasional verse. Neither devote more than a couple of sentences to the “Haßgesang” or its international reception.

The two most comprehensive studies to date of Lissauer’s life and work are *Am wilden Zeitenpass: Motive und Themen im Werk des deutsch-jüdischen Dichters Ernst Lissauer* by Rainer Brändle, and *German-Jewish Cultural Identity from 1900 to the Aftermath of the First World War* by Elisabeth Albanis, both of which I have drawn on for details of Lissauer’s biography and his writing of the “Haßgesang.”

This thesis is divided into three chapters, looking at the German-speaking, English-speaking, and specifically New Zealand receptions of the poem, respectively. Each chapter is further divided into sections examining aspects of the topic. The first chapter looks at Lissauer and the “Haßgesang” in the context of German poetry at the beginning of the war. The chapter documents Lissauer’s rapid rise to fame within Germany, which came about because of his poem’s success at capturing the *Zeitgeist* in a way no other poets had managed. Also reviewed is other German poetry of hate either inspired by or contemporaneous with the

---

“Haßgesang.” The subsequent backlash against Lissauer and his poem from within Germany is investigated, along with the poet’s later expressions of regret for having written the poem. The chapter ends with an appraisal of the neglect Lissauer’s work has suffered in the eighty years since his death.

The second chapter investigates the reception of the “Haßgesang” in the English-speaking world, where it became popularly known as the “Hymn of Hate.” The poem’s translation into English by Barbara Henderson is discussed, along with this translation’s subsequent publication in the *New York Times*, the London *Times* and *Spectator* newspapers, and then other papers throughout the English-speaking world. Archibald Henderson’s plea for a “better understanding of the German situation” in (the then) neutral US is considered in light of the two poems he chose to illustrate his point: Lissauer’s “Haßgesang” and William Watson’s “To the Troubler of the World.” Mark Van Wienen’s study of American political poetry of the First World War, *Partisans and Poets*, is useful here in its exploration of the remarkable poetic exchange that followed the first publication of Lissauer’s poem in translation.

British responses to the poem are then examined, particularly the responses of professional poets such Hardy and Kipling, who in contrast to less established versifiers refused to meet Lissauer on his own terms, preferring not to stoop to mere parodic response. Humour, too, was a mechanism through which Lissauer’s bile was frequently transmuted into reverse propaganda, and this thesis appraises the numerous cartoons responding to his “Haßgesang” that appeared in the press. The phrase “Hymn of Hate” entered the popular vocabulary with two different meanings: as a short-hand for “everything that is wrong with the Germans,” and as a metaphor for artillery bombardment. In these senses it was uttered through all strata of society from Members of Parliament down to the soldiers in the trenches, dodging shells as the enemy was at its “morning hate.”

In the final chapter the reception of Lissauer’s poem in New Zealand is considered. Connected to the world through the wonders of telegraphy, New Zealand was geographically isolated but still very much in touch with the unfolding events in Europe during the Great War. New Zealand provides a useful case study in examining responses to the “Hymn of Hate” in that it became a collection point where many responses to the poem published in the English-language press internationally were republished. In addition, local responses appeared in the newspapers lending, at times, a very local inflection to the discourse. Perhaps
more than anything the New Zealand reception illustrates the unprecedented global impact achieved by a poem from a German writer in faraway Berlin.
1. Ernst Lissauer, his “Haßgesang” and its Reception in the German-Speaking World

Ernst Lissauer (1882 – 1937)

Writing in 1987, fifty years after the death of Ernst Lissauer, historian and Holocaust researcher Cesar Aronsfeld noted that the German-Jewish poet was then barely remembered. “Most of his poems (and other literary works) are now forgotten (even, perhaps particularly, in Germany).”¹¹ If Lissauer is remembered at all – anywhere – it is for a single poem, his “Haßgesang gegen England” of 1914.

Stefan Zweig, in his autobiographical work Die Welt von Gestern: Erinnerungen eines Europäers, sketches a rather endearing portrait of his first meeting with Lissauer.¹² Instead of the “schlanken, hartknochigen jungen Mann” Zweig was expecting (due to Lissauer’s “pithy Germanic verses which strove for the utmost brevity”)¹³, he encountered a man:

dick wie ein Faß, ein gemütliches Gesicht über einem doppelten Doppelkinn, ein behäbiges Männchen, übersprudelnd vor Eifer und Selbstgefühl, sich überstotternd im Wort, besessen vom Gedicht und durch keine Gegenwehr abzuhalten, seine Verse immer wieder zu zitieren und zu rezitieren. Mit allen seinen Lächerlichkeiten mußte man ihn doch liebgewinnen, weil er warmherzig war, kameradschaftlich, ehrlich und von einer fast dämonischen Hingabe an seine Kunst.¹⁴

Born and brought up in Berlin, Lissauer was from a wealthy family of silk manufacturers and merchants, and was educated at the Friedrich-Werdersche Gymnasium – at which institution he would have received a thorough grounding in Latin and Greek, as well as in Prussian literature and history.¹⁵ His father Hugo was a published poet, his half-brother Fritz a

¹² This meeting was, presumably, before the First World War, although Zweig gives no date.
¹⁵ Albanis, Elisabeth. German-Jewish Cultural Identity. 221.
musician, and his half-sister Margarete a writer and active member of the women’s movement. From 1902 to 1905 he studied modern German literature in Leipzig and Munich, then worked as a free-lance writer in Dachau until 1907 when he returned to Berlin.

In 1917 Lissauer described the relationship between his Germanness and his Jewishness in an “Autobiographische Skizze” for the literary magazine *Das Literarische Echo*: “In meiner Erziehung betonten meine Eltern das jüdische Element gar nicht. Ich habe mich immer vornehmlich als Deutscher gefühlt, ohne mein Judentum in mir zu unterdrücken.”

Such was the degree of assimilation in Lissauer’s upbringing that one biography goes so far as to state: “Dieser Tradition entsprechend wurde Lissauer ganz ‘als Deutscher’ erzogen.” Indeed, Zweig characterised Lissauer as “vielleicht der preußischste oder preußisch-assimiliertesteste Jude” he had ever known.

Er sprach keine andere lebende Sprache, er war nie außerhalb Deutschlands gewesen. Deutschland war ihm die Welt, und je deutscher etwas war, um so mehr begeisterte es ihn. Yorck und Luther und Stein waren seine Helden, der deutsche Freiheitskrieg sein liebstes Thema, Bach sein musikalischer Gott. […] Niemand kannte besser die deutsche Lyrik, niemand war verliebter, verzauberter in die deutsche Sprache – wie viele Juden, deren Familien erst spät in die deutsche Kultur getreten, war er gläubiger an Deutschland als der gläubigste Deutsche.

Aronsfeld quotes Lissauer (in English and without citing any source) when the poet describes his intense love of German history, art, culture and morality as a “monomania.” Lissauer was well established as a poet and literary editor before the First World War and the success of his “Haßgesang.” By 1912 he had two published volumes of poetry to his credit – *Der Acker* (1907) and *Der Strom* (1912) – and he had edited an anthology of German literature,

---

17 Albanis, Elisabeth. *German-Jewish Cultural Identity*. 221.
18 Quoted in Albanis, Elisabeth. *German-Jewish Cultural Identity*. 220.
21 *Ibid*.
22 Aronsfeld, *op.cit.*, p. 48
In these works Lissauer reveals his early preoccupation with themes of history and tradition. There are calls for both a continuity with the past and for a renewed emphasis on German national unity in his work. Elisabeth Albanis observes that the theme of German national unity in Lissauer’s writing was at its strongest at the outbreak and in the early months of the war. She notes that Lissauer “had used much of his writing to express his strong and undivided affiliation to Germany.”

The historians Werner Mosse and Egmont Zechlin argue that Lissauer’s early writing foresaw the coming of war. This was attributable less to “an intrinsically Jewish perceptiveness of ‘unseen currents of the time’ […] than to a strong identification with German nationalist ideals and aims.” Lissauer’s pre-war diaries also confirm what Albanis describes as a “strong preoccupation with Anglo-German relations, in particular with the arms race.”

An early foray into nationalistic poetry for Lissauer came in the form of a cycle of poems published in 1913, and entitled 1813. This cycle was produced in commemoration of the Prussian war of liberation against Napoleon one hundred years earlier. In this collection Lissauer examined, particularly, the German liberation from French occupation. As Albanis observes, “in these poems he rejected the idea of submitting to foreign rule for reasons of safety and convenience.” Hans-Günther Thalheim sees in Lissauer’s 1813 a poet who “celebrated the ‘people’s war’ as a tradition of future value,” and, as Albanis further asserts, a poet who was “an example of younger writers who particularly identified with nationalistic Prussian sentiment in 1913 and went on to support the war in their wartime writings.”

Lissauer was acutely aware of the similarities between events in 1813 and 1914, and this awareness informed his political views. The anti-Napoleonic forces were united through Friedrich Wilhelm III’s “Aufruf an mein Volk,” which contributed to the Prussian victory.

24 Albanis, op.cit., p. 223.

25 Ibid.

26 Quoted in Albanis, Elisabeth. *German-Jewish Cultural Identity from 1900 to the Aftermath of the First World War*. 223.

27 Albanis, op.cit., p. 223.

28 Aronsfeld, op.cit., p. 48

29 Albanis, op.cit., p. 225.

30 Quoted in Albanis, Elisabeth. *German-Jewish Cultural Identity from 1900 to the Aftermath of the First World War*. 225.

over the French. As Albanis notes, “in 1813, a year after the edict that brought Jews in
Prussia a step closer to civil equality with Christians, [Jewish] men fought as Prussians and
Germans.”32 A century later, Wilhelm II’s speech abolishing party differences to create the
“Burgfrieden,” a civic truce producing a unified stance on the First World War, had a similar
effect: “Ich kenne keine Parteien mehr; Ich kenne nur noch Deutsche.”33

During the war Lissauer served as a volunteer, editing the German sections of the
*Feldwochenschrift*, which was published in German and Hungarian from 1917 to 1918.
Towards the end of the war he was transferred to Berlin, where he worked in the media
department of the Ministry of War. Lissauer continued to write poetry and essays after the
war, and starting in 1919, he began to write plays. His biggest success was the comedy
“Gewalt,” which received its premiere in Frankfurt in 1924. A year earlier Lissauer had
moved to Vienna, where he stayed for the rest of his life.34

As a result of Hitler’s rise to power in 1933, opportunities for Lissauer to publish in Germany
ceased – not just self-publishing but also in newspapers and magazines. Similar difficulties
followed in his new homeland. After being excluded from the Austrian P.E.N. Club (an
association for poets, essayists and novelists) in 1934, Lissauer wrote: “Meine Bücher sind
nicht verboten und nicht verbrannt, soviel ich weiß, aber ich bin ausgeschaltet, wie ich es ja
auch nicht anders erwartet habe.”35 His last collection of poems, *Die Steine reden*, was
published in Vienna in 1936.

Lissauer died of pneumonia in Vienna on his 55th birthday, 10 December 1937. He was
buried two days later in the Jewish Cemetery there.36 Noting that he died barely three months
before the *Anschluss*, Aronsfeld suggests with considerable irony that, had he lived longer,
the author of the “Haßgesang gegen England” may well have ended his days as a refugee in
England.37

---

34 From biographical note to the Ernst Lissauer Collection (AR25209) on Leo Baeck Institute website. <lbi.org>
37 Aronsfeld, *op.cit.*, p. 50
Fig. 1. Ernst Lissauer (photo: Max Fenichal)\textsuperscript{38}

The “Haßgesang gegen England”

Lissauer’s poem “Haßgesang gegen England,” perhaps more than any other poem of the First World War, captured the spirit of the time in Germany at the outbreak of hostilities – an impression confirmed by its great and sudden popularity. The exact date of composition is uncertain, although Dan McMillan (without citing any source) asserts the particular date as 24 August 1914. Ernst Volkmann, writing in 1934, quotes Lissauer’s description of when the poem was written:

Haßgesang gegen England, verfaßt in der zweiten Augusthälfte 1914 und zuerst erschienen in der “Dammeck’schen Korrespondenz,” deren Chefredakteur Dr. Bondy die ungeheure Wirkung des Gedichts voraussagte.\(^{39}\)

Soon after this initial exposure, Lissauer published the “Haßgesang,” along with three other war poems, in the form of a pamphlet *Worte in die Zeit – Flugblätter 1914 von Ernst Lissauer*, and from there the poem was reprinted widely in magazines and newspapers throughout the German-speaking world.\(^{40}\) In *Worte in die Zeit*, the “Haßgesang” appears in the following form:

```
Haßgesang gegen England
Was schiert uns Russe und Franzos’,
Schuß wider Schuß und Stoß um Stoß!
Wir lieben sie nicht,
Wir hassen sie nicht,
Wir schützen Weichsel und Wasgaupaß, –
Wir haben nur einen einzigen Haß,
Wir lieben vereint, wir hassen vereint,
Wir haben nur einen einzigen Feind:

Den ihr alle wißt, den ihr alle wißt,
Er sitzt geduckt hinter der grauen Flut,
Voll Neid, voll Wut, voll Schläue, voll List,
```


\(^{40}\) The other poems in the initial Flugblatt are: “Spruch 1914,” “Kampfgesang der Deutschen,” and “Führer.” Lissauer published two further Flugblätter in the early months of the war as the popularity of the “Haßgesang,” in particular, continued to soar.
Durch Wasser getrennt, die sind dicker als Blut.
Wir wollen treten in ein Gericht,
Einen Schwur zu schwören, Gesicht in Gesicht,
Einen Schwur von Erz, den verbläst kein Wind,
Einen Schwur für Kind und für Kindeskind,
Vernehmt das Wort, sagt nach das Wort,
Es wälze sich durch ganz Deutschland fort:
Wir wollen nicht lassen von unserm Haß,
Wir haben alle nur einen Haß,
Wir lieben vereint, wir hassen vereint,
Wir haben alle nur einen Feind:
   England.

In der Bordkajüte, im Feiersaal,
Saßen Schiffsoffiziere beim Liebesmahl, –
Wie ein Säbelhieb, wie ein Segelschwung,
Einer riß grüßend empor den Trunk,
Knapp hinknallend wie Ruderschlag,
Drei Worte sprach er: “Auf den Tag!”
Wem galt das Glas?
Sie hatten alle nur einen Haß.
Wer war gemeint?
Sie hatten alle nur einen Feind:
   England.

Nimm du die Völker der Erde in Sold,
Baue Wälle aus Barren von Gold,
Bedecke die Meerflut mit Bug bei Bug,
Du rechnetest klug, doch nicht klug genug.
Was schiert uns Russe und Franzos’,
Schuß wider Schuß und Stoß um Stoß!
Wir kämpfen den Kampf mit Bronze und Stahl,
Und schließen den Frieden irgend einmal, –
Dich werden wir hassen mit langem Haß,
Wir werden nicht lassen von unserm Haß,
Haß zu Wasser und Haß zu Land,
Haß des Hauptes und Haß der Hand,
Haß der Hämmer und Haß der Kronen,
Drosselnder Haß von siebzig Millionen,
Sie lieben vereint, sie hassen vereint,
Sie haben alle nur einen Feind:
   England.
Editorial Variations

A striking feature of the poem is the refrain (which varies from printing to printing):

Wir haben alle nur einen Feind:
England.

[...]

Sie hatten alle nur einen Feind:
England.

[...]

Sie haben alle nur einen Feind:
England.

In various later printings of the poem, the effect is intensified by the use of accumulated exclamation marks. An early typescript of the poem (presumably made by, or for, Lissauer) in the Lissauer Collection at the Leo Baeck Institute, New York, employs exclamation marks thus (see Fig. 2): 41

Wir haben alle nur einen Feind:
England!

[...]

Sie hatten alle nur einen Feind:
England!

[...]

Sie haben alle nur einen Feind:
England!!

The versions republished in two wartime anthologies: Heinrich Oellers’s Wehe dir England!42 (1915) and Wilhelm Peper’s Deutsche Kriegslieder aus den Jahren 1914/1643 (1916), use no exclamation marks. Julius Bab in his 1914 Der deutsche Krieg im deutschen

41 See website: http://erster-weltkrieg.dnb.de/WKI/Content/EN/Objects/05-lissauer-hassgesang-en.html
Fig. 2. Early typescript of Lissauer’s “‘Hassgesang” showing use of exclamation marks

Gedicht⁴⁴ (1914), Ernst Volkmann in his Deutsche Dichtung im Weltkrieg 1914-1918⁴⁵ (1934) and Anz and Vogl in their Die Dichter und der Krieg: Deutsche Lyrik 1914-1918⁴⁶ (1982 and 2014), on the other hand, use single exclamation marks after each “England.”


The version of “Haßgesang” in the Anz and Vogl anthology is also notable because one line of the poem is omitted: “Haß des Hauptes und Haß der Hand.” There is no explanatory annotation in the 1982 edition, and the fact that its omission interrupts the rhyming pattern of the poem indicates that this is a misprint rather than a revision of the original text. This is unfortunate, since recent scholarship has relied heavily on the Anz and Vogl anthology as a source for the text, without seeming to have noticed the misprint.\textsuperscript{47}

Both Albanis (2002) and Murdoch (1990) cite Anz and Vogl (1982) as their source for the text of the “Haßgesang.”\textsuperscript{48} When Murdoch quotes the “sixth and final strophe” on p.34, he repeats the omission from Anz and Vogl. Albanis also shows some inconsistency over the number of lines in the poem. She states that there are 48 lines in the original poem,\textsuperscript{49} which would mean not counting “England” as a separate line. But then she quotes the first 23 lines of the poem, counting the “England” as the 23\textsuperscript{rd} line.\textsuperscript{50}

---

\textbf{“Haßgesang” and the Anglophobic Tradition}

Lissauer’s focus on England is made clear from the title of the poem, and from the opening lines it can be seen that the target of hate is England and England alone. The closing lines of the poem provide a neat summation of both the principal theme – hatred, specifically Anglophobia – and Lissauer’s view that such hatred could be a unifying force within Germany.

The image here, of a united Germany of “siebzig Millionen,” is telling. World War One was the first major conflict involving the politically united Germany which had been created following the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-1. As Robert Nelson observes, “the issue of
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\textsuperscript{47} Anz and Vogl appear to have noticed the omission and the line has been reinstated in the 2014 edition of the anthology.

\textsuperscript{48} See Albanis, Elisabeth. \textit{German-Jewish Cultural Identity from 1900 to the Aftermath of the First World War}. note (1) to page 215.; and Murdoch, Brian. \textit{Fighting Songs and Warring Words}. note (30) to page 33 (the note itself is on p. 233)

\textsuperscript{49} Albanis, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 215

\textsuperscript{50} \textit{Ibid.}
national understanding marks a crucial difference between the Allied and German armies, for it is quite simply the case that the unified nation of Germany was still very young in 1914. It cannot be forgotten that the Bavarians, Saxons and Württembergers actually fought in armies separate from the German army, though all were ultimately under the control of the High command.”

Now, through the mechanism of hatred, the social classes within Germany are united (“Haß der Hämmer und Haß der Kronen”). Likewise, the head and the hand are mediated here by a common hatred (“Haß des Hauptes und Haß der Hand” – an interesting alternative to Fritz Lang’s thesis in his film Metropolis (1927), in which the head and the hand are mediated by the heart!).

Lissauer makes no claim in his poem for Anglophobia as a racially unifying force, yet many German Jews saw their personal participation in the First World War as an opportunity to prove their Germanness and to establish their German nationalist credentials. Lissauer, in particular, was eager to join the fighting, but was officially deemed unfit for service.

Als dann der Krieg ausbrach, war es sein erstes, hinzueilen in die Kaserne und sich als Freiwilliger zu melden. Und ich kann mir das Lachen der Feldwebel und Gefreiten denken, als diese dicke Masse die Treppe heraufkeuchte. Sie schickten ihn sofort weg. Lissauer war verzweifelt: aber wie die andern wollte er nun Deutschland wenigstens mit dem Gedicht dienen.52

By leveraging Anglophobia Lissauer was tapping into an established tradition. As Albanis notes, “in the years immediately preceding the outbreak of the war, and during the war itself, an idea of ‘Perfidious Albion’ acquired popularity in Germany. In the eighteenth century the phrase was a favourite of the Francophile Frederick the Great of Prussia after a change in domestic politics in Britain in 1760-61 caused him to feel deserted in the Seven Years’ War.”53
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The focus of German Anglophobia in the early twentieth century was on the naval arms race. It is significant, therefore, that the hatred in “Haßgesang” finds its expression at sea as well as
on land: “Haß zu Wasser und Haß zu Land.” This is reinforced with an entire stanza of the poem describing a scene set “In der Bordkajüte, im Feiersaal,” complete with references to “Schiffsoffiziere,” “Segelschwung” and “Ruderschlag.” When the ship’s officer raises his glass he is not proposing a toast to the Kaiser’s good health and long life, rather he gives the standard German naval toast of the time: “Auf den Tag!” – to the day when the British navy is defeated. This stands out in the poem because it is such a specific image amongst much abstract verbiage elsewhere.

Britain’s dominance of the seas had been a particular irritation to Wilhelmine Germany, not least to the Kaiser himself. As Jonathan Steinberg points out, “Germans had come to want what Britain had and to believe that they could have it.” The German navy grew considerably in the early years of the twentieth century, in a sign, perhaps, of the Kaiser’s preparedness to take a fight beyond continental Europe to the high seas if necessary.

