



Kesit Akademi Dergisi

The Journal of Kesit Academy

ISSN: 2149 - 9225

Yıl: 5, Sayı:20, Eylül 2019, s. 159-170

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Gamze SABANCI UZUN

İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı, gamzeuzun@aydin.edu.tr

Arş. Gör. Göksu GÜZELORDU

İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı, gguzelordu@aydin.edu.tr

**KEEPING THE DARK SIDE OF THE WAR IN THE BACKGROUND IN
RUPERT BROOKE'S "THE SOLDIER" AND RUDYARD KIPLING'S "FOR ALL
WE HAVE AND ARE"¹**

Abstract

In the earlier stages, the war culture is predicated on patriotism and the glory of dying in the battle. British poets Rupert Brooke and Rudyard Kipling employed their unique voice in their poetry as an instrument of war propaganda to manipulate the society. The poem "The Soldier" (1914) by Brooke carries the idea of how divine it is to fight for the motherland or how people will be rewarded after they die in the war. Similarly, Rudyard Kipling calls soldiers to fight, focuses on the destructiveness of the enemy and create the sense of that England need to protect itself from this devastating enemy in his poem "For All We Have and Are"(1914). This study aims to analyse how both poets employ war propaganda in disguise of fighting for the nation, while they hide the dark consequences of the war in the background of their poetry.

Keywords: The Great War, Poetry, Propaganda, Rupert Brooke, Rudyard Kipling

¹ Bu makale ASOS 6. Uluslararası Sosyal Beşeri ve İdari Bilimler Sempozyumu'nda tarafımızdan sunulmuş olan "There Is But One Task for All - One Life for Each to Give.": The Glory of Dying in War" başlıklı sözlü bildirinin genişletilmiş halidir.

RUPERT BROOKE'UN "THE SOLDIER" VE RUDYARD KIPLING'İN "FOR ALL WE HAVE AND ARE" ADLI ŞİİRLERİNDE SAVAŞIN KARANLIK YÜZÜNÜN ARKA PLANDA TUTULMASI

Özet

Eski zamanlarda, savaş kültürü vatanseverlik ve savaşta ölmenin şanı üzerine kurulmuştu İngiliz şairlerden Rupert Brooke ve Rudyard Kipling, şiirlerindeki kendine has tarzlarını bir savaş propagandası aracı olarak toplumu manipüle etmek amacıyla kullanmışlardır. Brooke'un "The Soldier" (1914) adlı şiiri, savaşmanın ana vatan için ne kadar kutsal olduğundan ve insanların savaşta öldükten sonra nasıl ödüllendirileceğinden bahsetmiştir. Benzer şekilde, Rudyard Kipling "For All We Have and Are" (1914) adlı şiirinde, askerleri savaşmaya çağırmış, düşmanın yıkıcılığına odaklanmış ve İngiltere'nin kendisini karşısındaki yıkıcı düşmandan korumaya ihtiyacı olduğunu vurgulamıştır. Bu çalışma, her iki şairin de vatan için mücadeleye adı altında, şiirlerinin arka planındaki karanlık sonuçları gizleyerek ne şekilde savaş propagandası yaptıklarını incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: 1. Dünya Savaşı, Şiir, Propaganda, Rupert Brooke, Rudyard Kipling

KEEPING THE DARK SIDE OF THE WAR IN THE BACKGROUND IN RUPERT BROOKE'S "THE SOLDIER" AND RUDYARD KIPLING'S "FOR ALL WE HAVE AND ARE"

In the earlier stages of warfare, the war culture is predicated on patriotism and the glory of dying in the battle. British poets Rupert Brooke and Rudyard Kipling employed their unique voice in their poetry as an instrument of war propaganda to manipulate the society. The poem "The Soldier" (1914) by Brooke carries the idea of how divine it is to fight for the motherland or how people will be rewarded after they die in the war. Similarly, Rudyard Kipling calls soldiers to fight, focuses on the destructiveness of the enemy and create the sense of that England need to protect itself from this devastating enemy in his poem "For All We Have and Are" (1914). This study aims to analyse how both poets employ war propaganda in disguise of fighting for the nation, while they hide the dark consequences of the war in the background of their poetry.

