



## The "Demonic Other" and the Colonial Figures in Kipling's The White Man's Burden and Taher's Sunset Oasis: A Comparative Study

Abdel Kareem Qutb Shehata

Department of English- Faculty of Languages and Translation 6th October University – Cairo – Egypt

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v4i4.1066>

**APA Citation:** Shehata, A. K. Q.(2022). The "Demonic Other" and the Colonial Figures in Kipling's The White Man's Burden and Taher's Sunset Oasis: A Comparative Study. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*. 4(4).12-26. <http://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v4i4.1066>

**Received:**  
22/09/2022

**Accepted:**  
25/11/2022

**Keywords:**

Demonic other  
Colonial Figures  
Kipling White Man  
Burden Taher  
Sunset Oasis  
Comparative.

**Abstract**

In 1899, The British poet Rudyard Kipling directed his poem, *The White Man's Burden*, to the United States on the occasion of the invasion of the Philippine Islands. In his poem, Kipling mainly encourages the States to occupy the Islands. Kipling also draws a portrait of the colonized peoples. In 2007, the Egyptian novelist Bahaa Taher published his novel (*Waht Al Ghoroub*), *Sunset Oasis*. In his novel, Taher presents a group of Egyptian, English, Irish and Circassian characters who live in Egypt during and after the Urabi Revolution (1882). The first aim of this paper is to show the main features of the picture of the colonized people in Kipling's poem. The second aim is to highlight the traits of the pictures of the characters, who are terribly influenced by the imperial project throughout the history in Taher's novel. Comparing Kipling's and Taher's pictures is another important aim of the paper. The paper will achieve these aims in the light of the postcolonial theory and the paper comes in two parts and a conclusion.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

In 1899, The British poet, Rudyard Kipling presented his poem, *The White Man's Burden* to the United States on the occasion of the States' invasion of the Philippine Islands. In this poem, Kipling mainly encourages the States to occupy the Islands and to do, what he believed, the human role of the Western world towards the Eastern peoples. He thought colonialism is the Western method to help the Eastern countries. However, Kipling, in the poem, draws a portrait of the colonized peoples as well.

In 2007, the Egyptian novelist, Bahaa Taher published his novel, (*Waht Al Ghoroub*), *Sunset Oasis*. In this novel, Taher presents a group of Egyptian, English, Irish and Circassian characters who live in Egypt during and after the Urabi Revolution (1882) against the British occupation of Egypt. These characters range from the bloody colonial English officers who kill the Egyptians in the massacre of Alexandria to the Egyptian police officer Mahmoud Abdel Zaher, who supports the Urabi Revolution but in the investigations after the Revolution, he

reported it as a mutiny. It is a picture of different victims of the dangerous and inhuman Western project of colonialism.

The first aim of this paper is to show the main features of the picture of the colonized people in Kipling's poem, *The White Man's Burden*. The second aim is to highlight the traits of the pictures of the characters, who are terribly influenced by the imperial project throughout history in Taher's novel, *Sunset Oasis*. Comparing Kipling's and Taher's pictures is another important aim of the paper. The paper will achieve these aims in the light of the postcolonial theory.

So, the paper comes in an introduction, two parts and a conclusion. In the introduction, the "demonic other" concept is presented as a postcolonial one. Then the first part of the paper tackles the details of the picture of the colonized in the poem of Kipling. In the second part, the paper deals with the long and comprehensive picture of the different characters in Taher's novel. In conclusion the paper compares the two works as two attempts to consider how the colonizer and the colonized see each other.

## **2. "THE DEMONIC OTHER" CONCEPT**

Edward Said presents the Western point of view about the difference between the Western colonizer and the Eastern colonized, "Orientalism depends on a culturally constructed distinction between the 'Occident' (West) and the 'Orient' (East) (Wang,2018, p.651). This distinction is an invention of the Western governments:

Orientalism is just like the Westerner's fantasy, regarding the east as a place of backwardness, irrationality, and wildness. It is a political and cultural doctrine made by the west, trying to control the east politically or culturally. (p.651)

The Western ideas about the 'Occident' (West) and the 'Orient' (East), the self and the other are politically used to achieve imperial aims.

Literary works have been highly skillfully used by the Western world to defend the colonial projects. Earlier than their colleagues in the colonized countries, the literary men in the West had introduced and explained the theory of the postcolonial literature. Their poets and novelists also described the human experiences in the colonized societies before the colonized writers did. In the introduction of their book Ashcroft, Gareth and Helen (1989) divide the post-colonial literature into three stages and save the first stage for the works of the Western writers:

They inevitably privilege the center, emphasizing the "home:" over the native...  
. At a deeper level their claim to objectivity simply serves to hide the Imperial discourse within which they are created. Literary works which emerge from this moment can be illustrated by the poems of Rudyard Kipling. (*The Empire...*, p. 5)

**The "Demonic Other" and the Colonial Figures in Kipling's *The White Man's Burden* and Taher's *Sunset Oasis: A Comparative Study***

Here, Kipling, because of his poems, presents an example of the imperial part of the world. In such poem, he "makes a political appeal and the more we respond to that appeal the more we shall respond to his poetry" (Lackey, 2007, p. 23). When he directs his poetry to the Western readers, as in the *White Man's Burden*, he is greatly influencing.