As rhetoric, Lissauer’s “Haßgesang” succeeds through the simple device of building the idea of hatred toward England into what Murdoch describes as “an incantatory and self-conscious crescendo.”

The poem takes the form of a call and response, which is also typical of protest chants and football slogans. “Vernehmt das Wort, sagt nach das Wort”: the “Haßgesang” is tailor-made for popular use. Other rhetorical techniques to be found in the poem include the repetitive use of personal pronouns (anaphora): “Wir lieben vereint, wir hassen vereint / Wir haben alle nur einen Feind”; and the layering of unrelated images (parataxis): “Haß zu Wasser und Haß zu Land / Haß des Hauptes und Haß der Hand / Haß der Hämmer und Haß der Kronen / Drosselnder Haß von siebzig Millionen.” Internal rhymes and repetitions, together with a rhythm relying on accentual meter, reinforce what Murdoch describes as “the incoherent, but at the same time, cumulatively effective piling up of ideas.” Ultimately, Lissauer employs elevated rhetorical tropes to give an illusion of profundity, but the intellectual content is banal. The final stanza, with its echoes and repetitions of the word “hate” as both verb and noun, presents the final summation of the poem’s hateful message.

---
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The Hate Theme in German Poetry

As Albanis observes, a literary model which Lissauer may have been aware of when he composed his “Haßgesang” is the poem “Das Lied vom Hasse” by the nineteenth-century writer Georg Herwegh. Associated with the Jungdeutscher movement, Herwegh’s poetry found a popular audience in the Vormärz period. “Das Lied vom Hasse” formed part of a collection of poems published in Zurich between 1841 and 1843, entitled Gedichte eines Lebendigen. The satirist William Makepeace Thackeray made a translation of some of these poems into English in 1843. They were banned in Prussia, but the success of “Das Lied vom Hasse” nevertheless earned Herwegh an audience with King Friedrich Wilhelm IV. Friedrich Wilhelm’s curiosity soon turned to contempt, however, and Herwegh was expelled from Prussia.

Herwegh was born in Stuttgart in 1817. Through his radical politics he became the leader of the German Republican Committee in Paris, and participated in the revolutions of 1848. Some seventy years later, Lissauer may well have intended to follow in the footsteps of Herwegh “whose poem has been considered directly aggressive rather than critical or satirical.”

There is some irony, however, in having Herwegh’s anti-Prussian “Das Lied vom Hasse” as a precursor for Lissauer’s “Haßgesang,” as the latter affirmed unity under the German Kaiser, who occupied that office because he was also the King of Prussia.

Das Lied vom Hasse (1841)

Wohlauf, wohlauf, über Berg und Fluß
Dem Morgenrot entgegen,
Dem treuen Weib den letzten Kuß,
Und dann zum treuen Degen!
Bis unsre Hand in Asche stiebt,
Soll sie vom Schwert nicht lassen;
Wir haben lang genug geliebt,
Und wollen endlich hassen!
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Die Liebe kann uns helfen nicht,
Die Liebe nicht erretten;
Halt du, o Haß, dein jüngst Gericht,
Brich du, o Haß, die Ketten!
Und wo es noch Tyrannen gibt,
Die laßt uns keck erfassen;
Wir haben lang genug geliebt,
Und wollen endlich hassen!

Wer noch ein Herz besitzt, dem soll's
Im Hasse nur sich rühren;
Allüberall ist dürres Holz,
Um unsre Glut zu schüren.
Die ihr der Freiheit noch verbliebt,
Singt durch die deutschen Straßen:
“Ihr habet lang genug geliebt,
O lernet endlich hassen!”

Bekämpfet sie ohn’ Unterlaß,
Die Tyrannie auf Erden,
Und heiliger wird unser Haß,
Als unsre Liebe, werden.
Bis unsre Hand in Asche stiebt,
Soll sie vom Schwert nicht lassen;
Wir haben lang genug geliebt,
Und wollen endlich hassen!

Herwegh’s “Das Lied vom Hasse” and Lissauer’s “Haßgesang gegen England” make for an interesting comparison. The most obvious similarity between them is in their titles. Lissauer’s “Haßgesang gegen England” is commonly translated into English as “Hymn of Hate” or sometimes “Chant of Hate.” While the poem is in form rather more of a chant than a hymn, the important element in its full German title is that the target of the invective is a country – specifically England. On the other hand, Herwegh’s “Das Lied vom Hasse,” translated by Thackeray as “The Song of Hatred,” is not at all explicit in its title about the object of the hatred. We have to read Herwegh’s poem in order to discover that tyranny is the object of his animosity. Prussia itself is never mentioned. Recognition of the poem’s

anti-Prussian message depends on a knowledge of the circumstances of Herwegh’s life and
times, not on any specific details in the text.

The use of a catchy and rousing refrain in both poems suggests that they were written with a
popular readership in mind: Lissauer with his seventy million united in their hatred, and
Herwegh with his revolution in the streets united against tyranny. Both poems, likewise, rely
heavily on the inclusiveness of plural pronouns: Herwegh’s “Wir haben lang genug geliebt /
Und wollen endlich hassen!”, and Lissauer’s “Wir lieben vereint, wir hassen vereint / Wir
haben nur einen einzigen Feind.”

On the other hand, there are significant differences between the two poems, which are in
keeping with their differing aims. Herwegh’s politics are clearly revolutionary and his poem
is a call to action from street to street for the people to free themselves from the yoke of the
tyrannical oppressor. In contrast, Lissauer’s cry is nationalistic, and his politics align with
the militaristic imperialist agenda of Wilhelmine Germany. Herwegh’s people are
encouraged to rise up in the name of freedom against the Prussian ruling elite. Lissauer’s
people are called upon to present a united front in support of the leadership against an
external aggressor.

As Albanis observes:

The mythic quality Lissauer ascribed to the war reinforced the identification with
Germany’s history. The war is portrayed as an event of acute danger through which
the relationship between Germany and her past is intensified. By evoking the
assistance of what one might call a “Generalstab der Geister,” Lissauer militarised
culture and placed war and religion in a dangerous proximity. The ennobling of war
and its portrayal as an educative force also served the purpose of legitimating the
nation’s past.  

While Herwegh’s “Das Lied vom Hasse” may have been an influence from the past on
Lissauer’s writing, the theme of hatred in poetry was also being explored by Lissauer’s
contemporaries. Fritz von Ostini’s poem “Haß! Zu dem Fürstenmord in Serajewo,” which
appeared in the literary magazine Jugend on 1 July 1914, just three days after the
assassination referred to in its title, presents an analysis of hatred strikingly different to those
of Lissauer and Herwegh. Ostini’s extremely dark poem personifies hatred in a way
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reminiscent of Georg Heym’s personification of war in his poem “Der Krieg” (1911). In contrast to Herwegh and Lissauer, Ostini implicitly rejects hatred by drawing an ugly picture of it:

**Haß!**  
*(Zu dem Fürstenmord in Serajewo)*

Die Menschheit schauderte in Schmerz und Schmack  
Nach wüster Untat – und der Dämon sprach:  
**Ich bin der Sohn des Wahns. Ich bin der Haß**  
Und regsam bin ich ohne Unterlaß!  
Ich will’s nicht leiden, daß der Friede lacht  
Auf heiter Erde, hell wie Frühlingspracht,  
Und daß ein Glanz von reiner Menschlichkeit  
Die Narren träumen macht von goldner Zeit.  
Schwarz ist mein Banner, dunkel wie der Tod –  
Ich kann das Glück nicht schaun – ich will die Not.  
Den Jammer will ich. Meine Fackel sprüht,  
Bis Land und Stadt in roter Lohe glüht  
Und Himmelsblau sich deckt mit schwarzem Qualm.  
Die Saaten tret ich nieder, Halm für Halm!  
Ich will nicht Kampf, der frei die Kräfte mißt –  
Ich will den Kampf, der alles Maß vergißt  
Und Greuel bergehoch auf Greuel häuft  
Und alles Menschliche im Blut ersäuft,  
Von seinem Purpur will ich Ströme sehn,  
Die ekel dampfend durch die Lande gehn!  
Mir ist es Wolluft, wenn ein Wechselgellt  
Und Zanf und Kreischen zetern durch die Welt  
Und Volk dem Volke Schimpf und Schande tut,  
Daß nie das Schwert in kühler Scheide ruht,  
Daß Mißtraun lebt, so weit als Menschen sind –  
Ich bin der Eitelkeit verderbtes Kind,  
Die gierig einst sich mit dem Wahn gepaaart –  
Und wer da andern Sinns und anderer Art,  
Dem sendet mich mein böses Elternpaar,  
Daß ich ihm Unheil säe und Gefahr!  
Und wenn ich Völker nicht verblenden kann,  
Daß die sich würgen, rasend, Mann um Mann,  
Dann ist mir jeder Narr und Knabe recht  
Als Werkzeug, der sich feiger Tat erfrecht  
Und Ahnungslose mordet, blind und dumm,  
Kaum daß er stammelnd sagen kann, warum?
Und der nicht fragt, ob die ihm was getan –
Ich bin das Kind von Eitelkeit und Wahn!
Ich bin uralt. Ich werde ewig sein.
Seit Abel fiel durch seinen Bruder Kain,
Zeit Judas’, des Ischariot Verrat,
War ich die Geißel jeder frevlen Tat.
Kein Glaubenskünder und kein Gottessohn
Hat mich besiegt, noch Jedem sprach ich Hohn!
Und steigt der Mensch in der Äonen Lauf,
Verklärt, vergöttlich, schier zum Himmel auf –
Ich reiß’ ihn, nah dem Gipfel, noch zurück,
Ich gönn’ ihm niemals der Vollendung Glück,
Ich bann’ ihn fest im Kot der Erde hier
Und immer wieder mach’ ich ihn zum Tier!
Auf mich, o Fürst der Hölle, ist Verlaß,
Unüberwindlich bin ich – ich, der Haß!63

Adolf Ey’s poem, “Des Alten Gebet,” on the other hand, published in the satirical magazine Kladderadatsch at the beginning of November 1914, is philosophically and ideologically much closer to Lissauer’s poem than Ostini’s “Haß!” Ey personalises the hatred towards one figure – in this case directing it towards Edward Grey, the British Foreign Secretary at the beginning of the war. Like Lissauer, Ey presents hatred as justifiable.

**Des Alten Gebet**

O Herr, ich bitte
Um ein, eh ich sterb’:
Daß Grey, der Brite,
Elendig verderb’,
Daß der Verhaßte
Im hanfenen Ring
An einem Orte
Wie Judas sich schwing’,
Und noch im Schauer
Des Todes Gewahr’
Hoch überm Tower
Den deutschen Aar.64

---


There are many more examples of hate poems that were written in German in the early months of the war. In 1915, Oellers collected some 107 such poems and published them in an edition entitled *Wehe dir England!* This remarkable publication, and other poems that contributed to the productive reception of Lissauer’s “Haßgesang,” will be discussed in a later section of this chapter.

**Jugend Magazine**

Newspapers and magazines like *Kladderadatsch* and *Jugend* played a significant role in the dissemination and popularising of German war poetry at the beginning of the conflict. Incredibly, the writer, critic and poetry anthologist Julius Bab estimated that some 50,000 poems inspired by the war were being written in Germany daily in August 1914. Indeed, he maintained that one of the leading Berlin newspapers was receiving more than 500 poems for publication every day at the beginning of the war. Bab, whose twelve-volume anthology of German poetry of the First World War was by far the most extensive contemporary collection of its kind, must surely have been in a better position than most to make such assertions.

The case of *Jugend* is of particular interest. *Jugend* was a weekly magazine loosely connected to the *Jugendstil* movement in the arts, a German variation on the *Art Nouveau* style. Recent poetry and painting was featured amongst advertisements for holiday homes, handguns and hair-remover. The roster of contributors appearing in the magazine included Rainer Maria Rilke, Stefan George and Hugo von Hofmannsthal, and ideologically it ranged from the pacifist René Schickele to the militarist Will Vesper. During the war many works published in the magazine (both poetry and painting) were inspired by, and reflective of, the hostilities.

Although *Jugend* was to play a significant role in the English-language reception of “Haßgesang,” Lissauer’s connection with the magazine was not particularly extensive, and it is important to note that despite the repeated claims to the contrary (discussed in chapter 2) the “Haßgesang” was never published in *Jugend*. In fact, Lissauer had only three poems
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published in the magazine during the war, and only seven in total from 1910 to 1926. Of those seven poems, most are concerned with music (e.g. “Bach zuhaus” (1914); “Brucknerscherzo” (1915); “Die Orgelstimme” (1916); and “Hymnus” (1926)), and none of them have hatred or Anglophobia as their subject.

Nevertheless, the rhetoric of chivalric might and sacred duty – together with blame and guilt – which characterised much of the early poetical response to the First World War, had been established already in Jugend in the 5 August 1914 edition, with such poems as “Das Marienburger Lied” by Albert Matthai:

Auch wir sind noch die Ritter stark,
Voll Gottvertraun und Löwenmark.
Wir weichen nicht, wir wanken nicht,
Wir kennen unsre heil’ge Pflicht.
Umsonst die Mut
Der Feindesflut,
Sie bricht an deutschem Heldenmut,
Dem Felsendamm am Weichselstrand
Zu Schutz und Trutz fürs Vaterland.  

Here is an invocation of the heroism of the Teutonic Knights, and a version of the “strength through unity” argument on which Lissauer’s “Haßgesang” so heavily relies. This is a language identifiable with conservative, nationalist writers, yet many readers would have understood and accepted its message. As Nelson observes, “the fantastic element of much of this language and imagery references the powerful, and surprisingly enduring, Wilhelmine iconography, with its powerful Romantic allusions to a medieval pastoral Germany, full of manly knights, chaste maidens and clear values of right and wrong.”

If Russia is the implied aggressor in Matthai’s poem, then it is explicitly so in Ostini’s ironical poem “Der Friedenszar” from the same edition of Jugend:

Nun auf sein Haupt die Schuld an all der Not!
Europas Jugend jagt er in den Tod,
Zerstört, zertreten wird auf seinen Ruf,
Was deutscher Geist, was deutscher Fleiß erschuf;
In allen Gauen schleicht die Sorge um –
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Ihr fragt: warum die Schandtat nur, warum?
Aus Feigheit! Weil nun endlich die Geduld
Des Volkes riß – die Schale seiner Schuld,
In die er frevelnd Gift um Gift geträuf,
– Aus Feigheit auch! – weil die nun überläuf!
Daß ihn Empörung nicht vom Throne fegt,
Hat frech den Brand er an die Welt gelegt
Und hat sein beutegierig Volk gehetzt
Auf uns, denn seine Seele zittert jetzt!
Aus Feigheit ward die Memme ein Barbar,
Der Friedenszar!69

In these poems Russia is characterised as the aggressor (indeed Tsar Nicholas II must personally carry the blame for all the troubles), while Germany (das Vaterland) is the victim, determined to stick up for itself.

The publication dates of Jugend are important here. These two poems were published on 5 August 1914, by which time Germany had already declared war on Russia (1 August 1914). Britain had only just declared war on Germany (4 August 1914), but this was too close to the publication date to have had any editorial impact on the 5 August edition. The following week’s edition, however, puts England firmly in the frame. Ernst Rosmer’s “England” incorporates the popular German view (at the time) of Britain’s duplicity in declaring war, and Germany’s proper, fiery response to the challenge:

Euch, den Geschickten, spielerfahren
In doppelzüngig kühler Kunft,
Euch wollen wir es offenbaren,
Was eines Volks Begeisterungsbrunst.

Wir wollen solch ein Feuer zünden,
Daß übers Meer die Lohe schlägt
Und unsre Flammen sich verbünden
Dem Sturm, den Gott im Mantel trägt.70

---
On the same page, Ostini in “Kriegschronik” charts the progress of the war to date, which now includes the participation of Britain as a sixth power adding to the encirclement of Germany and Austria-Hungary:

Daß der Pöbel in Paris
Gegen Deutsche sich erwies
Echt französisch, feig und schändlich,
Dies war beinahe’ selbsverständlich.
Selbsverständlich ist es auch,
Daß nach wohlbekanntem Brauch
England sich als falsch bewährt:
Hat uns flugs den Krieg erklärt;
Stücke Sechse gegen Zwei –
O! Da ist man gleich dabei!
Längst geplant war die Verschwörung,
Doch man heuchelte Empörung,
Weil wir die Neutralität
Belgiens, eh’ es schon zu spät,
An der Grenze, der bewußten,
Leidergotts verletzen mußten.
Wie “neutral” die Belgier waren,
Haben wir bereits erfahren!
Hei! Das “stolze Albion”
Ficht für Niklausens Thron,
Den verfaulten Staat des Zaren,
Für die serbischen Barbaren,
Für die sauber’n Panschlawiner
Macht’s den Helfer nun und Diener –
Der famose Mister Grey
Sprach zwar immer von “fair play,”
Meint, nun sollt Verrat ihm frommen –
Na, es kann auch anders kommen!
Daß uns Belgien nun nicht lieben
Will, sei ihm nicht angeschrieben;
Daß es gegen uns marschiert,
Dort die Deutschen malträtiert,
Wird ihm manches Unbehagen
Noch und manche Prügel tragen;
Ist nun halt ein Gegner mehr –
Immer zu: Viel Feind, viel Ehr!

[...]
Also ist das halbe Dutzend

Wilder Feinde nun komplett –
Sechs auf Zweie – so wird’s nett!
Aber daß wir nicht verzagen,
Brauch’ ich weiter nicht zu sagen:
Will man beißen auf Granit?
Na, dann guten Appetit!\(^71\)

Despite the patriotic fervour of these poems, the overall editorial position of *Jugend* was ambivalent, at least in the opening stages of the war. Inside the front cover of the same edition that features Rosmer’s “England” and Ostini’s “Kriegschronik,” there is a translation of Walt Whitman’s “Song at Sunset,” which is a celebration and an affirmation of life, in praise of the over-arching continuity of life and existence, but also the inevitability of change – significant symbolism at the beginning of the war. Night follows day which follows night. There is a measure of comfort to be found in this inevitability.

\[
\text{Glanz des vollendeten Tags, der mich umflutet und füllt!}
\text{Prophetische Stunde, bis alles Vergangene trägt!}
\text{Göttliche Tageswende, du machst meine Kehle erschwellen –}
\text{Euch, Erde und Leben, sing’ ich, bis der letzte Strahl verglüht!}\(^72\)
\]

Such was the context in which Lissauer composed his “Haßgesang” in those early weeks of the war. Although the “Haßgesang” was not published in *Jugend*, the above examples illustrate that it would not have been out of place in that magazine.

**Words and Music**

No other German poem from the First World War seems to have captured the popular imagination, allied or enemy, in quite the same way as “Haßgesang.” In Germany, the diarist
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Victor Klemperer observed that the poem expressed “eine Entrüstung und eine Leidenschaft, die wir 1914 alle als echt empfanden und alle gleichermaßen fühlten.”

In order that it should reach the widest possible audience, the “Haßgesang” was translated into regional dialects and other languages, and even printed on postcards and enclosed with business correspondence. As a conversation topic it ran through all strata of society. The politician Conrad von Wangenheim, writing to his colleague Gustav Roesicke in April 1915, was in support of the poem: “Lissauer’s Hymn of Hate is of course nothing new and is not at all disagreeable to me. I think it is [a] good thing in these soft-hearted times that once in a while this form of hatred against our very worst enemy gets a hearing.”

Evidence for its wider popularity is provided by an Australian woman, Ethel Cooper, who lived in Germany during the war. Writing to her sister in February 1915, she complained:

I loathe the newspapers so, and yet what else is one to read! And I loathe most of all this policy of hate-breeding which is being followed everywhere. I must get you a copy of this so-called “Song of Hate” against England, which the Kaiser has ordered to be published among all the troops and learned in the schools.

The place of the “Haßgesang” in schools became an issue of contention, as we will see later in this chapter, but for the first years of the war, at least, it found its way into the curriculum. Thus, we find it in Wilhelm Peper’s 1916 anthology Deutsche Kriegslieder aus dem Jahren 1914/16. Peper’s collection was part of a series of “Quellensammlungen für den geschichtlichen Unterricht an höheren Schulen.” Other volumes in the series had titles such as Die Entwicklung zum Krieg and Der deutsche Geist im Weltkrieg. The inclusion of a collection of war poems in this series of school books suggests a recognition that poetry had a significant role to play in students’ sense-making of the war.

Later, reflecting on the extraordinary impact of the “Haßgesang” in Germany, from a distance of nearly thirty years after its first appearance, Stefan Zweig recalled:
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Das Gedicht fiel wie eine Bombe in ein Munitionsdepot. Nie vielleicht hat ein Gedicht in Deutschland, selbst die “Wacht am Rhein” nicht, so rasch die Runde gemacht wie dieser berüchtigte “Haßgesang gegen England.”

Zweig’s comparison of “Haßgesang” with Max Schneckenburger’s “Die Wacht am Rhein” is particularly interesting. Schneckenburger, an industrialist from Württemberg, wrote his patriotic poem during the Rhine crisis of 1840, in which France asserted its claim to the river as its natural border. Like the “Haßgesang,” the poem calls for the German people to unite against those who threaten German sovereignty.