English poet Rupert Brooke who was born in 1887 experienced a serious mental breakdown in 1912 before the Great War started. At the beginning of the war, he was part of Churchill's unit of the Royal Naval Division, a division that was unsuccessful in its first mission. According to Tim Kendall (2013), this first failure was instrumental in forming Brooke's attitude to the war; he writes "[the division's] first task, in October 1914, was to reinforce Antwerp against German advance, but its failure under the weight of enemy bombardment persuaded Brooke of the necessity of total British engagement in the War" (p. 103). Brooke writes his famous poems in the first years of war to build a strong image of patriotism. In "The Soldier" (1914), the focus of the

poet can be analysed in two category; firstly, he aims to emphasize the love for the nation and the eternal sense of belonging and secondly he touches upon the religious duty to go to the battle. He opens the poem thus:

If I should die, think only this of me:

That there's some corner of a foreign field

That is forever England (Greenblatt et al., 2012, p.2019)

The speaker gives the idea that while he may die in war, it is not a pointless tragedy for him or for his nation. The speaker is so loyal to his country that he considers death might be an opportunity for proving his devotion because he knows that if he dies he will be buried in the foreign land in which he fights. In an imperialist gesture, the speaker sees himself as somehow embodying the nation, therefore dying in a foreign land and his body being buried there would symbolise a microcosmic conquest of that foreign land where his English blood could make that land forever England. His death can therefore expand England's reach and legacy, which is why the speaker asks the reader to "think only this" and does not mention any fear or anxiety but only sees the advantage in his sacrifice. He regards his body as a vessel that channels his Englishness;

There shall be

In that rich earth a richer dust concealed;

A dust whom England bore, shaped, made aware,

Gave, once, her flowers to love, her ways to roam,

A body of England's, breathing English air,

Washed by the rivers, blest by suns of home (Greenblatt et al., 2012, p.2019)

Brooke, here, endeavours to show a great love of country by depicting a soldier's decomposing body as a richer dust, coming from one whose love for his nation will transcend his death. Therefore it is easy to assume that for the speaker his Englishness supersedes his individuality, and his patriotism trumps his subjectivity. The image of "dust" has multifaceted connotations to this idea. While dust undoubtedly evokes an idea of impending death, it also perhaps represents his idea about his current stance in his country, he likens himself to dust, which can circulate in all directions, but yet is insignificant until consolidated in the body of a soldier. According to the speaker, the man had no defining characteristics or direction until England gave him a chance to be a soldier. He was as aimless as "driftwood". Thus England emerges as a mother-figure in the poem, bearing and raising the speaker, giving him flowers and "ways to roam". She has also awakened his consciousness, "made [him] aware" which can be seen as giving a life purpose to this otherwise insignificant dust. The poem's speaker seems to act as a soldier symbol for all young men of the age, who, the poem suggests, all owe their life and existence to England and should feel the gratitude of a son towards his mother in his feelings towards his country.

This stanza above suggests two alternative readings regarding death. The first implies a desire to die, perhaps exemplifying a fulfilment of the death drive conceptualised in Sigmund Freud's "Beyond the Pleasure Principle". According to Freud there are two instincts which shape the behaviours in people, and these are life (Eros) and death (Thanatos). Freud's preoccupation with these instincts in his "Beyond the Pleasure Principle" starts from the notion that every living being is born and every living being dies, and this is a unifying truth which may imply the idea that people live to die. Freud posits "[i]f may reasonably suppose, on the basis of all our experience without exception, that every living thing dies – reverts to the inorganic – for intrinsic reasons, then we can only say that *the goal of all life is death*, or to express it retrospectively: *the inanimate existed before the animate*" (as cited in Phillips, 2006, p.166). From a Freudian perspective, the protagonist of "The Soldier" and his readiness to die in the battle can be interpreted as a desire to satisfy the death instinct, which is ultimately the goal of life.