The unnatural conditions of the colonizers, who live among the colonized peoples, make this influence greatly easier. In "such texts..., the representations of others to Europe were not accounts of different peoples and societies, but a projection of European fears and desires masquerading as scientific 'objective knowledge' " (Ashcroft, Gareth and Helen, 1995, *The Post...* 85 ). The Western reader receives the descriptions and the images in these works as scientific facts.

Through his theory of Orientalism, Edward Said presents an explanation of the postcolonial Western attitude towards the peoples in the colonized countries. Said (1991) sees that:

A very large mass of writers, among whom are poets, novelists..., have accepted the basic distinction between East and West as the starting point for elaborate theories, epics, novels... concerning the Orient, its people, customs, "mind", destiny, and so on. (p. 2-3)

The Western poets, novelists and intellectuals accepted that distinction as a natural matter. Their imperial projects affected their belief in equality and human rights. For them, Said thinks, the world is divided into two separate and different divisions: the self and the other. Ann B. Dobie (2012) in her book explains Said's point of view:

Their view of the "Other" world- "orientalism" is inevitably coloured by their own cultural, political and religious backgrounds, leading them to depict those unlike themselves as inferior and objectionable – for example, as lazy , deceitful and irrational ...( p. 205)

To convince their peoples of their imperial projects in Africa, Asia and other parts of the world, they have depended on the differences between the West and the colonized countries. The Western countries have had stronger economies, more educated peoples and better equipped and organized armies. Showing the other as lazy and deceitful made it "easier to justify military or economic conquest" (p. 205). The western peoples have followed their governors and supported the imperial armies to occupy the countries of the others to "help", "educate" and "free them from slavery".

The colonizers liked the idea of seeing and showing the other as inferior and deceitful. That method helped them so much. It justified their conquest of the lands and their aggressive

actions against those peoples. “Sometimes the dominant culture sees the “other” as evil, in which case it is known as the 'demonic other'” (p. 209). That other is wicked, cruel, lazy and energetic at the same time.

### **3. KIPLING'S PICTURE OF THE COLONIZED**

In his poem *The White Man's Burden*, Kipling introduces a detailed picture of that “demonic other”. The traits of the colonized show the main features of the colonial discourse. The poet wants to justify the imperial objectives of the white man when he invades a country and controls its people. However, most of the traits of the colonized expose the imperial intentions and contradict each other. The poet refers to a famous story in the Holy Bible to give his view a sacramental influence to make the picture more convincing.

In his poem, Kipling (2013) mainly encourages the government of the United States to do their “human” duty and to occupy the Philippine Islands to "help" the people in those islands. However, he refers to the colonized man more than once as "another” or “other”. This is so clear in the following lines:

To seek another's profit,  
and work another's gain. (lines 7-8)

(and)

And when your goal is nearest  
The end for others sought, (lines 21-22)

Kipling sees that the colonizers do not show pride, and they speak so much in simple language to explain their goals. Referring to the colonized as the “other”, he makes clear the racial attitudes of the colonizers and, more important, the contradiction in their view of the colonized is so apparent.

More contradicting is that while the colonial discourse that Kipling and the rest of the imperialists adopt sees that freeing man from slavery is one of their aims, Kipling repeatedly refers to the colonized as “your captives” and "your new caught”,

To serve your captives' need; (line 4)

(and)

Your new- caught sullen peoples, (line 7)

These references to the colonized people show them as animals caught by hunters or as enslaved people in the hands of their masters.

Kipling's racist eyes see the adult peoples of the colonized countries as deformed creatures. The colonized is not only “other”, “animal”, or "slave”, but he is also strange, deformed, and an ugly beast: “Half-devil and half-child” (line 8). The colonized is as deceitful as the devil and at the same time he can not be as responsible as the adult. This is the colonizer's

**The "Demonic Other" and the Colonial Figures in Kipling's *The White Man's Burden* and *Taher's Sunset Oasis: A Comparative Study***

point of view that Kipling paradoxically represents. How could the colonized be a devil, that has superpowers and strange abilities and in the meantime, he is as lazy and weak as a child.

In his poem, Kipling sees the colonized slowly, physically and mentally as well. Kipling sympathies with the colonizers, who terribly suffer from the bad treatment of the colonized:

Watch sloth and heathen folly

Bring all your hope to naught. (lines 23-24)

Again Kipling finds a similarity between the colonized and one of the animals; the sloth. That different type of man is as slow as the sloth. He is ignorant concerning the Christian God and very stupid too. These traits of the colonized turned the colonized into a disabled creature that resists any attempt to develop and destroys the projects and the hopes of the colonizer to improve those peoples and their countries.