Es braust ein Ruf wie Donnerhall,
Wie Schwertgeklirr und Wogenprall:
“Zum Rhein, zum Rhein, zum deutschen Rhein!
Wer will des Stromes Hüter sein?”
Lieb’ Vaterland, magst ruhig sein,
Fest steht und treu die Wacht am Rhein!

For Schneckenburger, the threat was from France towards the Rhine and German territories on the western bank. The cry is for a defensive stance against the enemy by a coalition of peoples who consider themselves to be ethnically German, but who are not (yet) united politically. In Lissauer’s poem, by contrast, the threat is explicitly from England, and its call is to action from a German people who are now united not just politically but also in their hatred for the enemy.

Setting Schneckenburger’s poem to music greatly enhanced its popularity and its utility. With music by Carl Wilhelm, the work became the German patriotic anthem of the Franco-Prussian War (1870-71), and helped establish the enduring image of German infantry as die singenden Helden who marched into battle united in song. In the First World War this image inspired Otto Ernst’s poem “Die singenden Helden” which, together with Hans Schroedter’s picture of cheerfully marching soldiers, was co-opted for propaganda use on postcards (see Fig. 4).

---
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Lissauer’s use of the word “Gesang” in his title places his own poem within the same tradition and suggests he might even have imagined it being sung by the new generation of singing heroes marching westward to meet the enemy.

As with the Schneckenburger poem, a musical setting of Lissauer’s “Haßgesang” played a significant role in the poem’s popularity. The setting was composed in the early months of the First World War by the Chemnitz music professor and minor composer Franz Mayerhoff (1864-1938). As Stefan Zweig noted:
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Mayerhoff’s setting was published as the first of a series of five songs grouped under the title Aus großer Zeit (see Fig. 5). This was his Opus 39, and was a collection of texts reflecting active participation in the war. In addition to the “Haßgesang,” which is given pride of place in first position, the third song is a setting of another poem by Lissauer – “Kampfgesang der Deutschen” – and the other texts are by Ludwig Thoma and Hermann Hesse.82

“Haßgesang” as a song is in the form and rhythm of a march. Mayerhoff arranged the music for baritone (or mezzo-soprano) and piano accompaniment, and later made another arrangement of the same music for male-voice choir. The setting is, for the most part, faithful to Lissauer’s original text, although Mayerhoff has made some minor adjustments to even out some of Lissauer’s irregular rhythms. The song cadences on the word “England,” which Mayerhoff states three times with considerable theatrical effect: “Eng-land, England, En-gel-land.” This produces the musical equivalent of an exclamation mark. Altogether the music is rather stirring, and it is not hard to imagine it being sung by troops on the march.

The songs seem to have been received relatively well by the German musical establishment of the day – at least to begin with. In a round-up of recently published music in late November 1914, Dr. Max Unger, a reviewer of the Neue Zeitschrift für Musik, left his review of the first three songs of the set for last. His comments echo those of his contemporaries Klemperer and Zweig that Lissauer’s poem seemed to capture the spirit of the times:

Zum Besten überhaupt, was mir diesmal an Musikalienliteratur vorliegt, gehört das Triptychon “Aus großer Zeit” von Franz Mayerhoff. […] Es handelt sich hier um drei gleich- und vollwertige aus dem Geist der Zeit heraus entstandene Gesänge. Besonders das erste davon (nach dem schnell bekannt gewordenen Text von Lissauer) setzt als das umfangreichste und schwierigste einen Mittler von guter musikalischer Auffassung voraus – umfangreich im zwiefachen Sinn verstanden, im Hinblick auf

81 Zweig, op.cit., p. 266-7

A slightly later review of January 1915, however, shows that not everyone in Germany was caught up in the frenzy of acclaim for the “Haßgesang.” Reviewing a *Vaterländischen Abend*, given by a Chemnitz Lehrergesangverein, Prof. Dr. Otto Müller was complimentary of the choir and its music director:


The conductor was the composer Franz Mayerhoff, and the concert contained the premiere performance of the third song in his *Aus großer Zeit* set. The third song, it will be remembered, was a setting of another poem by Lissauer: “Kampfgesang der Deutschen.” Here the reviewer is again full of praise: “Der ‘Kampfgesang der Deutschen’ von F. Mayerhoff ist als Komposition hinreißend, schwungvoll, voll Kraft und Schönheit.”

However, not everything finds favour with the reviewer:

> Ich liebe die Lissauerschen Texte aber nicht und würde weder diesen noch das Haßlied gegen England komponiert haben. Der Text zum “Kampfgesang” ist eigentlich ein in Reime gebrachter Leitartikel. Die Komposition macht dies glücklicherweise fast vergessen.

Not for the first time in the history of song was there a perceived mismatch in relative quality between words and music, but this review represents one of the earliest published criticisms of Lissauer’s war poetry in Germany, and swims against the tide of popular esteem in which the “Haßgesang,” in particular, was held.

---

83 Unger, Dr. Max. *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 26 Nov. 1914: 551  
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One of the intriguing aspects of the “Haßgesang” is the universality of its appeal across social strata: its official endorsement in Germany, its popularity amongst the German public as well as its resonance for soldiers at the front. Zweig, once again, found this noteworthy:

Der Kaiser war begeistert und verlieh Lissauer den Roten Adlerorden, man druckte das Gedicht in allen Zeitungen nach, die Lehrer lasen es in den Schulen den Kindern
Lissauer was among a small group of writers (others included Richard Dehmel, Gerhart Hauptmann and Rudolf Presber) who were awarded the Order of the Red Eagle, Fourth Class, with Crown, on the Kaiser’s birthday in January 1915. The order was established in 1705 by the hereditary prince Georg Wilhelm of Brandenburg, and by the time of the First World War was awarded in six classes: Grand Cross, then down through the classes First through to Fourth, and then the medal for enlisted men. There were numerous gradations within each class, and the addition of a Crown to the decoration was a further distinction. Conferral of the Order, even Fourth Class, was a significant honour. By way of comparison, Baron von Richthofen (the so-called “Red Baron”) was awarded the Order of the Red Eagle, Third Class, with Crown and Swords, for his achievement of 70 aerial victories as Germany’s leading fighter ace of the war. Although principally a military award, some civilians were admitted for services to the country. Lissauer and his colleagues were honoured in recognition of their service to the war effort through their writing.

That Lissauer’s patriotic writing was received as a form of war service, and that this service was recognised and valued so highly by the Kaiser, only strengthened the popularity of the “Haßgesang.” The honour also gave Lissauer what he craved, official recognition of his service to Germany, and status as a German writer and citizen.

Another significant endorsement from the highest echelons of society and the military came in the person of Rupprecht, Crown Prince of Bavaria, who at the beginning of the war was given command of the German Sixth Army. When the Sixth, which confronted the French in battle at Lorraine in August 1914, subsequently faced the British, Rupprecht had thousands of copies of the “Haßgesang” printed and distributed amongst his men on the front lines,

---

87 Zweig, op.cit., p. 266


89 Yet Lissauer seems to have been unaware of, or unwilling to recognise, the advantages he had gained by the success of the “Haßgesang”. See: Lissauer, Ernst. “Der ‘Haßgesang’.” Berliner Tageblatt 10 Aug. 1915: 3.
together with the message: “Soldaten der sechsten Armee, wir haben nun das Glück, auch Engländer vor der Front zu haben. Übt Vergeltung an ihnen, an unsern Hauptfeinden!”

Poems, songs and chants, and soldier newspapers, all had a role to play in the psychological preparation of troops at the front. As one young soldier wrote to family back home: “Es ist uns eine große Freude solche Gedichte zu lesen, die den Krieg nicht nur als Zerstörer, sondern auch als neuschaffende Arbeit ansehen, nicht nur als drückende Not, sondern als Läuterung.”

In his study of German soldier newspapers of the First World War, Nelson argues that “soldier newspaper editors peppered their articles and images with the ‘pre-knowledge’ or ‘repertoire’ of the readers. […] The audience understood what was being argued because the argument relied upon prejudices and opinions often shared between author and reader.” A striking example of this can be found in a March 1915 edition of the Liller Kriegszeitung, the soldier newspaper established in the German-occupied French town of Lille. Here, in a front-page article by Lieutenant Colonel Kaden entitled “Feuer,” the theme of hatred towards England is developed at some length. The clear echoes of the “Haßgesang” in Kaden’s piece testify to the effect of campaigns such as Rupprecht’s to popularise the poem among frontline soldiers.


---


92 Nelson, op.cit., p. 43

93 Kaden, Oberstleutnant. “Feuer.” Liller Kriegszeitung. 3 Mar. 1915: 1. – Note that this and all subsequent excerpts from Kaden’s article are reproduced here verbatim. An interesting feature of the text is that it has been printed without the use of a specifically German character set (i.e. without the use of umlauts or the eszett character). It seems likely that the editors of the Liller Kriegszeitung, having requisitioned a local French printing press, would have found that French language publications have little use for ä, ö and ß characters, and so the standard transcriptions for restricted character sets were applied: ae for ä, oe for ö, ue for û and ss for ß.
Kaden’s direct quotation of Lissauer’s poem in the key phrase “Wir haben alle nur einen Feind: England!” provides the rallying-call. Readers would have been aware of the refrain from Lissauer’s original poem, and once again they are reminded that what unites them as Germans is their hatred of England.

There is a suggestion, too, that this sort of rhetoric served the purpose of helping soldiers make sense of the war and their role in it. This is, in Nelson’s view, “the compensation achieved through justification of one’s position and actions. […] Given that they are being asked both to risk their own lives and to take the lives of others, it is easy to understand why many soldiers seek out moral certainty in what they are doing. This desire extends into a tendency for many soldiers to rely upon firm, often conservative, beliefs and values when they find themselves in terrifying environments.”

From this perspective, Lissauer’s Anglophobia was an easy sell. Kaden continues:

Ihr Millionen deutscher Maenner in Ost und West, die ihr durch Englands Niedertracht, Neid und Hass gegen Deutschlands Emporkommen gezwungen seid, der Heimat heilige Scholle mit eurem Blute zu verteidigen, schuer in euren Seelen den zehrenden Brand.

Beyond mere justification, Kaden’s article incites his readers to act on their hatred. The quiet hissing of the approaching flames might be read as an eerie foreshadowing of the first gas attacks in the trenches, which were just weeks away. Kaden cries out:


Anticipating, or perhaps at this stage responding to, growing concern about adopting a national posture of hatred, Kaden is blunt about the role of the education system in

---
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persuading the country that such hatred is expressly “nicht undeutsch,” and that it has not poisoned the people:


Similarly, Kaden is clear that the family has a role to play in nurturing this hatred of the “verfluchten Engländern.” At this point his Anglophobia resembles Lissauer’s not only in its phrasing, but also in its universal extension and unifying force.

Schuere das Feuer dieses gerechten Hasses, du deutsches Volk daheim!

Ihr Muetter, grabt ihn dem Saeugling ins Herz!

Ihr Vaeter, kuendet ihn laut ueber die friedlichen Fluren, dass der erntende Bauer dort unten euch hoert, dass die Vöglein im Walde erschreckt aufflattern und pfeilschnell die Hassbotschaft tragen ins weite Land, dass das Echo deutscher Felsen sich tausendfach bricht und wie Glockenton von Turm zu Turm durch alle Gauen droehnt: Hass, Hass den verfluchten Englaendern, Hass!98

While Kaden’s hateful exhortations may have carried more weight on the Western front than on the home front, the “Haßgesang” was nevertheless ubiquitous.

The popularity of the “Haßgesang” in Germany could hardly go unnoticed in other countries. As the English-speaking world became aware of the poem, and reacted with astonishment, this in turn was reported on in German-language newspapers. Readers of the Prager Tagblatt, for example, on 12 November 1914, could read all about how the Times of London and the Daily Mail had introduced the poem to their readers. An article from the Times was reprinted in German translation, and the English translation of “Haßgesang” was printed alongside Lissauer’s original so that the Prague readers could judge for themselves the

97 Kaden, op.cit., p. 1

98 Ibid.
quality of the translation, and gauge the degree of outrage caused. The “Haßgesang” had now become an international phenomenon.

Productive Reception

Beyond the local reaction to the poem, and the sentiments expressed in it, Lissauer’s “Haßgesang” gave other writers license to vent their hatred through poetry – with a particular focus on England and the English. As we have seen, hatred as a general theme in German poetry at the beginning of the war was not unknown, but Lissauer’s particular brand of Anglophobic poetry began to be imitated and developed by other writers, creating its own subgenre. Ernst Volkmann, compiling his considerable anthology of German poetry of the First World War in 1934, noted that other poets contemporary with Lissauer had shared his feeling of betrayal by Britain’s declaration of war. Volkmann went on to list twenty such poets who had composed “Haßgesänge gegen England.”

The poetry of hate, particularly Anglophobic poetry, flourished in the first months of the war, and found its way into magazines and newspapers throughout the German-speaking world. One of the most remarkable consequences of this activity was the publication of Wehe dir, England! (1915), a collection of 107 Anglophobic poems from more than seventy German writers, most already published elsewhere. Lissauer’s “Haßgesang,” as the founding document for this minor literary movement, provides the centrepiece – both figuratively and literally – of the collection.

An excerpt from Frederick the Great’s “Ode an die Deutschen” (1760) is used as the foreword for the anthology and, although not itself Anglophobic, serves to remind the reader of the link between Frederick and his alleged use of the epithet perfides Albion for England.

100 Volkmann, op.cit., p. 46-47
The poems are then arranged alphabetically by author. The collection’s editor, Heinrich Oellers, attempts to place contemporary German Anglophobic poetry within a continuity of historical and international Anglophobic poetry by including poems from non-German writers, whose poetry may have been inspired by other conflicts with England at other times. The poem “Engländs Untergang” by the Russian poet Alexej Stepanovich Chomjakoff (1804-1860) is dated to the mid-nineteenth century, perhaps in relation to the Crimean War (1853-1856), and the poem “England” by the Portuguese poet Manuel Duarte d’Almeida (1844-1914) was sourced from a translation in Wilhelm Storck’s *Aus Portugal und Brasilien* (1892). As Oeller notes, Chomjakoff’s poem, in particular, reveals “seinen tiefen Haß

---

gegen das herrschsüchtige, heuchlerische und perfide England von der Seele.”

In addition to these two older poems, Oellers includes two contemporary poems reprinted from the *New Yorker Staats-Zeitung*, one of the oldest American German-language weekly newspapers: “An England” by R.M. Moynahan and the anonymous poem “Made in Germany.”

Of these two, Moynahan’s poem, originally written in English, is the one most overtly inspired by Lissauer’s work, and brings an international perspective by referencing Ireland and the so-called “Irish Question”:

Frankreich und Rußland, das gilt uns gleich,
’s gibt Böses und Gutes in jedem Reich!
– England allein steht vor Gericht.
Themis wägt mit verhülltem Gesicht.
Hie Irland, da Belgien! Bist du bereit?
Sag uns, was lauter zum Himmel schreit,
o England!  

Here, significantly, the roles are reversed; it is England that is portrayed as the hater, and Ireland the hated:

Denn nicht in wildem, rasendem Krieg
brachst du Irland! – Kein blutiger Sieg
stieß den raschen Stahl in Irlands Brust!
– Dein Messer stieß langsam in grausamer Luft!
Ist geschliffen mit Haß, ist getaucht in Gift,
läßt eiternde Schwären, wo immer es trifft.
Und dein Messer traf in Irlands Herz –
Da steckt es noch heute! Und ob dem Schmerz
lachst du noch heute,
England!  

Rather than mere perfidy, it is English thuggishness and brutishness that is at issue here:

Wo nur ein Blatt deine Lügen druckt,
hast du es glorreich hingespuckt:

103 Oellers, *op.cit.*, p. 159-160.
“Freiheit und Recht! Das ist mein Preis!
Australien! Kanadier! Seht den Beweis!”
Ach, die sind fern, doch Irland ist nah,
so sag uns doch lieber, was da geschah!
Zerbrochen, zertreten durch deinen Tritt,
hinkt es in deinem Raubzug mit!
Du nahmst uns den keltischen Mutterlaut,
doch in deiner Sprache schreien wir laut:
Du hast uns gestoßen in tiefe Nacht,
du hast uns zu Bettlern und Sklaven gemacht,
du, England!106

By this point, German readers may well have been wondering how England’s oppression of Ireland related to Germany’s hatred of England, aside from the obvious solidarity built from sharing a common foe. Moynahan ties the threads together. If Ireland is the question, Germany is the answer!

Durch der Jahrhunderte dunkle Macht
haben Englands Märtyrer betend gewacht:
“Herr! rett’ uns aus britischem Druck und Spott,
von den Ketten befrei’ uns gerechter Gott!”
Und es sprach der Herr: “Die Rache ist mein!”
– O England, nun bricht das Gericht herein –
durch Deutschland!107

Moynahan’s original poem is also part of the story surrounding the reception of the “Haßgesang” in the English-speaking world, as we shall see in chapter 2.

Many of the poems in Wehe dir, England! are restatements of the themes Lissauer employs in his “Haßgesang,” while others develop Lissauer’s ideas significantly, or attack on a different front altogether. Amongst the first group are poems such as “Auf den Tag!” by Walter Ferl:

106 Moynahan, op.cit., p. 88
107 Ibid. 89
So bleibt mir nur das heiße, süße Hassen
als Brand in andre Herzen einzuglühn –
bis auf den Tag! Den Tag! Dann will ich gern erblassen.\textsuperscript{108}

Likewise, “Gott strafe England,” by A. Kaiser, places German hatred of England front and centre:

\begin{quote}
Gott strafe England!
Dröhnd schon hörte es unsre Kanonen,
Nimmer soll Deutschlands Haß es verschonen;
See, Land und Luft sie empören sich;
England, Gott strafe dich!\textsuperscript{109}
\end{quote}

Other poets escalate the hatred to its ultimate conclusion. “Tod England,” for example, by Paul Keller prescribes death:

\begin{quote}
Ewigen Haß, ewigen Haß
Wasser ist naß, Blut ist naß,
Engeland schuf die Not.
Will es uns ans Leben geh’n,
soll ihm Übeles gescheh’n –
\textbf{Tod!} Tod! Tod!\textsuperscript{110}
\end{quote}

In a departure from direct expressions of outright hatred, several poets featured in the collection take a different tack, praising the heroic deeds of German soldiers and sailors, and lamenting their loss. There are no fewer than five poems in the collection which directly refer to the SMS \textit{Emden}, the German cruiser destroyed by the Australian light cruiser HMAS \textit{Sydney} during the Battle of Cocos in November 1914. The theme of naval warfare in these poems provides the link with the naval episode in the “Haßgesang.”

“Emden,” by Heinrich Eggersglüß, is typical of these poems:

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
O Emden, du freie, du fürstliche Maid,  
du Helden in blutigen Tagen!  
Du lebst uns im Herzen, du lebst allezeit  
in deutschen Liedern und Sagen. –  

Das eiserne Kreuz, dir vom Kaiser verliehn,  
die kommende Emden solls tragen.  
Soll stolz wie du, Fürstin, die Meere durchziehen,  
mit Kränzen aus ruhmreichen Tagen.  

As these Emden poems show, not all the poetry in Oellers’s collection is strictly Anglophobic. Will Vesper’s poem “Haß oder Liebe?” takes a metaphysical angle and addresses an area of particular concern for many readers: the religious objection to hatred. The poem takes the form of a dialogue with Christ, and the argument is that hate for the enemy is really the fruit of the highest love: the love for a country.

**Haß oder Liebe?**

Ich sah am Kreuze Jesu Christ,  
der aller Liebe Vater ist,  

und noch in Kreuz- und Todesnot  
den Feinden seine Liebe bot.  

Es sprach zu mir sein mild Gesicht:  
Nun singe Liebe! Hasse nicht!  

Ich aber hab mich abgewandt,  
nehm hier die Feder in die Hand  

und schreibe her: Ich hasse, Herr!  
Aus tiefster Seele haß ich, Herr!  

Und blick dir doch klar ins Gesicht:  
Mein Haß weicht deiner Liebe nicht!  

Weil dieser Haß, Herr Jesu Christ,  
die Frucht der höchsten Liebe ist.  

Mein Vaterland bis in tiefer Not:  
Haß allen Feinden bis in den Tod!  

---


In addition to appearing in *Wehe dir, England!*, Vesper’s poem was anthologised widely during the First World War. It spoke to those who sought to resolve the apparent conflict between taking a position of hatefulfulness on one hand and a position of Christian forgiveness on the other. The speaker here is an apologist for hatred on patriotic grounds, and the poem depicts his attempt to convince Jesus of the rightness of his un-Christian cause. This aligns neatly with the then prevalent motto “Gott strafe England – Er strafe es,” an appeal for divine sympathy for German Anglophobia.

The phrase “Gott strafe England – Er strafe es” became a common greeting as well as a propaganda slogan in the early part of the war.  

113 In *Wehe dir, England*, W. Tilgenkamp even makes a poem out of the greeting:

```plaintext
Da habe nun die Gelehrten gesucht
in mancher Stunde der Muße
und haben in alte Scharteken gelugt
nach einem echt deutschen Gruße.
Nun kommt der Krieg und rüttelt das Land
aus langen Jahren des Schlafes,
und flugs ist der deutsche Gruß zur Hand:
“Gott strafe England!” – “Er straf es!”
```

114 In the final poem of the collection, a mere twelve pages after “Haß oder Liebe?” Hans von Wolzogen makes a play for redemption with “Kein Haß,” which argues that Germans, as Christians, do not hate England. This is a counter argument to the one Vesper makes in “Haß oder Liebe?” where hatred is permissible as an expression of the highest love for one’s country. Wolzogen’s argument is qualified, though, as hatred of England’s behaviour (lies, hypocrisy and greed) is deemed acceptable if not actually required of a Christian, but hatred of England itself is not.