A second Freudian reading of the poem rather might concentrate on the imagery of mother-England and soldier-son and their relationship in the light of Freud's pre-oedipal theory. According to Freud, the psychosexual development of children is divided into distinct stages, with the oedipal stage being crucial in the development of the male child who starts to create a sexual bond with his mother as, "[i]n taking care of [the] child's bodily needs, she becomes its first seductress" (Phillips, 2006, p. 43). At the same time, Freud contends that the male child at this point considers his father as a "...rival who stands in his way, and whom he wishes to get rid of" (Phillips, 2006, p. 44). In the pre-oedipal stage, prior to the Oedipal stage, however, the child has a strong bond with his mother without feeling threatened by his father as he is not fully aware of the sexual difference and does not perceive a challenge in the figure of his father. According to Freud, the child feels so attached to his mother that he cannot even distinguish between the breast, which feeds him, and his own body (Phillips, 2006, p. 43). The speaker of the poem may be viewed as the child who is stuck in the pre-oedipal stage, as the mother image used for England and the soldier who is grateful and fully satisfied with the connection to his mother, reminds the reader of a very typical Freudian pre-oedipal mother-son relationship. In the poem, the mother and son relationship goes parallel with the concept of motherland because the speaker needs his motherland to identify himself. For this reason, it can be said that the war is a promise to maintain this duality because death and to be buried under the mother soil signifies an eternal bodily connection with the mother.

The poem continues:

And think, this heart, all evil shed away,
A pulse in the eternal mind, no less
Gives somewhere back the thoughts by England given;
Her sights and sounds; dreams happy as her day;
And laughter, learnt of friends; and gentleness,
In hearts at peace, under an English heaven (Greenblatt et al., 2012, p.2019)

These idealistic first lines speak of the passing away of all evil things and reaching the eternal life, which is death. However, this idealization may also evoke the child's desire to return to the Freudian pre-Oedipal stage when we are children at a stage of total innocence. In this interpretation, the poem becomes one about emotional insecurity and immaturity, the speaker unwilling to break his connection with his childhood, lose his innocence and separate from his mother. After this, he personifies England calling the nation "her" and creating an image of a bright England, filled with light, enhanced by using the words "dreams", "happy", "laughter", "gentleness" and "heaven". These words effect the readers positively and make them feel like that dying in the war is an opportunity for the soldiers to experience eternal gratification. Don Gifford (1995) supports this idea saying that "[w]e have here is a suicide note that says: ...in this escape of death, I will find peace "under an English heaven" (p. 49). This reading relies on an interpretation of the poem which sees the speaker as unquestioningly desiring death. Tim Kendall (2013), on the other hand, supportively emphasizes that Rupert Brooke "...was willing to die for the dear England whose beauty and majesty he knew, and he advanced to the brink in perfect serenity, with absolute conviction of the rightness of his country's cause" (p. 104).

A crucial tool of Brooke's propaganda is the use of religion. Brooke's soldier is explicit about the religious duty of enlisting for the war in his poem. Martyrdom was cuttingly defined by George Bernard Shaw (1897,1906) as "the only way in which a man can become famous without ability" (p. 56), but the notion that to die in battle was a glorious death was powerful in the war period, and indeed remains a compelling part of many patriotic rituals. The idea that there was a religious compulsion towards martyrdom, facilitated by the Christian belief system, encouraged a general belief among the population that the easiest way to get immortality was to sacrifice themselves and become a martyr in a war. Brooke's poem also encourages this belief emphasized with the words of "under an English heaven". "The Soldier" is, in this way, a promise addressed to other soldiers of the Great War that if they die for their country then heaven awaits them.