---


Nein, wir sind Christen! Hassen sollen wir selbst England nicht. Die Lüge hassen, wohl, die Heuchelei, die Niedertracht, die Gier nach Gold und Macht, die seelenlos und hohl.

[...]

Mitleid verletzt, Verachtung trifft zu Tod, mehr als der Haß. Der Lüge Reich zerbricht nach eh’ner Weltgerechtigkeit Gebot. Doch wir sind Christen und wir hassen nicht.  

Readers wondering just how far this theme of hate could be taken, poetically at least, needed only to wait until the last weeks of 1914, when Heinrich Vierordt penned his “Deutschland, hasse!” Calling for nothing short of genocide, Vierordt’s three strident stanzas had the distinction of being so inflammatory that the German General Staff banned them. The poem is no longer a specific expression of Anglophobia, but an impassioned declaration of hatred towards all surrounding nations. This represents a significant escalation in scope as well as rhetoric in German poetry of the First World War.

Deutschland, hasse!

O du Deutschland, jetzt hasse mit eisigem Blut, Hinschlachte Millionen der teuflischen Brut, Und türmten sich berghoch in Wolken hinein Das rauchende Fleisch und das Menschengebein!

O du Deutschland, jetzt hasse geharnischt in Erz! Jedem Feind ein Bajonettstoß ins Herz! Nimm keinen gefangen! Mach jeden gleich stumm! Schaff zur Wüste den Gürtel der Länder ringsum!


\[117\] Vierordt, Heinrich. *Deutschland, hasse! Kreigsruf.* Karlsruhe: Müller & Gräff, 1914. See also *Welt am Sonntag* 20 Nov. 1914.
Anti-Semitic Backlash

The German backlash against the “Haßgesang” started late in 1914 and gradually gained momentum throughout the following year. Just as Lissauer was enjoying his greatest acclaim as the author of the famous poem, the seeds of opposition were being sown which would see

---
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critical discourse surrounding the poem shift between objections on moral and aesthetic grounds, to disparagement on racial and cultural ones.

As Albanis notes, “the discussion of the ‘Haßgesang’ soon became a debate about racial predisposition for revenge and hatred, for which special aptitude was attributed to the Jews.” As early as December 1914, the virulently anti-Semitic journal *Hammer* took the position that the sentiments expressed in “Haßgesang” were as un-German as possible.


By linking the cultural stereotypes of greed and commercialism with both the English and the Jews, the *Hammer* article is at once deriding both the poet and the object of his poem.

*Hammer* is pointing up an irony here, but a greater irony lies in the fact that it was the English-born German philosopher Houston Stewart Chamberlain who most publically played the race card in relation to the “Haßgesang.” Chamberlain, who married the composer Richard Wagner’s daughter, had written the polemical *Foundations of the Nineteenth Century* in 1899, in which numerous racist claims were made, including that the Germanic race was solely responsible for modern European civilisation. Chamberlain asserted, as Matthew Stibbe notes: “The future belonged to Germany […] so long as it freed itself from anti-Germanic, above all Jewish influences. If, on the other hand, the Germans failed to assert themselves, they would go under.”

In his book of 1915, entitled *Neue Kriegsaufsätze*, Chamberlain is condescending in his assessment of the “Haßgesang” and its writer. He puts issues of race at the core of his argument. Chamberlain refers to neither Lissauer nor European Jewry by name, but the


121 Stibbe, *op.cit.*, p. 53
implication is clear. He insists that a true German is uncomfortable with Old Testament hate, whereas Lissauer, posing as a German, is from a race for whom hatred is a traditional value.

By suggesting that the English are too arrogant to be hateful, and that the French are too frivolous, Chamberlain is contending that Jews (particularly German Jews) are baser even than the enemy. In associating Lissauer racially with the editors of British and French newspapers, Chamberlain comes close to recasting hatred as an international Jewish conspiracy.

Amongst Lissauer’s unpublished Bermerkungen zum Leben, written after the war, are some notes made in response to Chamberlain’s attack. Lissauer refutes, particularly, the accusation that only a Jew could be so hateful. He cites expressions of hate from such celebrated Prussian figures as Kleist and Bismarck:


123 Quoted in: Albanis, Elisabeth. German-Jewish Cultural Identity from 1900 to the Aftermath of the First World War. 236.
These remarks seem defensive and self-justifying, but Lissauer does not seek to engage in the racial debate. Rather, he attempts to place his poetry alongside the work of notable Prussians, arguing that they set the precedent, which he, as a Prussian, was merely following.

On the other hand, the Jewish press, during the war, tackled the racial debate head-on. Binjamin Segel, for example, writing in the Jewish journal *Ost und West*, firmly rejects the accusation that only a Jew could write a poem such as the “Haßgesang.” He objects to Chamberlain’s implied double-standard applying to Jews, in that Jews are identified as of the Jewish nation if they are involved in theft or fraud, but “as Germans if they achieve something noteworthy.” Segel does not, however, approve of the sentiments in the poem, and suggests that Lissauer likely already regretted having written it.124

Elsewhere in *Ost und West*, the editors were happy to point the finger back at Christians, noting that even before Lissauer’s poem had become widely known there had been, “sehr christliche und sehr germanische Damen, die in schönen und geistvollen Artikeln den Haß, den unversöhnlichen Haß gegen die Feinde heilig priesen.”125 Similarly poets such as Will Vesper had shown that Christian beliefs could also inspire poetry of hate.126

### Moral Backlash

At a political level, discussion centred on concerns that the use of the “Haßgesang” in schools could lead to a “corrupting and deplorable atmosphere of long-term hatred in our youth.”127 Albanis discusses a debate that took place in the Prussian Chamber of Deputies in early 1915, where the Social Democrat Konrad Haenisch warned that “the open display of a generation-long hatred did nothing for an education of mutual understanding among nations and encouraged youths to glorify violence.”128

---


125 “Der ewige Hass.” *Ost und West* April 1916: 191


128 Albanis, *op.cit.*, p. 235
The press picked up on these moral concerns and by August 1915 the Berliner Tageblatt was publishing articles critical of the “Haßgesang.” Under the headline “Gegen den ‘Haßgesang’,” the paper reported on a letter in the Kölnischen Volkszeitung from a member of the clergy condemning Lissauer’s “Haßgesang” as “against all Christian sentiment.” A commentary from the Berliner Tageblatt followed, criticising the poem’s use in school publications.129

Two days later, the Tageblatt printed Lissauer’s response in which he was at pains to point out that the poem expressed a personal sentiment reflecting the already existing attitude towards England; it had not created it. It is also notable that he did not try to defend the poem, but simply to mitigate his own responsibility for its glorification of hatred. As with his later comments in response to criticism, Lissauer portrays himself as the victim. Rather than having gained from the celebrity of his poem, Lissauer posits that he has suffered as a result of its reception. The rather lengthy text is reproduced here in full because it provides a first-hand account of the poem’s reception by the author himself.

Sehr geehrte Redaktion!

Zu Ihrem Artikel “Gegen den Haßgesang” seien mir folgende sachliche Feststellungen erlaubt:


Hochachtungsvoll ergebenst

Ernst Lissauer

By 1916 the “Haßgesang” had ceased to make headlines in the German press. The popular enthusiasm for the poem and its sentiments dwindled as both sides came to the realisation that there would be no quick end to the war. The poem’s propaganda value was well and truly spent. Debate continued in the Jewish press in the following months, but consisted largely of attempts by writers to distance themselves from both Lissauer and his poem. By now, Lissauer worried that the notoriety of the “Haßgesang” was preventing his other writing from being taken seriously. This very real concern was to stay with Lissauer for the rest of his life.

**Legacy**

Amongst the hundreds of papers in the Ernst Lissauer collection held by the Leo Baeck Institute – Center for Jewish History in New York, there is a typescript document headed:

---


132 See Aronsfeld.

The first volume of the proposed twelve-volume set of collected works was to have been entitled Lyrische Gedichte, poems for which numbered “zusammen über 500.” On the subject of his war poetry, Lissauer is wary:

Hinzu einige Kriegsgedichte, z.B. Auf eine zerschossene Orgel, vielleicht auch Brot, aber keinesfalls den Hassgesang, auch nicht Führer, ebenso nicht das von den stärksten Bataillonen. Ueberhaupt aus diesem Bereich nur ganz wenige.

Despite these detailed plans, the collected works of Lissauer have not appeared in the eighty years since his death. As Guy Stern notes:


The sad irony for Lissauer is that the one thing he did not want to be remembered for, the one poem he explicitly did not want included in his collected works, is the only thing he is remembered for today, when indeed he is remembered at all.

Ernst Volkmann, writing in 1934, offers perhaps the most clear-sighted assessment of the various “Haßgesänge” and their legacy in Germany:
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Die Haßgesänge aber sind etwa nach einem Jahr in dem gleichen Tempo abgeklungen wie der Massenaffekt, der sie hervorlockte, und spielen eigentlich nur noch in der Propaganda der Feinde und der Kriegsgegner eine Rolle.\footnote{Volkmann, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 74}

This neglect of Lissauer’s “Haßgesang” in Germany has continued to the present time: the poem today is familiar only to a small group of scholars. The poem’s role in enemy propaganda and its wider reception in the English-speaking world will be examined in the next chapter.
2. The English-Language Reception of Lissauer’s “Haßgesang”

Barbara Henderson’s Translation

The appearance of Barbara Henderson’s English translation of Lissauer’s poem in the *New York Times* on 15 October 1914, just one month after its first publication in Germany, provided the springboard for the work’s international exposure.138

**A Chant of Hate Against England**

French and Russian, they matter not,  
A blow for a blow and a shot for a shot;  
We love them not, we hate them not,  
We hold the Weichsel and Vosges-gate,  
We have but one and only hate,  
We love as one, we hate as one,  
We have one foe and one alone.

He is known to you all, he is known to you all,  
He crouches behind the dark grey flood,  
Full of envy, of rage, of craft, of gall,  
Cut off by waves that are thicker than blood,  
Come let us stand at the Judgement place,  
An oath to swear to, face to face,  
An oath of bronze no wind can shake.  
An oath for our sons and their sons to take.  
Come, hear the word, repeat the word,  
Throughout the Fatherland make it heard.  
We will never forego our hate,  
We have all but a single hate,  
We love as one, we hate as one,  
We have one foe and one alone –

ENGLAND!

---

In the Captain’s Mess, in the banquet-hall,
Sat feasting the officers, one and all,
Like a sabre-blow, like the swing of a sail,
One seized his glass held high to hail;
Sharp-snapped like the stroke of a rudder’s play,
Spoke three words only: “To the Day!”
Whose glass this fate?
They had all but a single hate.
Who was thus known?
They had one foe and one alone –

   ENGLAND!

Take you the folk of the Earth in pay,
With bars of gold your ramparts lay,
Bedeck the ocean with bow on bow,
Ye reckon well, but not well enough now.
French and Russian they matter not,
A blow for a blow, a shot for a shot,
We fight the battle with bronze and steel.
And the time that is coming Peace will seal.
You will we hate with a lasting hate,
We will never forego our hate,
Hate by water and hate by land,
Hate of the head and hate of the hand,
Hate of the hammer and hate of the crown,
Hate of seventy millions, choking down.
We love as one, we hate as one,
We have one foe and one alone –

   ENGLAND! 139

The first thing to be noted about Henderson’s translation is its quality. She has retained the structure and rhyming scheme of the original without apparent strain. In general her rhymes are at least as good as Lissauer’s, and arguably better. Compare the following:

   Wie ein Säbelhieb, wie ein Segelschwung,
   Einer riß grüsend empor den Trunk,

   Like a sabre-bow, like the swing of a sail,
   One seized his glass held high to hail;

On the other hand, one possible weakness is the reliance on visual rhyme in the refrain:

Wir lieben vereint, wir hassen vereint,
Wir haben nur einen einzigen Feind:
We love as one, we hate as one,
We have only one foe and one alone.

In any case, Henderson has evidently gone to considerable trouble to present a translation as close to the original in form and content as possible. The result is a poetic statement that is as strident in English as it is in German. Clearly Henderson felt it was worth being so meticulous in her work, so much so that she might even be accused of endorsing Lissauer’s original poem by her translation.

Even though it would become popularly known under a different title – “Hymn of Hate” – to the one Henderson chose for her version, it is probable that the quality of Henderson’s translation played a role in the rapid rise to notoriety of the work in the English-speaking world. Certainly, this was the form in which it became widely read in the English-speaking world, as confirmed by the sheer number of republications and the lack of any alternative translations. In addition, whereas the tendency among German writers had been to respond to the “Haßgesang” by echoing its sentiment and themes, English-language writers were more likely to respond to Henderson’s translation of it by varying its theme but imitating its form, as we shall see in the present chapter. The popularity of its form is itself testament to the success of Henderson’s translation.

In the same way that Lissauer’s version of the “Haßgesang” might be seen to have adroitly captured the German Zeitgeist, Henderson’s “Chant of Hate” correspondingly summed up for the English-speaking world everything that was wrong with Germany, namely its hatefulness. That, in essence, was the considerable value of the poem as propaganda for both sides.
Context for Publication of the Henderson Translation

As part of the United States debate on neutrality and isolationism, the translation of the poem was printed below a letter to the editor of the *New York Times* by Henderson’s husband, Archibald Henderson, a professor of mathematics at the University of North Carolina. Henderson’s account of his and his wife’s discovery of “Haßgesang” adds an interesting twist to the story of its English-language reception. Henderson claims to have sourced the “Haßgesang” from a recent edition of the German art magazine *Jugend* “just come to me from Munich.” However, this cannot have been the case. All editions of *Jugend* from 1896 to 1940 have been digitised and can be scrutinised online. A close examination reveals no evidence that Lissauer’s “Haßgesang” was ever published in *Jugend*, and given the date of Henderson’s letter to the *New York Times* so soon after the outbreak of the war, it is possible that Henderson had got hold of an early copy of Lissauer’s *Worte in die Zeit: Flugblätter 1914*, the first part of which, as we have seen, contains the “Haßgesang.”

In the *New York Times*, the translated “Haßgesang” appeared under the heading “War Songs of the Belligerents – Those of Germany and England Give an Insight into the Present Psychology of the Nations.” Professor Henderson notes that the “immense majority of the reports of the war” come to the neutral United States from English and French sources, and that “virtually all of the poetry printed in our newspapers is contributed by English poets or by American poets who sympathize with England and France in the titanic struggle.”

Indeed, virtually all telegraphic communication between Germany and the United States had been disrupted following the actions of the British General Post Office cable ship *Alert*, which cut Germany’s five Atlantic submarine telegraph cables early in the morning of 5 August 1914, just hours after Britain’s declaration of war against Germany. It was through these submarine cables that Germany had been linked to France, Spain, and the Azores, and from there to North America and the rest of the world. This single action at the very

---
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beginning of the war meant that all information coming out of Europe by telegraph cable could be censored or controlled by Britain. Jonathan Winkler notes, “by its actions, the Alert had also rendered the United States virtually dependent upon Britain for communication with the rest of the world.”

Henderson’s plea is that if the United States is to claim neutrality, “let it be a neutrality of fact.” The publishing in American newspapers of the “best German poems evoked by the war,” he argues, would contribute to a better understanding of “the psychology of the German situation at this critical moment in her national history.”

At this very early stage in the war Henderson clearly identifies the hatred “aroused in the breasts” of both the German and the British peoples, and its expression in the poetry of both sides. On the British side, the animosity takes the form of “concentrated hatred of the person and principles of the Kaiser.” By way of example, Henderson quotes ten lines from the (then) recently published sonnet “To the Troubler of the World” by William Watson:

At last we know you, War Lord. You that flung
    The gauntlet down, fling down the mask you wore,
    Publish your heart, and let its pent hate pour,
You that had God forever on your tongue.
    We are old in war, and if in guile we are young,
    Young also is the spirit that evermore
Burns in our bosom ev’n as heretofore,
    Nor are these thews unbraced, these nerves unstrung.
    We do not with God’s name make wanton play;
We are not on such easy terms with Heaven;¹⁴⁶

For the German side, Henderson references Lissauer’s “Haßgesang,” describing it as “a veritable chant of hate, resonant with the note of ancient tribal rites and the primitive ferocity

¹⁴⁴ Winkler, op.cit., p. 5-6


¹⁴⁶ Published in Times 6 Aug. 1914: 7. Without the four last lines which complete the sonnet:

    But in Earth’s hearing we can verily say,
    “Our hands are pure; for peace, for peace we have striven”;
    And not by Earth shall he be soon forgiven
    Who lit the fire accurst that flames to-day.
of a people stirred to the topmost pitch of a passionate racial animosity.” Watson’s “To the Troubler of the World” seems to have been chosen to balance Lissauer’s work, in showing the hateful aspects of both sides’ national psychology. Henderson’s strategy might seem misguided, however, in equating “national psychology” with visceral, unreflected, populist, nationalistic responses that would be likely to intensify animosity rather than promote understanding.

Within a fortnight Barbara Henderson’s translation of the “Haßgesang” crossed the Atlantic and was published in the Times. Under the headline “A Poem of Hatred – England the Only Foe,” the translation is published in full, again attributing the original poem to “the famous Munich illustrated weekly paper, Jugend.” Describing its appearance as “a curious coincidence,” the Times also quotes from a “long leading article” in the Frankfurter Zeitung of the previous Sunday with the heading “Hatred,”

declaring that since the beginning of the war Germany had learnt, as never before, her own unity and strength, but learnt also “how deep and bitter is the hatred of Germany and everything German, not only among Germany’s enemies, but in a far wider sphere.” The Frankfurter Zeitung said: “The greatest mistake we could make would be to reply in kind to the impotent hatred which spits at us everywhere. The fight that we are fighting is too splendid. And we have better things to do.”

The Frankfurter Zeitung seems to be contradicting Lissauer here by suggesting that Germany is the victim of hatred, and that it would be a mistake to hate the enemy back. This article post-dates the publication of “Haßgesang” and so it can be inferred that this is a criticism of both the poem and its popular local reception. There is the suggestion, too, that the war is a noble pursuit that would be degraded or debased if the combatants were to stoop to the level of mere hatefulness. In this respect, the Frankfurter Zeitung pre-empts responses to the “Haßgesang” made by several British commentators, as we shall see. Likewise, the notion that it would be a mistake to reply in kind, to meet hatred with hatred, was a position also expressed elsewhere in the British press. In choosing to publish these comments from the Frankfurter Zeitung alongside the translation of Lissauer’s poem, the Times is pointing out divisions within Germany and showing that not all Germans think like Lissauer. The Times

is taking a perhaps surprisingly moderate and nuanced position here. In this article it does not attempt to conflate the “Haßgesang” with German public opinion.

Nevertheless, elsewhere in the same edition of the *Times*, in an editorial headed “A Hymn of Hate,” the paper is less moderate:

> The War has produced many verses and some poetry, but the remarkable stanzas we quote this morning are the most passionate utterance that has yet appeared. And the passion they utter is hate – the hate of Germans for England. There is something frightful about it, something deadly, concentrated, malignant. It is no hysterical outburst of weakness, but a revelation of collected, conscious, and purposeful rage.\(^{150}\)

The *Times* editorial reaches this conclusion:

> It only sums up in concentrated form many previous expressions of the same feeling. But it does so with an intensity which makes it a portent. Such verses spring only from the heart of a people, and we shall do well to note them.\(^{151}\)

### Commentary in the British Press

Two days after the *Times* ran these articles, the British weekly magazine *The Spectator* published a Letter to the Editor from Richard D. Harlan (Washington D.C.), in which he discusses Barbara Henderson’s translation of “Haßgesang” and Professor Henderson’s accompanying article in the *New York Times*. The letter perpetuates the story that “Haßgesang” was published in *Jugend*, and makes a strikingly false assumption about the target readership of that journal: “It appeared very recently in a Munich periodical, *Jugend*, which from its title (Youth) is presumably a periodical for boys and girls.”\(^{152}\) Harlan notes the gravity of this, and in so doing, conflates the “Haßgesang” with public feeling. This is a less nuanced view of the poem than the *Times* had offered:

> If those of us who are happily distant from the battle could imagine a state of feeling in any part of the British Empire which would lead the responsible editor of a magazine intended for youth to print such a “Song of Hate” in its columns, the shock that would come to us from the idea of feeding the minds of tender years with a song

---


\(^{151}\) Ibid.

of that character would give a new and startling measure of volcanic hatreds leading up to and growing out of this war. And this may be said without criticizing the Munich editor for printing such a song. Doubtless he knew that it was representative of public feeling in Germany. It is that very fact which makes the song so significant.\textsuperscript{153}

In the first months of the war, whenever Henderson’s English translation of “Haßgesang” was reprinted around the world, Jugend was given as the source of the original poem. As can be seen from Harlan’s comments, this led to some confusion outside Germany that the poem was specifically reflective of the voice of German youth. However, as the editor of The Spectator, pointed out in response to Harlan:

\textit{Jugend}, the magazine in which this poem appeared, is probably the best-known periodical devoted to art and letters published in Germany, but, to judge from the habitual nature of its contents, the title indicates emancipation from tradition rather than any reverence for the young.\textsuperscript{154}

This clarification from the editor of the Spectator with regard to the makeup of Jugend notwithstanding, the issue of misattribution is important because it shaped the poem’s reception throughout the English-speaking world. The misattribution seriously skewed the more ambivalent treatment of the war in Jugend, as discussed in chapter 1, as well as the journal’s overall editorial philosophy, and merely fed into anti-German prejudice.