Returning to the Christian significance of martyrdom, many martyrs who sacrifice their bodies for God are present in the Bible and an awareness of the significance of Biblical martyrdom is suggestive of society's perspective on self-sacrifice and commitment. Considering the Biblical acts of martyrdom, it can be seen that Jesus Christ is one of the most important martyrs in Christianity as he sacrificed himself for his people. He is called as the "Lamb of God" that appears at John 1:29 and associated with purity because everything is purified with blood and without shedding of blood there is no forgiveness. Jesus died for the sins of his people by shedding his own blood for purification, and becomes a martyr while the soldiers sacrifice their bodies for the country and likewise become martyrs. This strong relation emphasizes the idea of personal sacrifice, even of one's life, as a religious duty to the reader. This idea of martyrdom also gives a level of innocence to the English soldier; evoking the sacrificial lamb, the animal of innocence incapable of attacking or killing others makes the soldiers likewise seem innocent and hides the violence they will necessarily do to others. Rather, the soldier –and the audience of soldiers are also innocent, as they have a duty to protect their motherland when there is war.

Moreover, if we reduce the status of soldiers to lambs, we once again picture the English soldier as innocent and childlike.

Brooke's poem makes much use of the communal, personal and religious motifs which would mean most to his readers. The historical reception of the poem itself was remarkable and reflects this power of this synthesis: George Walter (2006) relates how Brooke's "The Soldier" had such a profound effect on the Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral in London that on "Easter Sunday 1915, [he chose] "The Soldier" as the text for his sermon, arguing that 'the enthusiasm of a pure and elevated patriotism has never found a nobler expression' (p. 14). The fact that "The Soldier" came to be read in churches proves its success in manipulating people about religious duty of going into battle. In an ironic twist of fate, three weeks later than Easter, Brooke died from an illness before he engaged in any combat and "his enthusiasm for the war was never to be tested by experience" (McLoughlin, 2009, p.164).

Rudyard Kipling was an English poet who was born in India in 1865. His military career began with his education at the United Services College at Westward Ho! and continued his association with the military as a journalist in the Punjab, writing for a journal which is published under the supervision of the army. Having lived both in America and in England, in the early 1900s he visited South Africa as a correspondent and witnessed the attacks of the Boer war. Tim Kendall (2013) emphasizes that according to Kipling, who sees a "national complacency" at that time, British soldiers "had forgotten their duties and their debts" (p.23). That is why Kendall (2013) says, "In subsequent decades, he [Rudyard Kipling] urged the case for military reform and a revolution in public opinion." (p. 23). For this reason, he supported compulsory military service and wrote many patriotic essays and poems. His poem "For All We Have And Are", for example, is a famous patriotic poem of the period of the First World War in which he warns against any passivity among the English soldiers and instead encourages them to galvanize like their enemies. Kipling wrote this rhetorical poem at the beginning of the war in 1914 as a warning about the coming destruction. He calls young men to fight for their country and their children. The poem opens thus:

For all we have and are,
For all our children's fate,
Stand up and take the war.
The Hun is at the gate! (Kendall, 2014, p.25)

The voice speaks directly to the soldiers and young men preparing to do battle, and calls on them to make themselves ready as the threat is imminent. The first lines suggest the fatalistic element of the soldiers' choice to "stand up and take the war", as there is no other real option. Yet in doing so the speaker is positive as he articulates the civilizational aspect of their conflict with the idea that to fight for England is to fight for freedom against the enemy. When it comes to the most famous line of the poem "The Hun is at the gate!" this call can be interpreted as a shout of an alarmed citizen. This line has become infamous for Kipling's embodiment of the German army as "the Hun" at the gate, with Kingsley Amis wading into the argument in the 1970s to Kipling's defence:

'The Hun is at the gate' has been taken as an incitement to racial hatred. No: "the Hun" is a metaphor for "the barbarian, the enemy of decent values", and "the gate" is not that of England and the Empire, but that of civilisation".

(Amis, 1975, p.76)

According to Amis, "The Hun" represents barbarism at the threshold of culture and civilisation. Indeed, "The Hun" actually refers to the fourth century Mongolian nomadic nation under the control of Attila known for its invasion of Europe. Yet, as Amis says, even though "The Hun" refers to a group of Asiatic people, it serves to function as barbarian in general, as European history has characterised the Huns as destroyers. Evoking this distant history allows Kipling to dehumanise the Germans in order to characterise them as a barbaric enemy. Thus the poet's utilization of the word "Hun" is a proof of that he sees how destructive and barbarian Germany's war style is.

Characterising the Germans as timeless barbarians allows the poetic voice to criticise the perceived passivity of England and her army and urges the soldiers to take up the cause of freedom. Brian Abel Ragen (1996) argues "[t]his poem, like many jeremiads over the centuries, describes the external threat to a civilization as the result of the civilization's own internal weakness" (p. 3) and confronts the reader with a serious criticism in the poem. Kipling undoubtedly is conjuring a fierce enemy with the implication that the quiet English soldiers should fight with the same barbaric methods and they need to be prepared for that because England has a weak side as it is seen in The First Scottish War of Independence and The Hundred Years' War which are the great defeats of Britain. For example, in "Hundred Years' War" between 1337 and 1453 the supremacy of the Britain was obvious at the beginning while France finalised the war as the victorious. On the other hand, the views of the poet can be explained in terms of "xenophobia", feelings of negativity towards the stranger, or the other. Cast in this light, the discourse of "Hun" can be seen as reflecting a serious racial hatred towards the enemy and as casting the German people as absolute outsiders.

Having characterised the enemy in this way, the poetic voice sinks into despondency for a lost age:

Our world has passed away
In wantonness o'erthrown.
There is nothing left to-day
But steel and fire and stone! (Kendall, 2014, p.25)

The speaker's despairing mood encourages him to reflect on battles already lost, arguing that their world has decayed. While he uses a retrospective point of view, it is probable that he is simultaneously projecting towards the impending destruction that war means for the country. He develops a negative point of view and forecasts that the world is about to collapse for no real reason, emphasized with the word "wantonness". From this pessimistic perspective, nothing is left from their country as everywhere is full of steel, fire and stone, perhaps referencing the weapons, bombs and destroyed buildings of war. He reveals the destruction differently

when it is compared to the first stanza in which the speaker calls people to fight. Brian Abel Ragen (1996) comments on the negativity of the opening, arguing that "[i]t might seem strange to envision the enemy as one of the waves of attackers who swept down on a doomed empire — it might seem even defeatist to cast one's own nation in the role of the vanquished just when it must summon all its resources to avoid the old empire's fate" (p. 3). Ragen sees in this Kipling criticizing the attitude of the Britain, arguing that those people who see the German attack as responsible for England's collapse, in fact the empire was already over. Ragen suggests that it is a strange position to hold while England can still defend itself. However, Ragen's reading of the poem is that Kipling is encouraging a thwarted England to stand up and prevent the impending disasters and save itself from further destruction. Thus when Ragen alludes to "the old empire's fate", he is referencing past arrogances and unpreparedness:

Kipling had seen England as foolishly unprepared for the war to come—especially since the Boer War had shown so dramatically the incompetence and inefficiency of parts of the British army. He wants to cast England in the role of the decadent, luxurious Rome that had become too effete to repel the invaders.

(Ragen, 1996, p. 3)

Kipling, Ragen argues, suggests that Britain is now demonstrating the same level of dissipation that the Roman Empire showed in its decline, citing in particular its attitude towards the war. In the Boer War Ragen refers to, the British Empire fought with African Transvaal and the Orange Free State between the years of 1899-1902; the British Empire won the war but demonstrated weakness on the part of its commanders. By evoking the old empire of Rome and its dissolution, Ragen argues that Kipling believes the British Empire itself is dissolving through indifference and lack of defence, which accounts for the bitter mood of the speaker.

Having set up this angry pessimistic tone, the speaker suddenly gathers his strength and continues:

Though all we knew depart,
The old Commandments stand: —
"In courage keep your heart,
In strength lift up your hand (Kendall, 2014, p.25)

Thus, even if many things are lost and the world is devastated, the soldiers must be encouraged to remember the commandments that give direction to believers. While the commandment is not Biblical, its rhetorical function echoes those which are such as "Fear not, [for] I am your shield" (Genesis 15:1), thus the poetic voice strengthens his ideological effect by touching on religion. More importantly, the speaker compels Britain's need to fight and implies that the soldiers should be galvanized to resist the enemy country by this commandment. The speaker wants to emphasize they have to be powerful and devastating as the enemy is a barbaric nation. In the next stanza the speaker continues to explain the way in which Britain should make war:

Once more we hear the word
That sickened earth of old: --
"No law except the Sword
Unsheathed and uncontrolled."
Once more it knits mankind,
Once more the nations go
To meet and break and bind
A crazed and driven foe (Kendall, 2014, p.25)

The speaker here urges a reluctant nation to recognise that there is only one option to save England at this point: she must fight and follow the ancient law of the sword. While the implication of "sword" is as for it to be recognised as a symbol of power, strength and authority it brings both harm and protection at the same time. The poems reference to the ancient quality of this battle reminds the reader of national myths where warriors draw their strength from their swords in using them to overcome their rivals -- Arthur's Round Table Knights, for example, with their belief that the knight who pulls the sword from the stone will be the most worthy and valiant knight in the world. Here the reference to the Hun from the opening proves interesting as Attila has his own sword foundation myth with the hidden sword, believed to be hidden by the God of War, being revealed to Attila thus proving his right to be the king. In other words, the poem's reasoning goes, whoever has the sword, holds the power.

Of course, the sword can be seen as a symbol of masculinity as it can also be seen as a phallic symbol. Freud says "...the male organ, has symbolical substitutes in objects of like form, those which are long and upright, such as *sticks, umbrellas, poles, trees*, etc. It is also symbolized by objects that have the characteristic, in common with it, of penetration into the body and consequent injury, hence pointed *weapons* of every type, *knives, daggers, lances, swords*" (as cited in Hall, 1920, p.126). From a Freudian perspective of this poem, the sword can be seen to function as the phallus, suggesting the insertion of something powerful into something weak which means power and masculinity at the same time. The poem emphasizes the power of the sword saying that it both runs the world bringing together mankind while ridding mankind of its enemy at the same time. Nevertheless, the speaker also is aware that inciting violence is a dangerous act as the sword "unsheathed and uncontrolled" has its own dominating power in the world of war. Nevertheless, the last lines, of the poem speak to this necessity, reminding the reader of essential otherness of the German enemy – it is "a crazed and driven foe".

Andreas Musolff (2017) suggests that this image is an essential part of "Kipling'[s...] unambiguously patriotic stance, portraying the enemy as a "crazed and driven foe" that started the war and has already brought it to Britain's "gate"(p. 105). Musolff continues his discussion highlighting that England must defend itself as it has no other choice. The sword is necessary because the state of the world is so serious. The poem continues:

Comfort, content, delight,
The ages' slow-bought gain,
They shrivelled in a night.
Only ourselves remain
To face the naked days
In silent fortitude,
Through perils and dismays

Renewed and re-renewed (Kendall, 2014, p.26)

The speaker states that the all "comfort, content, delight" gained over ages collapse at once because of the enemy attacks. All that's left is themselves and that is why they have to protect their own lives and their future. Including himself in this call to arms, the speaker spurs his fellow readers to face and overcome these fearful days bravely. Highlighting that the days ahead will be very difficult, full of "night, naked days, perils, dismays", however, the speaker sparks hope in the final words of the stanza with the word of "renewed". The speaker states that the confrontation with the enemy offers renewal and re-renewal and that as the nation and its soldiers face hardships, they will be rewarded with rejuvenation so powerful that the challenges, perils and dismays will compensate for all the previous failures. So, the call to arms of the poem presses the soldiers' need to fight and prove themselves by prevailing over the enemy so that in turn they can be released from their dissolute state and can be renewed. Indeed, recast in this light, fighting will give these soldiers the sole purpose of their life which is protecting England.

The final stanza of the poem reads:

No easy hope or lies
Shall bring us to our goal,
But iron sacrifice
Of body, will, and soul.
There is but one task for all—
One life for each to give.
What stands if Freedom fall?