At the start of November, a self-righteous and defiant Letter to the Editor responding to the “Hymn of Hate” was published in the Times:

\begin{quote}
Sir, – I must confess to having read the “Hymn of Hate” with considerable satisfaction. What honest man could desire the affection of the German nation – a nation which has robbed and murdered the inhabitants of the small neighbouring kingdom which it had bound itself by Treaty to protect, and which seems to consider the capture of its towns as a glory for her armies? Germany’s hatred is England’s honour.\textsuperscript{155}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{153} Letters to the Editor. Spectator 31 Oct. 1914: 11.

\textsuperscript{154} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{155} Sherborne. Letters to the Editor. Times 2 Nov. 1914: 9.
A lengthier response was given by Arthur Conan Doyle in his 1914 collection of essays *The German War*. In a piece entitled “Madness” the creator of Sherlock Holmes addresses German hatefulness: “We have all, I suppose, read and marvelled at the wonderful German ‘song of hate.’ This has been so much admired over the water that Prince Rupprecht of Bavaria (who had just stated his bitter hatred of us in a prose army order) distributed copies of the verses to his Bavarians as a stimulant in their long, unsuccessful tussle with our troops at Ypres.”

Doyle’s essay captures the essence of the British reception of the poem in the early months of the war. First, there is the suggestion that the poem is somehow unmanly:

> It fills us with a mixture of pity and disgust, and we feel as if, instead of a man, we were really fighting with a furious, screaming woman. [...] This shrill scream of hate and constant frenzied ranting against Great Britain may reach its highest note in this poem, but we know that it pervades the whole Press and every class of national thought.

Then there is the assertion that the Germans are unsportsmanlike in their hatefulness, in contrast to the British:

> We have never been a nation who fought with hatred. It is our ideal to fight in a sporting spirit. It is not that we are less in earnest, but it is that the sporting spirit itself is a thing very largely evolved by us and is a natural expression of our character. We fight as hard as we can, and we like and admire those who fight hard against us so long as they keep within the rules of the game.

To illustrate his point, Doyle gives what he describes as “an obvious example” of a German combatant who – exceptionally – demonstrates the British “sporting spirit,” citing the exploits of the SMS *Emden* and its captain:

> One German has done us more harm than any other in this war. He is Captain von Müller of the Emden, whose depredations represent the cost of a battleship. Yet an honest sigh of relief went up from us all when we learned that he had not perished with his ship, and if he walked down Fleet Street today he would be cheered by the

---
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crowd from end to end. Why? Because almost alone among Germans he has played the game as it should be played.159

We have already encountered the Emden in this thesis, and we have seen how it became the subject of poetry attacking the British. Now we have a British writer praising the actions of the Emden and the behaviour of its captain in order to condemn the Germans. Most significantly here, Doyle plays his trump cards of class and chivalry. Addressing the notional German reader directly, Doyle proclaims that the Germans are not behaving as gentlemen, that their behaviour has transgressed the unspoken chivalric code of warfare, and that poems such as the “Hymn of Hate” are merely illustrations of this transgression. Doyle concludes:

It is true that everything that he [Captain von Müller] did was illegal. He had no right to burn uncondemned prizes, and a purist could claim that he was a pirate. But we recognised the practical difficulties of his position; we felt that under the circumstances he had acted like a gentleman, and we freely forgave Germany harm that he had done us. With this example before you, my German reader, you cannot say that it is national hatred when we denounce your murderers and brigands in Belgium. If they, too, had acted as gentlemen, we should have felt towards them as to von Müller.160

English-language newspapers and magazines chronicled the progression of both the “Haßgesang” and Lissauer throughout the duration of the war. A regular column in the Times, “Through German Eyes,” gave readers some insight into German perspectives on the conflict, and it was through this column, and others like it, that English-speaking readers became aware of the poem’s reception in Germany. As we have seen already, there was something of a mutual fascination at play, with both sides in the war keen to know what effect the poem was having on the other.

The breathless commentary in the “Through German Eyes” column of Wednesday 25 November 1914, headed “The ‘Hymn of Hate’ in the Field,” furnishes us with an early example of this fascination. The column reports from a correspondent in Holland, who had sent the text of the piece noting that it contained “a scandalous song from the German Huns,

159 Doyle, op.cit., p. 92

160 Ibid. 92-93.
the German text of the remarkable ‘Hymn of Hate’ by Herr Ernst Lissauer. [...] The poem is published in a Crefeld newspaper, with the following comment:”161

Hatred against England is the title of this poem, which by order of the general in command has been distributed among all the Bavarian troops in the field. The author, who is a soldier in the 10th Bavarian infantry regiment, was moved to this flaming protest, inspired with the deepest popular feeling, by the Army Order of the Bavarian Crown Prince.162

It is worth noting here that there has been some confusion over Lissauer’s military service. As Albanis clarifies, Lissauer did not serve in the Bavarian army at any time. However, “from November 1916 he served in the Home Guard (Landsturm) in Hungary and from the end of 1917 in the Press Office of the War Ministry.”163 This confusion would have served to help British readers imagine the poison of the “Hymn of Hate” in the minds and mouths of German soldiers at the front – a rather more potent image than the one that the reality of Lissauer as an armchair warrior, far from the front, might have conjured.

The “Hymn of Hate” again featured in the “Through German Eyes” column of the Times at the end of November. “At the request of a large number of correspondents we publish the German text of Herr Ernst Lissauer’s now famous ‘Hymn of Hate.’ The second stanza, however, does not appear in the copy which has reached us.”164 Just why a “large number of correspondents” wanted to see the original German text is unclear. Perhaps readers, not wanting to believe everything they read in the newspaper, were suspicious as to the existence of the poem. Perhaps, too, readers wanted to be able to check the accuracy of the translation. Alternatively, this was a sign of the intense interest readers had in the poem, and a testament to the quality of the translation for inspiring it. Two days later the Times published the missing second stanza.165

161 “Through German Eyes: The ‘Hymn of Hate’ in the Field”. The Times, 25 Nov. 1914, p.6
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Just a few days after the publication of the German text of the “Haßgesang,” the Times reported a fresh poetic outrage. Under the headline “Air Raid on England: In Verse,” the paper revealed: “It appears that the now famous ‘Hymn of Hate’ was issued as the introduction to a series of leaflets published by Ernst Lissauer. Among his poems which have been distributed throughout the Bavarian army, are, according to the Cologne Gazette, the following verses.”¹⁶⁶ The German text of Lissauer’s poem “England träumt” is then printed in full:

Nacht . . . über England blaut gewölbige Nacht . . .
An die Meilen der Küsten der Anschlag der Wasser schäumt,
Vor den Häfen und draußen auf hoher See
Stehn Kreuzer auf Wacht;
Durch Belgien, durch Frankreich rückt die deutsche Armee,
Sie drängt auf Dükerque, Bologne, auf Calais, –
Von flutenden Forts des Weltmeers umsäumt,

England träumt . . .
Durch die Luftstille rinnt Surren,
Schmal
Über den blassen, glatten
Nachthimmel eilt langhin ein Schatten,
Widerschattend auf Wiese und Tal,
England träumt schwer . . . seine Wälder murren,
Der Himmel tönt,
Immer heller, immer schneller,
Horch, es brausen die Propeller,

England träumt . . . England stöhnt.¹⁶⁷

A “rough translation” is then provided:

Night! Over England vaulted night . . .
Along the coast the beat of the foaming waters. Before the harbours and out at sea cruisers are watching. The German army advances through Belgium and through France, and presses on Dunkirk, Boulogne, and Calais. Surrounded by the fortresses of the sea, England is sleeping . . . England is dreaming.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid.
England is dreaming . .
There is a humming in the still air. A shadow, a narrow shadow, glides swiftly over the pale night sky and is reflected in meadow and vale. England dreams heavily. England’s woods murmur. There is sound in the heavens, ever clearer, ever quicker. Listen! The propellers hum. England is dreaming . . . England is groaning.\textsuperscript{168}

There is a palpable malevolence here. Lissauer’s vision of a Zeppelin attack on a sleeping England takes the fight to the British in a way that, in December 1914, was still only a threat. Germany’s aerial campaign on Britain was still to come, but the peril would have been deeply felt. The poem ends before any physical damage is done, but the invasion of airspace is underway, the vulnerability is exposed, and England is caught sleeping. The “shrill and screaming” Lissauer of the “Hymn of Hate,” as described by Conan Doyle, has gone, to be replaced by a subtler, and therefore more sinister writer.

Like the “Haßgesang,” “England träumt” did indeed first appear in one of Lissauer’s \textit{Flugblätter} of 1914.\textsuperscript{169} In as much as the “Hymn of Hate” was deemed risible by the British, “England is dreaming” had a more sober reception. Perhaps it was because the “Hymn of Hate” was so easy to make fun of that its notoriety endured, whereas “England is dreaming” disappeared from view in the English-speaking world almost as soon as it arrived.

Less than a year later, in May 1915, the \textit{Times} reported on the publication in Germany of a new book of poems of hate, \textit{Woe to Thee, England – 1915}:\textsuperscript{170}

It contains more than 100 poems by as many authors. Among them is Lissauer’s “Hymn of Hate” and other verses of the same quality, under such headings as “God Punish England,” “Thou England,” “Hatred against England,” “A Song against England,” “Revenge,” and “To the Day.” This little collection of songs of hate is very valuable as what the Germans call a “Culture document.” It is, indeed, remarkable how very few of the German war publications show any sign of an attempt to take a lofty point of view or to look at the war with other than German nationalist eyes.\textsuperscript{171}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[171] “In Germany Today: Poems of Hate.” \textit{Times} 31 May 1915: 5.
\end{footnotes}
Yet Lissauer’s own reservations about the poem were also reported on. This might have been an attempt to moderate the nationalism.

Ernst Lissauer has written to the *Berliner Tageblatt* saying that he agrees with its view that his “Song of Hate” is not intended for the young, and that he has often advised against its publication in school-books. In one case he even refused his permission. “‘The Song of Hate’,” he declares, “was written as the result of the war, when the impression created by England’s declaration of war was fresh.” He says that he neither foresaw the success which the song has attained nor the attacks now made upon it. He denies that, except in isolated cases, he has received a pfennig as the result of the numerous reprints.¹⁷²

This report was backed up a few days later by an item in the column “Notes by a Neutral,” in the *Times*. The “neutral” correspondent brought confirmation of Lissauer’s “official regret,” but also news of the ongoing currency of the “Haßgesang” in Germany (particularly amongst soldiers, if not necessarily amongst the general public), and the reception of German Anglophobia in neutral countries:

Lissauer, I observe, has sent out an official regret for his Hymn of Hate. Yet his hymn, sung with dramatic action, can be heard in any town in Germany where young soldiers are being trained. The more violent and obscene anti-British postal cards have been stopped by the Government, and the indiarubber stamps of “Gott strafe England,” used for marking letters to neutral countries, are being abolished, chiefly because the Dutch, many of whom are friendly to England, wrote sharp reprimands to their German correspondents.¹⁷³

Despite such signs of a softening of German Anglophobia, during the subsequent years of the war, the “Hymn of Hate” continued to be a byword for everything that was monstrous about the Germans. If, as Klemperer wrote, for the Germans the “Haßgesang” captured the *Zeitgeist* at the beginning of the war, the poem’s translation into English provided the Allies with the moral high ground in the conflict.¹⁷⁴ Violet R. Markham’s Letter to the Editor of the *Times* at the end of 1917 presents this moral distinction between the two sides from the point-of-view of the Allies:

---


Organized national hatred, as the Germans have proved repeatedly, is apt to overreach itself. In the effort to be brutal it is often merely foolish – witness their silly Hymn of Hate. In any event such spirit is as the poles removed from the temper of courage, steadfastness, and endurance in which this country began, and let us hope will finish, its mighty enterprise.  

The “characteristic *sang-froid*” with which the British public received the “Hymn of Hate,” as Aronsfeld puts it, was greatly assisted by such popular satirical publications as the weekly *Punch* magazine, which began to run cartoons lampooning the poem. Murdoch identifies

---


177 Aronsfeld, *op.cit.*, p. 49
an early example in *Punch* from December 1914, in which German soldiers are driven into battle by a recording of the poem.  

Perhaps the most famous “Hymn of Hate”-inspired cartoon was the “Study of a Prussian household having its morning hate” by Frank Reynolds in a February 1915 edition of *Punch*. Here a glowering Prussian middle-class family, complete with dachshund, are mockingly depicted around a table in a session of ritualised group hate. This, we are led to believe, is a daily ceremony of ill temper, undertaken with grim Prussian resolve. Reynolds’s cartoon was reprinted in magazines and newspapers around the world, and itself became the subject of parody – as we shall see in chapter 3.

---

178 Murdoch, *op.cit.*, p. 33

A later cartoon for *Punch* magazine, published in May 1916, takes a more serious tone in its depiction of a “Lady Spy” expectantly awaiting the arrival of the German Fleet, after having set the signal lights. The scene is all the more sinister as we read that she has just “finished her performance of the Hymn of Hate,” the music for which can be seen on the stand of her piano keyboard. This cartoon reminds us that the “Hymn of Hate” is more than a mere joking matter, it is a call to action to those with whom Britain is at war.\(^{180}\)

---

**Fig. 10. The Lady Spy, Having Finished Her Performance of the Hymn of Hate, Sets the Signal Lights and Awaits Confidently the Arrival of the German Fleet\(^ {181}\)**

---

**Productive Reception**

A particular feature of the story of Lissauer’s “Haßgesang” relates to the power the poem had to elicit strong responses from readers. The combination of rhetorical and emotional force seems to demand a response and, as we have seen, many German writers felt moved to respond with more poetry along similar lines. So too in the English-speaking world,

\(^{180}\)“The Lady Spy,” *Punch* 10 May 1916: 311.

\(^{181}\)Ibid.
Lissauer’s “Hymn of Hate” was met with poetry in response. Indeed, as Mark Van Wienen observes, the publication of Henderson’s translation of the “Haßgesang” in the *New York Times* precipitated what became a ferocious poetical exchange.\(^{182}\)

Beatrice M. Barry’s “Answering the ‘Hassgesang’” took an astonishingly early lead when it was published in the *New York Times* just the day after Henderson’s translation. The newspaper duly noted: “the following lines in reply [to the ‘Hymn of Hate’] reached The Times office early yesterday afternoon, evidencing a speed of production truly remarkable, considering the technical excellence of the composition.”\(^{183}\) Indeed, this was a feat, as Wienen points out, requiring that “the poem be composed and delivered to the editor’s desk in the few hours between the appearance of the morning paper and the afternoon deadline for the next day’s edition.”\(^{184}\)

**Answering the “Hassgesang”**

French and Russian, they matter not.
For England only your wrath is hot;
But little Belgium is so small
You never mentioned her at all –
Or did her graveyards, yawning deep,
Whisper that silence was discreet?

For Belgium is waste! Ay, Belgium is waste.
She welters in the blood of her sons.
And the ruins that fill the little place
Speak of the vengeance of the Huns.
“Come, let us stand at the Judgement place.”
German and Belgian, face to face.
What can you say? What can you do?
What will history say of you?
For even the Hun can only say
That little Belgium lay in his way.
Is there no reckoning you must pay?
What of the Justice of that “Day”?
Belgium one voice – Belgium one cry


\(^{184}\) Wienen, *op.cit.*, p. 3
Shrieking her wrongs, inflicted by 

GERMANY!

In her ruined homesteads, her trampled fields, 
You have taken your toll, you have set your seal; 
Her women are homeless, her men are dead, 
Her children pitifully cry for bread; 
Perchance they will drink with you – “To the Day!”
Let each man construe it as he may. 
What shall it be?
They, too, have but one enemy; 
Whose work is this?
Belgium has but one word to hiss – 

GERMANY!

Take you the pick of your fighting men 
Trained in all warlike arts, and then 
Make of them all a human wedge 
To break and shatter your sacred pledge: 
You may fling your treaty lightly by, 
But that “scrap of paper” will never die!
It will go down to posterity
It will survive in eternity.
Truly you hate with a lasting hate: 
Think you you will escape that hate? 
“Hate by water and hate by land: 
Hate of the head and hate of the hand”
Black and bitter and bad as sin.
Take you care lest it hem you in.
Lest the hate you boast of be yours alone, 
And curses, like chickens, find roost at home 

IN GERMANY!

Barry’s poem imitates the form of Henderson’s translation (which, as we have seen, is itself very close to Lissauer’s original) more or less exactly. Barry’s response is an acknowledgement of the rhetorical force of both Lissauer and Henderson, but it is no mere parody. As Wienen observes, Lissauer’s criticism of England’s colonial power and greed is

met with Barry’s condemnation of Germany’s invasion of Belgium. For Barry, by implication, England occupies the moral high ground.\textsuperscript{186}

Not all readers of the \textit{New York Times} were in agreement with Barry, and some clearly felt more in sympathy with Lissauer’s Anglophobic position and even found additional reasons for hatred towards England. The day following publication of Barry’s “Answering the ‘Hassgesang’,” the \textit{New York Times} kept the versified debate running by printing “Another Chant of Hate” by Rosalie M. Moynahan.

\textbf{Another Chant of Hate}

French and Russian, they matter not,  
Some wrong remembered, some good forgot;  
England stands at the Bar alone,  
Nemesis rises to claim her own.  
Ireland or Belgium – dare you say  
Whose wrongs cry loudest this Judgement Day,  
\textit{ENGLAND}?

For not a sudden, swift campaign,  
The World as Mourner, was Ireland slain:  
No soldier’s steel plunged straight to her heart –  
The sword \textit{you} wield had a finer art.  
Deep in the darkness of your hold  
You forged it with hate, you weighed it with gold;  
You drew it with lust,  
You swung it with sin,  
Sure and stealthy you thrust it in,  
And never have plucked it out again,  
\textit{ENGLAND}!

You cry aloud through the printed page  
“For Liberty, Honor, the fight I wage!”  
Australia, Canada, governed well?  
Aye! \textit{They} are distant, might rebel.  
Ireland, helpless under your heel,  
Proof of the value those words conceal!  
You have wrenched their Celtic tongue away,  
But their hate cries out in \textit{your} tongue today,  
And casts your treacherous past in the way,  
\textit{ENGLAND}!

\textsuperscript{186} Wienen, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 3
Yet why the past do we judge you by?
Stricken Belgium must deny,
But we aloud to the world can cry:
“You pledged your Power to be her shield,
You pledged her the millions your conquests yield;
What help can now the wrong atone?
You pledged your honor – She fought alone,
ENGLAND!”

They have stood at the Judgement-Place,
The Saints, the Heroes of our race.
Through the long Night of the Tyrant’s sin
Ireland has trusted her Cause to Him.
“Vengeance is Mine, I will repay,”
And God fulfils His Word today
Through GERMANY! 187

We have already met Moynahan’s poem in chapter 1 of this thesis, but in its German translation as it appeared in Wehe dir England! 188 As with Barry’s rapid response to the “Hymn of Hate,” Moynahan’s reply to Barry’s involved a similarly speedy effort from both the author and the New York Times. Moynahan, too, adopts the form of Lissauer’s original, and employs the same rhetorical devices to condemn England. In contrast to Barry, Moynahan weighs Britannia’s past in the balance, and finds her wanting. How can we overlook England’s tyranny, treachery and greed with regard to Ireland, Moynahan asks, and yet criticize Germany?

Barry, true to form, had the counter. Her new response was published in the New York Times three days later:

The Crucial Moment

Ere the War of Nations had begun,
With care and judgement the plans were laid,
And the thought of all was expressed by one
Who said:
“Take heed, for the time is ripe.
Africa, India, too, will strike:

And while England battles with us and these
Ireland will creep on hands and knees –
While the smoke of battle hangs low and black,
And will stab her ancient foe in the back.
She will wield the knife, she will drive it home,
She will watch it cleave through flesh and bone;
For the lust of revenge will fill her heart.
And she will not fail to do her part.”

And England heard and she turned aghast!
She glimpsed the future. She thought of the past.
As she fought for life, would her foster child
Strike at her in her hour of trial?

But Ireland!
She rose to her feet and cried, “For shame!”
I have suffered enough – would you stain my name?
Shall it ever be said or ever be sung
That Ireland and treachery are one?
Ireland, awake! They know us not!
For the time our grievance is forgot.
And at England’s side we take our place,
For we fight no man save face to face.
England, we come! And you shall see
What manner of men the Irish be.
For ENGLAND!
For IRELAND!
Forever!  

In Barry’s view, historical grievances need to be forgotten, albeit temporarily, while England and Ireland stand together in England’s “hour of trial.” Note that it is England being tested here, extending the judicial metaphor common to all these poems. Until now, Lissauer, Barry and Moynahan have been anxious to claim the higher moral ground for either England or Germany. Barry’s innovation here is to re-focus the argument from some form of eventual judgement day, which she herself had employed in her first response and which Moynahan had picked up on in her “Another Chant of Hate,” when all parties will be in the dock facing divine trial, to the more immediate temporal trial of military might. This is “The Crucial Moment”: right now.