Who dies if England live? (Kendall, 2014, p.26)

Using cohesive objectives, the speaker continues to paint a situation in which everybody feels mutual responsible to fight for the country. Using the collective possessives "our" and "for all" to strengthen his propagandist message about patriotic solidarity, he warns simultaneously that this route will be hard as "no easy hope or lies" will allow them to achieve renewal; only "iron

sacrifice" marks the pathway to victory. Only by demonstrating their parallel purpose of protecting England against the enemy by fighting and destroying them can they reach their collective goal, and this may entail losing one's life. Indeed, here the speaker reaches the heights of his propagandizing idealism, as at that point, he states that citizens owe their life to their motherland, should it be necessary, saying that "One life for each to give" (1914). We can interpret this as Kipling's own sense of loyalty to his motherland, despite having been born in India, as voiced by the speaker of the poem. However, there is a problematic distance between the poet and those whom he addresses here, as Kipling himself is not at risk of experiencing these dangers while he exhorts others to take them on saying they should give their lives in that battle of freedom.

In the last significant lines of the poem Kipling idealizes death with the rhetorical questions of "What stands if freedom fall? Who dies if England live?" (1914). The speaker implies that nothing will be important if they lose their freedom. On the other hand "Who dies if England live?" is a kind of motivation as it looks for the person who will sacrifice oneself to keep England alive: protecting the motherland is worthy of great effort and sacrifice. For the speaker, the seriousness of the situation is fundamental and that is why he wants to unite people against the enemy. The poem's reception suggests that the polemical power of Kipling's work was successful. Lord Plymouth, for example, lost his son in 1914 and found some relief in Kipling's poem. In an interview which is published in *The Times* on September 20, "Lord Plymouth spoke of the heavy sacrifices that would have to be endured in the maintenance of the honour of the nation. 'We must learn', said he, 'to say with Mr. Rudyard Kipling, and say it with deep conviction, Who dies if England lives?'" (Renshaw, 2014, p. 97).

In conclusion, how the war culture is reflected to the poems is analysed through these two writings and it can be reasoned that the aim of creating that kind of poetry may be gilding the reality of fighting for the nation, propagandizing and so keeping the dark side of the war in the background. While Brooke focuses on the love for the nation and touches upon the religious duty to go to the battle, Kipling mentions the destructiveness of the enemy and creates the sense of that England need to protect itself from this devastating enemy. However they have a crucial common ground that they do not experience fighting while they manipulate people to go to the battle. That is why they praise fighting and dying for the country. Finally, the aim of these poets is stimulating men to enlist in the battle, propagandising and, in a way, hypnotizing them yet the way they choose shows their point of view and creates a variedness in making propaganda.

RESOURCES

- Amis, K. (1975). *Rudyard Kipling and his world*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Gifford, D. (1995). *Soldier Poets (1914-1918)*. *Hungarian Journal of English and*
- Greenblatt, S., Christ, C. T., David, A., Lewalski, B. K., Lipking, L., Logan, G., . . . Abrams, M. H. (2012). *The Norton Anthology of English Literature (9th ed.)*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Kendall, Tim. *Poetry of the First World War: An Anthology*. Oxford University Press, 2013.

- McLoughlin, K. (2009). *The Cambridge Companion to War Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Musolff, Andreas. "Wilhelm II's 'Hun Speech' and Its Alleged Resemiotization During World War I".
- Phillips, A. (2006). *The Penguin Freud Reader*. London: Penguin Classics. *American Studies (HJEAS)*, 1(2), 47-63. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41273896>
- Shaw, B. (1906). *The Devil's Disciple: A Melodrama*. New York: Brentano's Publishers.
- Walter, George. *The Penguin Book of First World War Poetry*. Penguin Group, 2006.
- Ragen, Brian Abel. "'The Hun is at the Gate': Rudyard Kipling's Poetry of the First World War," Poetry and History Conference, the University of Stirling, Scotland, June 1996. <https://www.brianbaleragen.net/The-Hun-is-at-the-Gate.pdf>
- Hall, S. (1920). *A General Introduction to Introduction to Psychoanalysis*. New York: Boni and Liveright.
- Renshaw, A. (2014). *Wisden on the Great War: The Lives of Cricketers Fallen 1914-1918*. London: John Wisden and Co, an imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.