The following day, the *New York Times* published yet another response to the “Hymn of Hate”: “Motherhood’s Chant” by McLandburgh Wilson. Like Barry’s poem of the day before, the argument is broadened, but here it is given a Pacifist twist: no longer a question of nation against nation, but of war against peace:

**Motherhood’s Chant**

French or Russian, they matter not,
German or English, as one begot.
We bore them all and we bore them well,
We went for them to the gates of hell,
We are the makers of flesh and bone,
We have one foe, one hate alone –

WAR!

He is known to you all, he has called to you all,
He crouches behind each boundary wall,
He rides on the waves of a crimson flood,
He rides on the tides of our children’s blood,
He lies of glory and sacrifice,
Of honor and fame and pomp he lies –

WAR!

Come, let us stand in the Judgement Place
And take an oath for the human race,
An oath our daughters, and theirs, shall take
An oath no trumpet or drum can shake
We hate no sinner, we hate the sin,
Not those who lose, not those who win.
We, the makers of flesh and bone,
We have one foe and one alone –

WAR!

You take the folk of our pain to slay,
That gold nor steel can ever repay.
You shall we hate with a lasting hate.
We will never forego our hate –
Hate of the heart and hate of the womb,
Hate of the cradle and hate of the tomb.
And you shall answer and make reply,
For we are partners of God on high.
What will you say before that Throne
To Us, the makers of flesh and bone,

WAR?  

Once again, the form of Lissauer’s original is imitated, but war itself is singled out as the common enemy, and the victims are no longer countries but people, specifically mothers. As in Ostini’s “Haß!” and Heym’s “Der Krieg,” war is personified in Wilson’s poem. Like the previous poems published in the New York Times, there is the ultimate threat of the final reckoning, but this time it is a calling to account by the mothers of humanity as “partners of God on high.”

The poetic debate in the New York Times, between Barry, Moynahan and Wilson illustrates Wienen’s observation that “by the end of 1914, the ‘Hassgesang’ had been transformed from a particular poem giving rise to a volley of poetic exchanges to a veritable subgenre.”

Other writers were moved to respond to the “Hymn of Hate” outside the realm of mass-circulation newspapers. The American poet and English professor Helen Gray Cone, published her reply in a collection entitled A Chant of Love for England – and Other Poems in 1915.

A Chant of Love for England

A song of hate is a song of Hell;
Some there be that sing it well.
Let them sing it loud and long,
We lift our hearts in a loftier song:
We lift our hearts to Heaven above,
Singing the glory of her we love, –

England!

Glory of thought and glory of deed,
Glory of Hampden and Runnymede;
Glory of ships that sought far goals,
Glory of swords and glory of souls!
Glory of songs mounting as birds,
Glory immortal of magical words;
Glory of Milton, glory of Nelson,
Tragical glory of Gordon and Scott;
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Glory of Shelley, glory of Sidney,
Glory transcendent that perishes not, —
Hers is the story, hers be the glory,

*England!*

Shatter her beauteous breast ye may;
The spirit of England none can slay!
Dash the bomb on the dome of Paul's —
Deem ye the fame of the Admiral falls?
Pry the stone from the chancel floor, —
Dream ye that Shakespeare shall live no more?
Where is the giant shot that kills
Wordsworth walking the old green hills?
Trample the red rose on the ground, —
Keats is Beauty while earth spins round!
Bind her, grind her, burn her with fire,
Cast her ashes into the sea, —
She shall escape, she shall aspire,
She shall arise to make men free:
She shall arise in a sacred scorn,
Lighting the lives that are yet unborn;
Spirit supernal, Splendour eternal,

*England!* 192

Once again, Cone imitates the form of Lissauer’s original, but unlike some other such imitations, this is a defence of England, not an attack on Germany. Yet, as Murdoch observes, Cone’s poem builds up to a climax “recalling uncomfortably Will Vesper’s casuistic identification of hate with love.” 193

Cone’s poem is an equal but opposite work to the “Haßgesang.” It is sentimental, but it works on the same terms as Lissauer. All these responses to Lissauer’s “Haßgesang” give his poem a life and a significance that it might not otherwise have had. They imply that Lissauer’s work is known to all and they engage with Lissauer on his own terms.

---


193 Wienen, *op.cit.*, p. 35
Kipling and Hardy

The nature of the productive reception of Lissauer’s poem, on the other side of the Atlantic, was quite different. On the United States side it was met with a barrage of formal imitations by amateur poets. In Great Britain, the response from the professional poets Rudyard Kipling and Thomas Hardy was subtler, but they engaged with the “Hymn of Hate” on their terms. For Kipling in particular, Lissauer’s poem seemed to confirm his darkest prejudices against Germany. In describing Kipling as “a vigorous and notorious Hun-hater,” Peter Firchow cites his “For All We Have and Are” (1914) as indicative of Kipling’s position: 194

For all we have and are,
For all our children’s fate,
Stand up and take the war.
The Hun is at the gate! 195

However, the poem in which Kipling most clearly responds to the “Hymn of Hate” is “The Beginnings”:

It was not part of their blood,
It came to them very late
With long arrears began to make good,
When the English began to hate.

They were not easily moved,
They were icy willing to wait
Till every count should have proved
Ere the English began to hate.

Their voices were even and low,
Their eyes were level and straight
There was neither sign nor show,
When the English began to hate.

It was not preached to the crowd,
It was not taught by the State.
No man spoke it aloud,
When the English began to hate.


195 Quoted in Firchow, Peter Edgerly. The Death of the German Cousin. 106.
It was not suddenly bred,  
It will not swiftly abate,  
Through the chill years ahead,  
When time shall count from the date  
That the English began to hate.\footnote{Firchow, op. cit., p. 107.}

“The Beginnings,” was published in 1915 and appended to Kipling’s wartime short story “Mary Postgate,” in which the title figure encounters a dying German pilot and, refusing to help him, watches him die. As Firchow suggests, the poem “seems clearly intended to serve as a kind of moral signpost for the story. The stanza by stanza tracing of the development of England’s hatred for Germany matches the gradual intensification of Mary’s emotional response.”\footnote{Ibid.} This hatred, as Kipling reminds us in his poem, does not come naturally to the Briton, and indeed has had to be learnt. On the other hand, the natural hatefulness of the German is implicit.

In some respects, there are echoes of Herwegh’s “Das Lied vom Hasse” in “The Beginnings,” and it is possible that Kipling knew of Herwegh’s work through Thackeray’s translation:

\begin{verbatim}
Fight tyranny, while tyranny  
The trampled earth above is;  
And holier will our hatred be,  
Far holier than our love is.  
Till death shall part the blade and hand,  
They may not separate:  
We’ve practiced loving long enough,  
\end{verbatim}

If Kipling’s personal hatred of Germany and the Germans was bubbling just under the surface of his writing, Thomas Hardy’s war poetry shows more detachment. In Firchow’s view, some of Hardy’s wartime poetry ranks among the greatest poetry written in English about the war, particularly “The Pity of It” (1915) and “In Time of ‘The Breaking of Nations’” (1916). But it is “England to Germany in 1914” (1914) which seems to respond most directly to the
Anglophobia of Lissauer’s poem, and which, in Firchow’s view, “expresses Hardy’s quite genuine and quite unpoetic puzzlement at why Germans should hate the English so violently”:\textsuperscript{199}

“O England, may God punish thee!”
– Is it that Teuton genius flowers
Only to breathe malignity
Upon its friend of earlier hours?
– We have eaten your bread, you have eaten ours,
We have loved your burgs, your pines’ green moan,
Fair Rhine-stream, and its storied towers;
Your shining souls of deathless dowers
Have won us as they were our own:

We have nursed no dreams to shed your blood,
We have matched your might not rancorously,
Save a flushed few whose blatant mood
You heard and marked as well as we
To tongue not in their country’s key;
But yet you cry with face aflame,
“O England, may God punish thee!”
And foul in onward history,
And present sight, your ancient name.

\textit{Autumn 1914}\textsuperscript{200}

\textbf{France’s Hymn of Hate}

Lissauer’s “Hymn of Hate” resonated beyond the English and German-speaking worlds, as the French poet Jules de Marthold’s response attests. A translation of “France’s Hymn of Hate,” again by Barbara Henderson, was published in the \textit{New York Times} on 4 July 1915. The newspaper declares: “no poem that has appeared since the war began has aroused such a storm of wrath or admiration as Ernst Lissauer’s now famous ‘Song of Hate Against

\textsuperscript{199} Firchow, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 117-8

England.’ Now comes a Frenchman with a reply to the German war poet, a ‘Chant of Hate’ against Germany, which has in it some of the fiery hatred of the poem which inspired it.”

**France’s Hymn of Hate**

Hate, hate for hate unto that devil foe,  
That forger-king we know,  
The corsair’s traitor blow;  
Hate, O thou God of Hell,  
We avenge, by shot, by shell;  
We sing of arms, a chant of hate,  
The holy canticle of hate!  
Let us fling fierce and far our hatred to the sun.  
Now we forget all mercy, all pity now have done:  
Bury them deep and dark in a mighty winding shroud,  
For there’s hate beneath our banners, no hate so mad, so proud:  
Hate, holy word, cry in your thought most deep,  
Hate, holy word, cry in your quiet sleep,  
Hate, holy word, cry as you awake,  
Hate, holy word, cry as your arms you take:  
Hate, we will teach to every babe thy name:  
Each mustard seed, like that of Bible fame,  
Shall wax and multiply each fragile head,  
Till smothering branches over them shall spread!

We sing of arms, a chant of hate,  
The holy canticle of hate!

Too strait for you the earth and sea and skies,  
Ferreting out the earth, vile race of spies,  
A universal robbery you scheme,  
A universe sealed with your seal you dream;  
Hate, holy word, forming our reason’s might,  
Hate, holy word, becomes the right of right,  
Hate, holy word, that daily grows in power,  
Hate, holy word, our armour in this hour;  
Your word can pass current no more than your gold,  
You know only actions of baseness untold.  
An ambush may lie in each vow that is borne,  
And no one will trust you, for ever forsworn!

We sing of arms, a chant of hate,  
The holy canticle of hate!

---

In thy pride a fool, thou thinkest God to cheat,
All-powerful impotent, here now is thy defeat,
Thy chariot has met a hindrance on the way,
And most just justice hath broken thine essay.
Hate, holy word, guides us, a beacon light
Hate, holy word, shines clear, star of our night,
Hate, holy word, will lead us where we go,
Hate, holy word, will end our savage foe;
Great vessel of the faith, cathedral grave,
Oh! Rheims shall be reborn; yea, Rheims again shall shine
And in a sea of fire this sacred nave,
Which yet shall crown our Kings, shall uncrown thine!

For Alsace Lorraine, the great,
For the human race and State,
Hohenzollern haters,
Tawny traitors,
Hear our war cry – madmen. We call:
Germans all,
Hate! Hate! 

Lissauer’s poem had opened with an expression of indifference towards France, but Marthold’s response indicates that this feeling was not mutual. Beyond its hatefulness, the feature of the original “Haßgesang” most forcefully imitated in Marthold’s poem is Lissauer’s taste for abstract verbiage. In terms of literary quality Marthold arguably takes the poetic exchange to a new low.

FRANCE'S HYMNS OF HATE

A REPLY TO LISSAUER'S
GERMAN WAR SONG

By JULES MARTHOLD

ENGLISH VERSION

by BARBARA HENDERSON

Fig. 11. France’s Hymn of Hate – New York Times 4 July 1914
Beyond the initial impulse to respond to the “Hymn of Hate” with more poetry, there was the larger issue of the poem’s value as counter or anti-German propaganda. Marsland notes in her comparative study of French, German and English First World War poetry that “as well as being German propaganda against England – French and English translations of the ‘Haßgesang’ served as anti-German propaganda.”

As the various cartoons inspired by the “Hymn of Hate” clearly show, such earnest hatred was fertile ground for parody and humour. Early in 1915 the Times gleefully reported on an incident at the Royal College of Music. Under the banner: “‘Hymn of Hate’ sung by British Choir – Sir Hubert Parry’s Joke,” the newspaper tells of Lissauer’s hymn having been published in the Weekly Dispatch along with its musical setting. Parry, the head of the Royal College of Music, seeing both the words and the music, felt that “it would not be a bad idea to get a practical experience of what it really sounded like.” A hundred copies of the newspaper were distributed amongst the choral class, and under the baton of Sir Walter Parratt, “we had our morning hate.”

“Seeing that there had been no preparation of the music,” said Sir Hubert, “the results were very creditable. The singers sang with the music page in the Weekly Dispatch propped up in front of them, and it was great fun. Sir Walter asked them to sing the hymn with plenty of snarl, to express honestly the intentions of the composer, Ernst Lissauer, but they laughed too much to snarl. However, when they came to the word ‘England’ they rolled it out in fine style, and Lissauer would have been delighted to have heard its reverberating note.”

Parry concluded:

The music is rather better than the poetry, and I felt like sending Lissauer a telegram telling him how much we had enjoyed his work and what infinite amusement it had afforded us, but I did not see how I was going to ensure the telegram reaching him.

---

203 Marsland, op.cit., p. 63
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With Lissauer and his poem now a figure of fun rather than fear, the alliterative phrase “Hymn of Hate” entered the popular consciousness as shorthand for the – in British eyes – absurd hatefulness of the Germans. Those three words alone, peppering discourse through all social strata, from the ruling elite down to the man in the street (or trench), were enough to conjure a stereotypical image of the enemy and to encapsulate why he must be fought.

Lord Sydenham stated, for example, in a House of Lords debate on the “Teaching of Patriotism” in 1915: “Happily in this country we have no response to the vile ‘Hymn of Hate’; and one of the most striking features, perhaps, of the war is the extreme tenderness that has been shown to enemy individuals and to enemy interests.” Presumably Sydenham was unaware of the Germanophobic verse of Watson and Kipling.

By contrast, in the House of Commons early in 1915, in a debate on the “Unified Administration of Supply,” Major Baird was less sweeping in his generalization about the lack of a British response, noting that at least a part of the British population was responding in kind to German Anglophobia:

but we know also that Great Britain is not making war in the sense that Germany is making war or that France is making war. Every German – man, woman, and, I think, child, for the children are encouraged with the Song of Hate – every living German, I am convinced, thinks of nothing from the moment of waking to the moment of going to sleep, but how to kill England. That part of our nation at war has for the last eight and a half months thought of nothing from the time of waking in the morning until going to sleep at night except how we can kill Germans. It is not a pleasant business. We do not do it because we like it, but because the country requires it. But there is not a member of the community who is excused from taking his or her share in that disagreeable task, and it is because we feel that hitherto the country has not been alive to the demands of the situation, one so constantly hears the question, “I wonder when the country is really going to make war?”

On the battlefield too – in a literal but also in a new, figurative sense – hate was being dealt out by all sides. Fraser and Gibbons, in their Soldier and Sailor Words and Phrases (1925)

---


neatly chart the changing status of the expression “Hymn of Hate” from anti-English propaganda, via anti-German propaganda, to a synonym for anyone bombarding anyone else:

All Germany went wild over the “Hymn of Hate”: children learnt it in the nursery; soldiers sang it in the trenches. In England people laughed at it, the Press doing its part in ridiculing it; in particular *Punch*, with an inimitable cartoon, entitled, “A Study of a Prussian Family having its Morning Hate.” A Sunday paper which published the words and music sold out its editions as fast as they appeared. A distinguished musical professor bought up all the copies he could get and taught his classes the “Hymn.” Military Bands on recruiting service in Trafalgar Square and elsewhere in London, played the air – a very stirring one – and were enthusiastically applauded and encored. Captured German officers and men were made to sing the “Hymn of Hate” for their captors. The word “Hate” became the war-word of the hour, everywhere with derisive applications. On the Western Front, to take two familiar instances, the German daily trench bombardments, which took place with a curious regularity, often were [called] “Fritz’s Evening and Morning Hate.” For us, on the other hand, to shell the enemy when he seemed quiet was to “Stir up a little Hate,” and so on.\(^\text{209}\)

The *Oxford English Dictionary* confirms this definition of “hate” as slang used “in the war of 1914-18” for “a bombardment”:

A jocular use based upon the German “Hymn of Hate,” which was ridiculed in *Punch* 24 Feb 1915, p. 150, in the legend of a drawing, “Study of a Prussian household having its morning hate.”\(^\text{210}\)

Partridge’s *Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English* also agrees with Fraser and Gibbons in their assertion that “hate” could be (and was) used as a slang term for bombardments by both sides, particularly in the years 1916-18.\(^\text{211}\)

Just how readily this new definition of the word “hate” entered the vocabulary of soldiers serving on the front lines can be seen in numerous diary entries. This one was written just after the Battle of the Somme by Private Louis Avery, serving with the 3 Field Co. Engineers of the First Australian Imperial Force:


Jan 11th

Fritz once again threw his ironmongery at us in the early hours, mud falling on my poor old malthoid roof. I asked Tom Prince if he was awake, Yes Lou. Well Tom how about getting under our beds. We laughed & bang, bang, bang, bang. We pulled the blankets over our heads until the Hymn of Hate subsided.212

Another Australian soldier keeping a diary was Percy Smythe:

Got to work with my field glasses to see if I could pick up anything, and after a time I made out what appeared to be an enemy post with a sentry on duty. I got some 22nd.Bn. Lewis gunners to bring their weapon into a suitable position from which to give the enemy post a few bars of the “Hymn of Hate,” but just then one of their officers came along, and he reckoned that it would be better to put a few Stokes mortar bombs over, a rather stupid idea, I thought, considering the target was so small. He also decided to send out a patrol to take the post.213

Smythe’s description of giving “the enemy a few bars of the ‘Hymn of Hate’” is an ironic counterpart to Lieutenant Colonel Kaden’s earnest referencing of Lissauer’s poem in the Liller Kriegszeitung, which we saw in chapter 1.

Lissauer’s poem continued to be alluded to outside Germany towards the end of the war. Murdoch points to Punch magazine which, as noted earlier, did much to mock the “Hymn of Hate” throughout the conflict.214 The magazine’s readers, in January 1918, were offered this reminder of the poem and its author:

A Fatherland Poet was busy of late
In making the Kaiser a new Hymn of Hate;
Perhaps, ere its echoes have time to grow dim,
The Huns may be learning a new Hate of Him. 215


214 Murdoch, op.cit., p. 37

Elsewhere, too, interest in the “Hymn of Hate” persevered. The Deseret News, a daily newspaper published in Salt Lake City, Utah, ran the headline “Employs ‘Hymn of Hate’ as British Propaganda: Most Noted of British Army Bandmasters Fixes Up the German Version With Surprising Variations and Makes Hit At American Camps – Rag Time Version Next in Order,” in an October 1918 edition. The accompanying article described the band of the Coldstream Guards touring American rest camps in the United Kingdom and playing a parody version of the “Hymn of Hate.”

After the war, more humour was to be derived from the poet and the poem when Punch magazine cast doubt on the originality of Lissauer’s work in Mr Punch’s History of the Great War. Here we are reminded of Lissauer’s decoration by the Kaiser:

This shows true magnanimity on the part of the Kaiser, in his capacity of king of Prussia, since the “Hymn of Hate” turns out to be a close adaptation of a poem composed by a Saxon patriot, in which Prussia, not England, was held up to execration.

Although the “Saxon patriot” is unnamed, it is clear that Punch is referring to Georg Herwegh (who, in fact, was born in Stuttgart) and his poem “Das Lied vom Hasse.”

Even the post-war peace process was satirised in a cartoon with reference to the “Hymn of Hate” (see Fig. 12).

Lissauer was not forgotten in the English-speaking press during the interwar years. Time magazine, for example, referring to Lissauer in its “Notes” section in January 1924, kept readers up to date with the writer’s latest advice to Germany:

Herr Ernst Lissauer, author of the German war-song Hate, now advises the nation to return to its poets, philosophers, scientists: “Now we have lost our might and our material possessions. There is nothing left but that other Germany, immortal and indestructible with Goethe, Bach and all the big and little prophets which come before and after them.”


217 Graves, op.cit., p. 16

218 See chapter 1. of this thesis.

Even in death, Lissauer and the “Hymn of Hate” were international news. The Adelaide Mail newspaper of South Australia noted Lissauer’s passing under the headline “Pacifist Who Wrote Famous Hate Hymn,” even as they misnamed his most famous poem:

Placid, tubby, benign-faced Ernst Lissauer, who wrote the famous German Hymn of Hate, is dead, it is reported from Vienna. His Gott Strafe England, a flaming lyric of fury which was Germany’s national anthem during the war, was translated into almost every known language – and Lissauer was a pacifist!  

---


The first two stanzas of the poem are then reproduced (in Henderson’s translation) to remind readers of Lissauer’s work. Almost twenty years after the First World War, and a world away from the battlefields of Europe, Lissauer was afforded the honour of remembrance at the time of his passing. He had achieved a legacy of sorts, despite the ridicule and incredulity with which he was remembered: a legacy comprising one poem and one alone – his “Hymn of Hate.”

Since the Second World War, Lissauer and his life’s work have faded from view. None of his work has been revived, and few scholars have paid any attention to him or his “Haßgesang.” Yet Lissauer’s “Hymn of Hate” warrants consideration as a document of its time and as a German war poem which achieved a unique notoriety in the English-speaking world a century ago.
3. The New Zealand Reception of Lissauer’s “Haßgesang”

The reception of Lissauer’s poem in New Zealand illustrates its global reach and can be viewed as a case study of the poem’s reception in the English-speaking world as a whole.

The major productive responses to the poem overseas were reported on in New Zealand, and not just in the main metropolitan daily papers, but the smaller regional papers as well, like the *Mataura Ensign* and the *Poverty Bay Herald*. In an age less obsessed with copyright, huge quantities of copy from foreign periodicals were recycled verbatim in New Zealand newspapers. Thanks to the telegraph, news reports could appear in New Zealand just hours after they had appeared in London papers.

As this chapter will illustrate, in addition to reports from overseas, the same newspapers published journalistic and literary, serious and jocular responses to the poem by New Zealand contributors. Local cartoonists were inspired to draw cartoons on the topic for local papers. Editorials appeared along with concerned letters to the editor. The “Hymn of Hate” was performed at local fundraising events, and noted in official government documents. New Zealand soldiers wrote letters home referring to enemy bombardment as the “Hymn of Hate,” and stories about the changing fate of Lissauer and his poem grabbed the headlines of New Zealand newspapers. Indeed, if the amount of coverage given to Lissauer and his “Hymn of Hate” in New Zealand newspapers is any guide, readers in this corner of the British Empire, despite its distance from the front lines in Europe, must have been amongst the best informed in the world.

**The Context for New Zealand Publication**

When Britain declared war on Germany in early August 1914, it did so on behalf of the British Empire, which included the dominions of Australia, Canada, Newfoundland, New Zealand and South Africa.  

---

Watters, Brian. “Where Britain Goes, We Go?” *New Zealand WW100* <http://ww100.govt.nz/where-britain-goes-we-go>
communication and were therefore scrutinised closely by New Zealanders as the war progressed. Attentive readers would have been aware already of the German military and naval build-up in the years before the war. The *Hawera and Normanby Star* of 29 January 1910, for example, warned of Germany’s “policy of blood and iron” with regard to international relations, and now the papers began to report war developments with renewed vigour.\(^{223}\)

Just days after the declaration of war, the Christchurch *Star*, under the headline “The Day: A German Toast: Crushing the Free Nations,” reprinted a report from Melbourne which recalled “the Germans’ naval and military toast to ‘the day.’ This meant the day when Germany felt strong enough to attack others. They thought this day had now come.”\(^{224}\) Another Christchurch newspaper, the *Sun*, followed up with its own special report under the heading “‘The Bully of Europe’: Real Causes of the Great War.” In this article special mention is made of the German naval toast “To the Day!” “Britain knows that the day referred to was the great day of the future Trafalgar, which may even now have arrived.”\(^{225}\) Armed with this knowledge, the paper’s readers would have been able to make sense of the third stanza (“In the captain’s mess”) of the “Hymn of Hate” when Henderson’s translation was printed in New Zealand newspapers a few weeks later.

By mid-November 1914, news of Lissauer’s “Haßgesang” was beginning to appear in local papers. The *New Zealand Herald*, for example, quoted a report from Copenhagen under the headline “Hatred of England: Music Hall Song: Distributed to Troops.” “The Crown Prince of Bavaria is distributing among the troops copies of the so-called ‘Poem of Hatred,’ a music hall song expressing the Germans’ undying hatred of England and England alone.”\(^{226}\) Readers, however, were not able to read the poem until Wellington’s *Evening Post* published a few lines on 24 November 1914, in an article sourced from the United States newspaper, the *Springfield Republican*. This piece, reporting on German hatred towards England, quotes part of Henderson’s translation of the “Haßgesang,” although it gives neither the source of the poem, nor mention of the title, author or translator. “This,” the report states, “is genuine poetry, because it is fired by a genuine hate; it comes flaming from the heart, and it may live

---

\(^{223}\) Blatchford, Robert. “Germany and Britain.” *The Hawera & Normanby Star* 29 Jan. 1910: 5-6.


for centuries as a spark struck out by the greatest war in history.” In contrast, the article laments “the rather poor showing that our own poets have made in the appeals that they have been making to the nation.” At this early stage of the war, in a view expressed in the Springfield Republican and implicitly endorsed in the Evening Post, Allied poets needed to lift their game.

When Henderson’s translation was printed in full in New Zealand newspapers from early December 1914, it was taken directly from the New York Times, and so the misattribution of Jugend magazine as the source of the German text was carried over. Similarly, the substantial editorial headed “A Hymn of Hate” in the Wairarapa Daily Times on 16 December 1914 was reprinted directly from the London Times, including the misattribution to “the well-known Munich paper Jugend” as the source of the “Haßgesang.” Also carried over into New Zealand newspapers, but with the correct attribution, was Beatrice M. Barry’s “Reply to the Chant of Hate,” published so speedily by the New York Times.

An Early Australasian Response in Verse

After publishing the initial flurry of overseas responses to the “Hymn of Hate,” New Zealand newspapers began to source replies from writers living closer to home. Just in time for Christmas 1914, a rather enterprising greeting card was received by the Otago Daily Times. Under the headline “Publications Received” the paper noted receipt “from Messrs Angus and Robertson, Sydney, a booklet containing a translation by Barbara Henderson from the German of Ernst Lissauer’s poem, ‘Chant of Hate,’ and some verses written by [the New Zealander] Arthur H. Adams on reading the lines written by the German.” Adams was a journalist and popular writer in both New Zealand and Australia in the early twentieth century.

---

228 See the Mataura Ensign and Poverty Bay Herald newspapers of 5 December 1914 for examples of this misattribution.
century. At the beginning of the First World War he was the editor of the *Sun* and *Bulletin* newspapers in Sydney. The article continues:

Mr Adams’s lines, which are entitled “My Friend, Remember!” deal with the treachery of the Germans, and impress upon readers the necessity for remembering that “Germany is Hate.” The verses are written in Mr Adams’s usual bright style, and sum up the German nation as it has appeared – a traitor and a spy.

![Fig. 13. Arthur Adams: My Friend, Remember!](image)

The most remarkable aspect of the booklet is its presentation. It has the size and general appearance of a greeting card, and on the cover surrounded by an embossed designed are the

---


words “With the Season’s Greetings.” Clearly this publication was designed to be sent as a Christmas card. The Otago Daily Times had this advice for its readers: “The booklet is published at 6d (post free, 7d) and may be purchased through any bookseller.”

My Friend, Remember!

We thank you, Germany, we thank
You for your bitter hatred frank.
Your curse is branded on your brow:
Traitor and spy, we know you now:
One pestilence this earth must shun,
One Judas-Race, and only one.
And when a blood-drained peace is born
This vow eternal we have sworn:

Never compact with you to make,
Never a German hand to shake,
Never a German word to take –
The plighted word that Germans break!
Never forget, through good and ill,
A German is a German still.

My friend, when peace comes, soon or late,
Remember: GERMANY IS HATE!

For forty years smouldered unseen
Your bitter rancour, black and mean.
We welcomed you and let you go,
A friend that was our bitterest foe.
We guessed not that the German smile
Concealed a heart of blackest guile.
But when peace comes – we know you now –
The world will echo this our vow:

Never compact with you to make,
Never a German hand to shake,
Never a German word to take –
The light parole that Germans break!
Never forget, through good and ill,
A German is a German still.

My son, for aye be wary, wait!
Remember: GERMANY IS HATE!

---

And in the nobler world that comes
Resurgent from this world of drums,
What place for you beneath the sun,
A pariah that all must shun?
Think not that only England knows
The hate that in your life-blood flows;
Look forward to the times unborn;
Remember that Mankind has sworn:

Never compact with you to make,
Never a German hand to shake,
Never a German word to take –
The solemn pact that Germans break!
Never forget, through good and ill,
A German is a German still.

England, when one comes smiling, wait!
Remember: GERMANY IS HATE!

This wanton war you made was worth
Our stricken, desolated earth
For it has shown us what you are!
Naked before Time’s judgement bar,
A maddened thing, still splitting lies,
You stand condemned, without disguise!
“German” – that word shall henceforth be
Your punishment and infamy!

Never compact with you to make,
Never a German hand to shake,
Never a German word to take –
The German word that Germans break!
Never forget, through good and ill,
A German is a German still.

This is your doom: you will too late
Remember: GERMANY IS HATE! 235

The stentorian tone of the poem, together with the refrains “Never forget, through good and ill / A German is a German still” and “Remember: GERMANY IS HATE!”, add to its rhetorical force and memorability.

In the column “Treasures of the Shelves” published in the *Star*, a review of Adams’s poem was printed under the heading “A Clever Rejoinder.” “There recently appeared in the Press an English translation of Ernst Lissauer’s ‘Chant of Hate,’ which, published in ‘Municher [sic] Jugend,’ the organ of Young Germany (the literary and artistic brand), has enjoyed a huge vogue in the land of the ‘baby killers.’” After quoting a few lines of the “Hymn of Hate,” the *Star* continues:

To Lissauer’s extraordinary effusion Mr Arthur Adams, ex-Wellingtonian, but now of the *Bulletin*, has replied, in a suitably vigorous style, in a set of verses entitled, “My Friend, Remember!” published in pamphlet form, together with the German poem by Angus and Robertson, Sydney. How hard Mr Adams can hit back at the Teutonic hate-monger may be seen by his opening verses.

Following the first stanza of the poem, the *Star* concludes: “The price of the pamphlet is sixpence. It is to be hoped that the author has sent a review copy to the ‘Jugend’ office.”

**Commentary in the New Zealand Press**

By early 1915, lengthy articles on German hate poetry began to appear in New Zealand newspapers. Under the banner “The War of all the Centuries: A Literature of Wrath: German Hatred of England: Clippings from the Kaiser’s Press,” the *North Otago Times* featured an extensive piece on hatred in German writing and the German press. “The one thing missing in German newspaper literature, just now, is a single note of cool reason; the faintest vision of the relative sizes of things; a lonely grain of humour – that true antiseptic of all literature.” Ultimately the paper concludes with a remarkably sober and detached assessment that contrasts with the eternal damnation invoked in Adams’s Christmas poem:

---


238 *Ibid*.

It would be a mistake to take the shrill rhetoric of German newspapers too seriously. Nor do we believe that hate as a permanent mood ever takes captive the mind of an entire nation, or can hold it long. It is a mood; it will pass like a mood; and a mood is but for a moment. When the tumult of the present war has died into silence, and the sky of the race has been cleansed from [sic] the battle smoke that now darkens it, facts will be seen in clear outline, and the hates bred of war will die.240

In a similar vein, Dunedin’s Evening Star published a sizeable article examining the passion of hate in German literature. The piece reveals something of the historical continuity of the subject in German writing leading up to the war and the contemporary German literature it was inspiring.241 A few days later, the Timaru Herald, in an editorial headed “The Poem of Hate,” condemns Lissauer’s poem and Germany’s capacity for hate. The paper also laments that the “Hymn of Hate” “should be instilled into the minds of German children.”242 “It was reported yesterday that he [Lissauer] has been decorated by the Kaiser for this poem, which is declaimed in all the German schools.”243 To illustrate the points made in the editorial, Henderson’s translation of the “Haßgesang” is reprinted, along with another translation into English of a German poem of hate which first appeared in “the well-known Berlin weekly, ‘Kladderadatsch’.” As the paper notes, “the most remarkable feature of the frenzied outburst of hatred of England in Germany is the infuriated attacks against Sir Edward Grey. The following poem, which appears in the famous German journal, is characteristic：“244

O Lord! I pray
By all I Cherish
That the Briton Grey
Like Judas perish!

Let mine eyes see
Before I die
Grey in a hempen ring
Dangling as he swings
Let him descry

240 Ibid.
244 Ibid.
The German eagle
Wheeling in the sky.\textsuperscript{245}

The title of this poem, its author, and the translator all go unnamed in the \textit{Timaru Herald}, but this is in fact a translation of Adolf Ey’s poem “Des Alten Gebet,” which we have met in chapter 1.

Further evidence of the institutionalisation of the “Haßgesang” in Germany was furnished for New Zealand readers through the publication of a translation of Lieutenant Colonel Kaden’s article “Feuer” from the \textit{Liller Kriegszeitung}, which, like “Des Alten Gebet,” we have met in chapter 1. The translation was published in the \textit{Hawera and Normanby Star} under the headline “The Gospel Of Hate: Invocation to the German People.”\textsuperscript{246} An editorial in the \textit{Otago Daily Times}, a week later, captured something of the incredulity with which Kaden’s article was received in the English-speaking world:

\begin{quote}
It is impossible to imagine a British newspaper publishing such a lucubration as that which appeared recently in the \textit{Lille War Gazette} in the form of an invocation to the German people by Lieutenant-colonel Kaden, who seems to be one of the most virulent of the Prussian militarist brood.\textsuperscript{247}
\end{quote}

Picking up on the sibilance of the word “hiss” (even in its German form “zisch”) and its proximity to the sound of gas, the editorial continues:

\begin{quote}
The theme of the inspired lieutenant colonel is the sacred flame of hate – hate, it is unnecessary to say, of England. The suggestion he offers as to the feeding of the sacred flame leaves no room for mistake. “God punish England” is to be the one German war cry, and in a frenzied paroxysm this gallant soldier, doubtless well versed in the use of asphyxiating gases, declaims: “Hiss this to one another in the trenches, in the charge, hiss it as if it were the sound of licking flames.”\textsuperscript{248}
\end{quote}

As well as keeping up with editorials and responses to the “Hymn of Hate” from home and abroad, New Zealand newspaper readers were able to keep abreast of the changing attitudes

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{245} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{246} “The Gospel of Hate: Invocation to the German People.” \textit{Hawera and Normanby Star} 10 May 1915: 3.


\textsuperscript{248} Ibid.
\end{footnotes}
to the poem in Germany. As early as February 1915, the *Evening Star* was reporting on protest in German Socialist newspapers against school children being compelled to learn the poem.\(^249\) Then, in August that year, the *Evening Post*, in an article headed: “The Hymn of Hate: Losing Favour,” quoted a report from Amsterdam: “Herr Lissauer’s ‘Song of Hate’ is losing favour. The *Tageblatt* approvingly quotes from the *Koelnische Volks Zeitung* a clergyman’s letter deploring the song and urging its removal from children’s books.”\(^250\) Later still in 1915, the *Evening Post* published a report from a London correspondent that Lissauer had relented on his “Hymn of Hate,” and “is now apparently chastened and almost penitent.” The report goes on to state, “some courageous professors and officials in Bavaria have had the song banned for children’s use, as tending to breed unworthy feelings in the young German mind.”\(^251\)

At about the time New Zealand newspapers were reporting on Lissauer’s change of heart regarding his poem, letters from New Zealand soldiers at Gallipoli were arriving home. “The Soldiers’ Mail-Bag” became a frequent column in the *Freelance* newspaper, printing extracts from letters of soldiers serving at the front. Through these letters, readers were able to gain an impression of the war through the eyes of serving soldiers. One such soldier was Gunner Joe Kenny of Wellington, serving with the Main Expeditionary Force at Gallipoli. An excerpt from one of his letters paints a vivid picture of life in the dug-outs, and also shows how the soldier slang “Hymn of Hate” – for enemy shelling – was being used by New Zealand soldiers on the Gallipoli peninsula:

> We are all living in dug-outs close to the beach, and have plenty of swimming until the Turks start with their Hymn of Hate, as we call their shells. We have got it pretty hot at times from their artillery. As a matter of fact, we have been under fire all the time since we landed, but now and again they give us hell with shrapnel, and then it’s a case of getting down deep in a dug-out or else stopping a shot. I don’t mind admitting we don’t need much telling to take cover.\(^252\)


Humorous Responses

In New Zealand, as elsewhere, initial reactions of shock and indignation to the “Hymn of Hate” soon gave way to humour and parody. A piece in the Evening Star in May 1915, with the headline “Germany’s Deep Hatred,” referred to Frank Reynolds’s Punch cartoon and Lissauer’s poem. The article notes: “It is a good omen that we have kept cool and smiled at all the Hymns of Hate and Gott stra[...] England business. To have done otherwise would have been to frustrate our own most cherished purposes.”253 This again brings to mind Aronsfeld’s commentary regarding the role played by humour in maintaining the “characteristic sang-froid” with which the “Hymn of Hate” was received by the British public.254

Earlier, in December 1914, the Star had printed a comical reply to Lissauer’s poem, under the heading “Ernst the Excited.” The Star tells us that this parody had first been published by “a rather slangy ‘Clarion’ poet,” using the nom de plume “Bezique.”255

French and Russian, they matter not?
My dear young friend, you are talking rot;
For in course of time they will touch the spot.
Then, what of your Weichsel and Vosges-Gate –
For you’ll have to clear out of ’em, early or late.
Your furious spite and your foolish hate
Can’t trouble or worry anyone,
Least of all an Englishman, my son!
But take my tip: now you’re trying to hurt
The British Lion, he’ll do you dirt;
He will gobble you up, and he will not halt:
He will gulp you down without any salt –
A pinch!

And, my dear young friend, pray don’t blaspheme
About the “Judgment Place,” for the scheme
Of your pious Kaiser destroyed Louvain,
And he’s got to be judged for women slain,
For children murdered in savage glee
In the name of Prussian piety.
And you’ll find it your country’s fate,


255 The Clarion was a British socialist weekly newspaper.
Whatever you, love or hate,
Loving as one, or hating as one,
To pay the bill my son –

And don’t forget it!

You rave of Am Tag and the deeds you’ll do
With your fancy fleet on the ocean blue,
But I beg to remind you here, old pal,
That your ships still slink in the Kiel Canal.
So what’s the good of your bluff and brag,
When they won’t sail out, though it’s now Am Tag,
Chummie?

And I rather think
That you were in drink
When you wrote – my aunt! –
Your precious chant

Of England.

Words don’t kill, though I must admit
That some German words hurt one’s jaw a bit:
And “Gottsdonnerkreuzschockwerothen!”
Is a shock to the very toughest throat –
Not ’arf!

But see here, sonnie, it’s easy to tell
You want a pill, for you don’t seem well:
Your mental attitude’s devoid of calm –
Your eye is wild and your nose is warm.
To hate with a forty horse-power hate
Is to show yourself a degenerate –
A dunderpate – jobberknowl – frenzied loon:
So soak your neck in cold tea-leaves soon.256

In July 1915, the Evening Post, the Star, the Ashburton Guardian and the Sun (Canterbury), all ran parodies of the “Hymn of Hate”: the first three “The Tommy’s Song of Hate” by an unnamed “member of the Expeditionary Force at the front,”257 and the Sun an anonymous parody, simply titled “A Hymn of Hate,” which had first appeared in the Toronto Daily Star.


257 When “The Tommy’s Song of Hate” was reprinted in the Evening Post early in the Second World War, the poem was cleverly credited as having been provided “by the favour of Upson Downes O’Flyffe.” See “The Tommy’s Song of Hate.” Evening Post 31 Jan. 1940: 8.
“The Tommy’s Song of Hate” involves a soldier’s complaint about a Prussian sniper creeping under a wire entanglement to steal a freshly made custard pudding. The poetised tribulation ends:

One hate I have an’ one hate alone,
One frightful hate in flesh and bone,
One hate that’s bigger than hate of wrong,
A hate that I’ve turned to a morning song:
I hate all Germans that lie and boast,
And pass our so-called listening post,
To sneak the comforts that feed the sick,
A horrible, dirty, low down trick.
I hate as one and I hate as four,
I hate the hate of an army corps;
One hate I have and one hate I hiss,
An’ I call the perishin’ blighter this:
PUDDEN-PINCHER.258

The parody that appeared in the Sun with “no apologies to Herr Lissauer” was also centred on food:

Carrots or beets, we hate them not,
We love them not, we hate them not.
Of all the things that land on our plate
There’s only one that we loath [sic] and hate;
We love a hundred, we hate but one,
And that we’ll hate till kingdom come—
Sauer Kraut.

It’s known to you all, its known to you all,
Pilgrims on this terrestrial ball;
Full of vinegar in distress,
Making a most unsavoury mess.
Come. Let us stand in our eating place:
An oath to swear to face to face;
An oath of bronze no wind can shake,
An oath for all sons of guns to take.
We will never forgo our hate—

We have all but a single hate.
We love as one, we hate as one,
And we’ll hate that dish if we do it alone –
Sauer Kraut.

Wienerwurst, liverwurst, lager beer,
Many a time hath given us cheer;
Not so bad if made just right;
Bad to take going to bed at night;
Better by far to lunch in – “The Day.”
Then there won’t be the devil to pay.
But you we hate with a lasting hate;
We will never forgo our hate;
Hate of the stomach and hate of the tongue;
Hate of the senses every one;
Hate of millions who’ve choked it down;
Hate of the country and hate of the town.
We love a thousand; we hate but one,
And that we’ll hate with hate of Hun –
Sauer Kraut.²⁵⁹

Local parodies of the “Hymn of Hate” included a cartoon with a poetic pastiche in the NZ Truth newspaper published in January 1916. Under the heading “Peace and Goodwill on Earth: Wicked Wilhelmites and Wossers’ Way,” the piece uses (without crediting the source) Punch’s Frank Reynolds cartoon “Study of a Prussian Household Having its Morning Hate” as a starting point. Whereas most responses to Lissauer’s poem published in New Zealand loyally followed the pro-English, anti-German line dominating the British Press, the NZ Truth poem compares the hateful Germans with the wowserish English, and finds them similarly joyless:

See a family of Germans with their well-known Hymn of Hate,
Which has now for special purposes been written,
And which since the War’s been started, had been early sung, and late,
And has chiefly been directed towards Great Britain.

[. . .]

Yes from noon till night the Germans chant their well-known Hymn of Hate,
Their staple food it seems in all this strife-time,
And they’re singing, singing, singing up into the evening late
Their Chant of Hate, the Chant is of a Lifetime.²⁶⁰


For the “Wowsers” – that is, for the British – the NZ Truth has just as little time as it has for the Germans. The joyless British, if they had their way, the paper suggests, would “clothe all

our park statues, put them into modern dress / In our cities no theatres they’d allow / They would ban all ballet-dancing, they would have no city press / And this Dominion they’d run anyhow.”

Fig. 15. Wicked Wilhelmites and Wowsers’ Way – 2nd cartoon NZ Truth 8 Jan. 1916: 6.

And Art Galleries they’d close up, and Noo Zee’d be “To Let,”
They wouldn’t run a Sunday tram or train.
For all, outside a Wowser, they a straight-jacket would get,
No wonder, they’d be hopelessly insane.

Things would all be topsy-turvy, and the Wowsers’d run the land.
Al ready in God’s Own there’s far too many;
It’s just as well those hypocrites now truly understand
That New Zealand of this crowd’s “not taking any.”

In April 1916 the *Evening Star*, in an editorial headed “Hymns of Hate,” discusses the way humour had been used to take the sting out of Lissauer’s poem, and the waning approval for the poem in Germany.

At a moment when Lissauer’s “Hymn of Hate” is said to be neglected and frowned upon in Germany, it is attaining a popularity of an equivocal character in the homes and among the people whom it holds up to execration and vengeance. The reasons are not far to seek. None but Germans ever took the “Hymn of Hate” seriously.

On the same day, the *Auckland Star* ran a similar editorial under the banner “Humour Out of Hate” in which the humorous reaction to the poem is discussed, but the piece also warns readers not to be complacent about the national sentiment behind the poem.

There was a Christmas truce in 1914, but none last year. In the meantime the British soldier had learned by bitter experience the truth about the German soldier’s methods. Today he may still find the “Hymn of Hate” amusing, but he knows there is nothing amusing in the devilry directed by it.

Late in 1916 the *Observer* [Auckland] published the cartoon “The Hymn of Love,” satirising the visit to Britain and the Western Front made by the New Zealand Prime Minister William Massey and Joseph Ward, the joint-leaders of the wartime coalition. Titled “How the War Was Won: The Illiad [sic] of Bill and Joe,” the multi-page spread presents the trip as a Homeric epic, complete with versified descriptions and cartoon illustrations of highlights from the visit. Late in the piece, as the two politicians make their way towards the enemy

---


trenches, the German soldiers are seen to react in consternation and surrender, as they suddenly recognise “Bill Massey.”

![Image of soldiers in trenches, with one soldier standing on a step and another on the parapet, looking at a sheet of paper labeled “It's Bill Massey.”]

*Fig. 16. The Hymn of Love. Observer 4 Dec 1916: 18.*

The accompanying verses read:

So Bill got on the parapet, and Joe stood on the step:
Then William made a fighting speech that proved him full of “pep”;
It was like a slab of Hansard with a modicum of sense,
Calling vengeance on the Kaiser for a “want of confidence.”

But the Germans, when they heard it and beheld his shiny pate
Couldn’t even screw their courage to repeat the “Hymn of Hate”;
Beneath his all-commanding eye their minds became a blank,
For they thought he was a sample of some deadly kind of “tank.”

So, while he had them mesmerised and shivering with fear,
The Tommies made a gallant charge, and drove them to the rear.
These tactics they repeated right from Calais to Verdun,
Till the message flashed around the world, “Bill has them on the run!”
And in the far Antipodes, they said, “I told you so,
There was only one thing for it when we sent them Bill and Joe.”

Wider and Later Reception

Also in Auckland, the “Hymn of Hate” – in musical form – was being used to raise funds for the war effort. The Observer was dismissive of the endeavours of one particular music shop:

Messrs A. Eady and Co. send for review an English edition of Lissauer’s German “Hymn of Hate,” the music for which is by Franz Mackioff [sic]. The money for the sales of this atrocity will be devoted to the “Weekly Dispatch” fund for supplying sailors and soldiers at the front with tobacco. Frankly, we can see no earthly reason for the dissemination of Lissauer’s hymn. A song is merely written to be sung, and the idea of any British person in New Zealand singing it is inconceivable. Perhaps it is being sold as a curiosity.

An advertisement in the entertainment columns for a “Bohemian Evening” may have caught the eye of readers of Wellington’s Evening Post in September 1916. A concert was to be put on at the Town Hall by the Wellington Savage Club, “concluding with a Trench Concert featuring: ‘Soldiers’ Chorus’, ‘Spotty’, ‘The Drummer’, ‘Two Grenadiers’, ‘Perils of Pauline’, ‘Spin Spin’, ‘HYMN OF HATE’ [capitals in the original], ‘Long Long Trail’, and Maori Haka.” The “whole of the net proceeds,” the advertisement continues, are to be “divided between Christmas gifts and War Relief Funds.”

The enduring popularity of the “Hymn of Hate” and the comparative lack of well-known patriotic verse in English continued to irk commentators in the New Zealand press. The Wanganui Chronicle, in an article headed “Poetry of the Great War,” refers to an item in the January 1916 edition of Munsey’s Magazine by the British writer Richard Le Gallienne in

---


which he critiques the poetry of the war to date. 269 “There has been much disappointment expressed in literary circles that our British poets have not risen to the occasion in the way of expressing their feelings – the feelings of the nation – in reference to the Great War.” 270 La Gallienne’s sentiment echoes that expressed in the Springfield Republican article re-printed in the Evening Post in November 1914 (discussed earlier in this chapter), in which Lissauer’s “Haßgesang” is used as a yardstick of effectiveness against which all other nationalist war poetry must be measured. La Gallienne holds up the “Haßgesang” as the exemplar, as well as Jules de Marthold’s French reply. Also praised are Watson’s “To the Troubler of the World” and Kipling’s “For All We Have and Are.” 271

Kipling’s war poetry was again in the spotlight in mid-1917, when both Wellington’s Free Lance and the Feilding Star had recourse to “The Beginning” in their search for English war poetry which sets an appropriately vengeful tone in opposition to Germany. Why should hate, these newspapers argued, continue to be the preserve of Germany? The Free Lance observed:

The day of punishment for the Master Villain of the World is not yet arrived, but when it does come, it should be merciless in its material severity. If Englishmen, and still more so, Englishwomen, hate the Kaiser, it is his own fault. It was due to Hun tuition and example that the English have learnt what hatred is. 272

In contrast, the Feilding Star, under the heading “The Need for Reprisals,” rolled out Napoleon’s cliché describing Britain as a nation of shopkeepers to support its argument that England has no need for hatred when responding to German atrocities: this was business. The phrase “blow for blow” evokes Henderson’s translation of the “Haßgesang.”

Today England, having had many women and children slaughtered by German bombs dropped upon the East End of London, is aroused to red-hot indignation. As Kipling interprets it: the English have begun to hate. There is no need for hatred to move John Bull to reprisals. He is a keen business man – he should recognise not only the value

269 Munsey’s was an American monthly mass-circulation magazine.


271 See chapter 2 of this thesis for de Marthold’s “France’s Hymn of Hate”, Watson’s “To the Troubler of the World” and Kiplings “For All We Have and Are.”

of blow for blow, but how unwise it is to allow a rival or competitor to go on getting the better of him in bad bargains. 273

When the Armistice arrived and soldiers began returning home, New Zealanders could have been forgiven, perhaps, for consigning the “Hymn of Hate” to history – an artefact of war, once considered execrable, but now fit only to be forgotten. Yet Lissauer and his poem were not forgotten in New Zealand, at least not in the interwar years. The poet Para Wai, writing “Coming Back” in the Observer immediately after the war, invoked the Germans and their Hymns of Hate within the first four lines of his poem. Once again, the phrase “Hymn of Hate” – or variations thereof – is used as shorthand for the enemy’s role in the war in its entirety, three words which encapsulate, in Archibald Henderson’s phrase, “the psychology of the German situation.”

Coming Back

When our heritage was threatened,
   When the Goth beat at the gate,
When the very breeze vibrated
   With the hymn of Hunnish hate;
Then the ploughman left the furrow,
   Then the townsman left his trade,
And they marched away together
   With the strong and unafraid.
Now the blacker clouds are clearing,
   There are brighter days appearing,
Soon we’ll hear the distant cheering
   Of the fellows coming back.

Coming back, coming back,
   Tommy, Raupo, Pat, and Mac,
From the blasting breath of battle
   To the homestead and the cattle,
From the crashing cannon’s rattle
   To the kiddies joyous prattle;
How the heart will throb with gladness
   For the fellows coming back.

When the troopship’s in the harbour
   And the boys are coming back,

---

The men who fought our battles,
    Stemmed the tide of fierce attack;
When they’re thronging down the gangway,
    When they’re swinging up the street,
Sunburned soldiers back from service,
    Dashing, debonair, and neat.
Then will shouts of welcome splendid
    With the peal of bells be blended,
For the strife for ever ended,
    And the fellows coming back.

Coming back, coming back,
    Down the ocean’s foaming track,
From the sodden fields of sorrow
    To the promise of to-morrow.
From the suffering and the sadness
    To the sunshine and the gladness;
Oh, what eager hearts are longing
    For the fellows coming back. 274

Amongst the thousands of pages of New Zealand government reports and documents considering the whys and wherefores of wartime conduct, commissioned during and after the war, Ernst Lissauer and his “Hymn of Hate” came up again. The particular document is a report on the treatment of prisoners of war at Somes Island in Wellington harbour (now Matiu Somes Island), commissioned in 1918 and tabled in the House of Representatives in 1919. The author was Mr Justice (Frederick Revans) Chapman.

While investigating ill-treatment of prisoners, Justice Chapman addressed complaints of “irritation” to prisoners caused by prison guards making disparaging remarks about the Kaiser in the prisoners’ presence. Chapman felt that this was a fairly minor matter, and excusable given the information the guards would have been able to glean from newspaper reports about the behaviour of Germany and the Kaiser. As Chapman points out, the guards were, perhaps, uneducated men who could be excused for believing what they read in “neutral newspapers,” and therefore be forgiven, too, for expressing their feelings about the Kaiser in their own ways. The report states:

These men read statements from neutral newspapers to the effect that the Emperor has listened to his soldiers singing Lissauer’s “Hymn of Hate,” and from a similar source that he has even decorated Lissauer. When they hear this kind of thing they recall statements to the effect that the shooting of Nurse Cavell was not merely the act of the Governor of Brussels, but was approved at Berlin, and that other incidents of the same kind are attributable to the Emperor’s Government. The men who hear these things from neutral sources and believe them are perhaps uneducated men, and it is not surprising that, they should express themselves in their own way respecting the enemy Sovereign.  

Awareness of the poet and the poem are taken for granted here, both amongst the prison guards, but also, presumably, amongst the members of the House of Representatives (the New Zealand Parliament), which had commissioned the report. There is no summary of the contents of the poem or biography of the poet. The assumption is that mere mention of the names of poet and poem are enough to remind the legislators of New Zealand that the prisoners would have been perceived as hateful Germans, and that this should be seen as a mitigating circumstance in their evaluation of these particular accusations of ill-treatment.

Even in the late 1920s, Lissauer was still capable of making headlines in New Zealand newspapers. The New Zealand Herald carried this title in 1929: “Flaming German Poem: ‘The Hymn of Hate’: Statement by Writer.” The article rehearses much of the commentary condemning both Lissauer and his poem that had filled newspaper columns during the war. Lissauer’s ultimate recantation of the poem is enlarged upon, however, with the paper offering this conclusion to the article:

Today, ashamed of that poem, the author of it wishes the world to know that he is a man of peace who has written peaceful works of which he is really proud. “I may have hated England, but I have never hated the English,” he says.

Lissauer was never able to shake the notoriety of his “Haßgesang.” In death, as in life, Lissauer and his “Hymn of Hate” were inseparable. The Evening Post, announcing his death in December 1937, summed it up with the headline: “Death in Exile – Author of Hymn of

---


Hate." In the text of the article that follows, the “Hymn of Hate” is the only work of his that is mentioned. In case the reader had forgotten (it had been 19 years since the end of the war, after all) Barbara Henderson’s translation of the poem for the *New York Times* was reprinted. The remarkable thing, perhaps, is not that poem and poet were remembered so long after the war, but that this notice of Lissauer’s death, running to several column inches, was published in the evening paper of Wellington, New Zealand, just hours after his death in Vienna.

That this was urgent news, so far away and so long after the events that made the poem famous, attests to the deep significance of the poem and its global impact during the First World War and interwar years.

---

*Fig. 17.* Headline for Newspaper Report on Lissauer’s Death

---


Conclusion

When it is considered in terms of its literary quality, it is tempting to disregard the “Haßgesang,” as Bridgwater has, as worthless doggerel, yet the sheer volume of material produced in response to it, and its impressive global reach, mark it as a text which achieved a ubiquity and notoriety unique for German war poetry. The public, of both sides, were hungry for poetry about the war, a hunger that was met with the production of large quantities of verse. However, the perceived lack of an adequate response to Lissauer’s poem on the Allied side led to the bizarre situation of the “Haßgesang” becoming the yardstick against which all other war poetry was to be measured.

In the preceding chapters the “Haßgesang” has been examined in the light of its international reception. The discussion of the wide range of responses to the poem, including new poems, newspaper articles and letters to the editor, cartoons, musical settings and public performances, supports the proposition that Lissauer’s text is a document of the First World War whose importance is today largely unrecognised.

Studies of First World War poetry almost invariably focus on a small pantheon of British pacifist writers, who tended to write from the vantage-point of the middle-class officer ranks. This narrowing of the canon blinds us to the scope and variety of the creativity inspired by the war, and many poems and writers are overlooked. A less blinkered approach, for example one that considers poetry with which we may be less ideologically comfortable, has much to reveal about the role of poetry in the press, and its function in shaping public perceptions and discourse. Consideration of the particular way in which Lissauer conceptualised hatred and packaged it in a poem, which was then reproduced, imitated and satirised around the world, illustrates the possibilities of such alternative approaches to the study of First World War poetry.

While this thesis focuses on one particular war poem and its international reception, there is scope for further research into the wide variety of poetry published in newspapers during the Great War. As the only mass-medium available to the public during the war, the role of newspapers as opinion leaders, with particular regard to the dissemination of ideas through poetry, is a rich and as yet largely unexplored area for research. Such research could have an international focus or a more limited local focus. New Zealand newspapers, for example,
published other German war poems (in translation) during the First World War, alongside local and overseas efforts. The recent digitisation of many press archives creates exciting possibilities for further research in this field.
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Worte in die Zeit
Flugblätter 1914 von Ernst Lissauer

Erstes Blatt

Zum Geleit

Haßgesang gegen England
Was schier uns Nasse und Tramp,
Schuf wider Schuf und Stoß um Stoß!
Wir lieben sie nicht,
Wir haßen sie nicht,
Wir schlagen Weichsel und Wasgauwaß,
Wir haben nur einen einzigen Haß,
Wir lieben vereint, wir haßen vereint,
Wir haben nur einen einzigen Feind:
Den ihr alle wisst, den ihr alle wisst,
Er sitzt geduckt hinter der grauen Flus,
Voll Rost, voll Rost, voll Schläue, voll Lys,
Durch Wasser getrunken, die hund dicker als Flus.
Wir wollen treten in ein Gericht,
Einen Schwur zu schwören, Gesicht in Gesicht,
Worte in die Zeit / Blätter 1914 von Ernst Lissauer

Einen Schwur von Eh' den verläßt sein Wind,
Einen Schwur für Kind und für Kindeskind,
Versetzt das Wort, sagt nach das Wort,
Es wächse sich durch ganz Deutschland fort:
Wir wollen nicht lassen von unterm Haß,
Wir haben alle nur einen Haß,
Wir lieben verein, wir haßen verein,
Wir haben alle nur einen Feind:
England.

In der Bodepässe, im Hexentale,
Soßen Schiffsfeinderei beim Liebesmahl,
— Wie ein Säbelstich, wie ein Segelschwung,
Einer rief grüßend empor den Trunk,
Knapp hinaus, wie Niederholzglüge,
Drei Worte sprach er: „Ausk den Tag!“
Wem galt das Glas?
Sie hatten alle nur einen Haß,
Wer war gemein?
Sie hatten alle nur einen Feind:
England.

Rumm zu die Köpfe der Erde in Gold,
Baue Wälle aus Barren von Gold,
Bedecke die Wercfut mit Bug bei Bug,
Du rechnest so, doch nicht so genau.
Was schürt uns Ruhe und Franzof?,
Schuh wider Schuh und Stoff um Stoff!
Wir kämpfen den Kampf mit Bronze und Stahl,
Und schöpfen den Frieden irgend einmal,
—
Doch werden wir haßen mit langem Haß,
Wir werden nicht lassen von unterm Haß,
Haß zu Wasser und Haß zu Land,
Haß des Hauptrades und Haß der Hand,
Haß der Hämmer und Haß der Kronen,
Drosselnder Haß von sieben Millionen,
Sie lieben verein, sie haßen verein,
Sie haben alle nur einen Feind:
England.

Spruch 1914

Nun ward die Zeit.
Wir sehn gedrängt,
Dicht Mann an Mann
Und Weib an Weib,
Ein Welt,
Siebzehn Millionen als ein eingesetztes Heer,
Die mit der Währung
Die ohne Währung,
Zu Lande, zu Luft, zu See,
Das eiserne Kreuz,
Das rote Kreuz,
Den Osten und Nord und West,
Wir fehnen gedrängt,
Karrer.

Kampfgesang der Deutschen
Im Ton von Hitler's Lied „Ich hab's gewagt“
Wir haben's gewagt mit Städten,
Und es und braun nicht Rot.
Wir werden den Krieg gewinnen,
Wir haben Eben und Eben.
Von Eben umgeben,
Ringel eingekreist,
Wir haben's lang' ertragen.
Lust, Erde und Meer,
Landshurn, Landwehr,
Wir wollen wollen wir schlagen.

Sie fieren rings mit Reide
Auf ander Wort und Glück,
Zu Liebe oder zu Leide,
Wir mehren nicht zurück.
Von West, von Nord,
Von Osten umgekehrt.
Sie laufen auf Ehren und Schäden.
Würgt laut, würgt dumpf,
Spielst falsch, spielt Trumpf,
Wir fliehen eure Karren.

Zwei Könige und drei Kaiser,
Dazu eine Republik.
Sie wuschen die Wegweiser
Und schälen sie mit in den Krieg.
Ob vom Kanal
Und vom Ural
Sie schwemmen Mengen und Massen,
Wir gesch'n,
Einer gegen Jeden,
Und treffe Haß mit Haß.
Wir wollen heute nicht rechten
Um Unrecht und Recht, —
Wenn Breiten bei Russen sechsten,
Sie füllmächtig Geschlacht.
Das hört der Tat,
Kommt Zeit, fummel Rat,
Die Fugle muss England führen.
Ich zu ihm ziehe,
Ich unterliege,
In Westen wirft du's aufwirren.

Stehert vom Himmel nieder
Verleumdung, Schimpf und Tag,
Wir reden nichts dämmerte
Als Sühne und Herrschaft,
Wir haben genug,
Sind unvertrag,
Es geht um Leben und Sterben.
Aus Velt, aus, Herr,
landsfuhrt, Landwehr,
laßt Deutschland nicht verderben!

Führer

An den Grenzen in Weiten und Pisten,
In beiden Meeren, entlang der Strand,
Erbarme Wolken lagen, Land über Land,
Immlische Mannschaft steht in Lüften auf Fischen.

Kühe, der Lebensfreude Gottes, mit reisger Böbel beweht,
Gedichte, verhechende Dichtungen,
Kant, gewappnet mit Pfeil,
Schiller, die mächtige Reichschirm der mächtendes Schwert,

Beethoven, von kämpfenden Ergüssen umfriedest,
Goethe, rauchend, rauchig, von Tagewermonne gefeuert,
Schiller, der größtartig, geschaffen, künstlich der Welt,
Der ewigen Bundes Kanzler in Erwacht, —

Soht sie gekrähnt verbäumen in Fernsehen,
Dürre und Sand und Heidel, Peter Fischer und Kleist und Stein.

Wings über Deutschland stehe sie auf heh er Nacht,
Generalsbli der Geister, mittelend über der Schlacht.
Franz Mayerhoff: *Aus großer Zeit Op. 39*
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Haßgesang gegen England.


Gesang:
Was schert uns Russ- se und Fran- zen? Schuß wi- der Schuß und Schuß wi- der

Piano:

Stoß! Wir lie- ben sie nicht, wir has- sen sie nicht, wir schlüt- sen zur Weich- sel und
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Neid, voll Wut, voll Schlau, voll Lust, durch Wasser getrennt, die sind

molto ritard.

Feierlich anschließen

durch als Bunt, wir wollen treten in ein Gesicht, einen

Schwur zu schwören.

Schwur zu schwören Gesicht in Gesicht, einen Schwur von Ew, den verweinen

abgesehen

...