The subjectivity of the colonial discourse and the British poet is apparent. Kipling's picture of the colonized reflects his racial and colonial point of view. In his book, Albert Memmi (2003) asks a question and concludes;

Is the colonized truly lazy? ... Essentially, the independence of the accusation from any sociological or historical conditions makes it suspect... By his accusation, the colonizer establishes the colonized as being lazy... It is possible to proceed with the same analysis for each of the features found in the colonized. (p.124- 125)

Here, Kipling, as a representative of the colonizer, wants to establish the colonized with all these negative traits. However, neither sociological nor historical evidence supports his point of view.

Trying to fix his false portrait of the colonized, Kipling references a famous Biblical story, the story of Moses and the Jews in Ancient Egypt. The colonizer in the modern story of Kipling represents Moses, and the colonized represents the Jews. The colonizers did many favours for the colonized peoples. However, the colonized blamed them.

The savage wars of peace

fill full the mouth of famine

and bid the sickness cease; (lines. 18-20)

The armies of the Western world fought terrible wars in the colonized countries and lost many soldiers and officers to make those countries peaceful. The imperial governments spent much money to face the famine and feed the hungry people in Africa and Asia. The colonizers also exerted great efforts to supply those poor places with medicine to stop the diseases and to turn the colonized into healthy societies

These great efforts of the colonizers are met only by hatred and the blame from the colonized peoples. Kipling informs the American government:

And reap his old reward  
the blame of these ye better,  
the hate of those ye guard- (lines. 34-36)

Kipling, who represents British imperialism, acts as the more experienced colonizer and “humanitarian”. He tells the new colonizers, The Americans, no to expect any grateful response. The colonized will only hate and blame the colonizers.

Kipling sees that the colonized peoples will not respond in a civilized way. They will cry to complain about the results of the colonizers’ efforts.

The cry of hosts ye humour  
(Ah, slowly !) towards the light:-  
“Why brought ye us from bondage,  
Our loved Egyptian night ?” (lines. 37-40)

The poet sees the hatred and the blame of the colonized towards the colonizer as “his old reward” to make his reference to the story of Moses and the Jews in the Old Testament. “And Moses said unto the people, Remember this day, in which ye came out from Egypt, out of the house of bondage” (Holy Bible, Ex. 13) . Moses faced the dangers of the pharaoh and could, with the help of God to free them from slavery in ancient Egypt. However, the Jews did not thank Moses. Kipling sees that the colonized peoples regretted getting out of slavery to freedom, exactly as the Jews did. The Holy Bible (1932) describes a similar response from the Jews of Moses;

And the people thirsted there for water;  
and the people murmured against Moses,  
and said , wherefore is this that thou  
hast brought us up out of Egypt, to kill  
us and our children and our cattle with thirst? (Ex. 17)

The Jews here blame Moses for taking them out of Egypt and asking him if he did so to kill them, their children and cattle with thirst.

Kipling makes this reference to a story from the *Holy Bible* to support his racist and aggressive description of the colonized. His colonial eyes see the colonized, the "demonic other", as “captives”, “devil”, "child", and “sloth”. When these traits showed the poet's subjectivity and were not supported by scientific, sociological or historical evidence, he goes to the Biblical story to add sacramental effects to his point of view. However, the reference is not successful.



#### 4. DISCUSSION

The Biblical story of Moses and the Jews in Ancient Egypt does not apply to the colonial situation. In the Holy book, according to his God's orders, Moses could, after a long struggle with the pharaoh, get the Jews out of Egypt, where they had lived as enslaved people for a long time. They were intended to live freely in another land decided by their God and prophet. The colonial situation is totally different. The colonizers were neither gods nor prophets for the colonized peoples. Invading other countries was not according to orders from any Gods. The colonized were free in their countries. The colonizers turned those free peoples into enslaved people and stole their countries. The colonized did not only complain or blame the Jews of Moses, but they rose in revolutions.

Kipling's picture of the "demonic other" is not convincing. On the contrary, it shows how aggressive and subjective the Western viewpoint concerning the colonized people is. It could be accepted only by the Western racist and colonial readers. The colonised countries' peoples and literary men have different viewpoints. In his novel, the Egyptian novelist Bahaa Taher presents the characters involved in the colonial situation. Is he more objective, comprehensive and convincing than Kipling?

##### 4.1. Taher's Imperialistic Characters

Some Western critics exclude postcolonial literature from the literary works written in English or, at the most, in one of the western languages. However, some other critics "use the term 'postcolonial'... to cover all the culture affected by the imperial process... So literature of Africa, ... etc., are all post-colonial Literature" (Ashcroft, Gareth and Helen, *The Empire...*, 1989, p. 2). Accordingly, Taher's *Sunset Oasis* is a postcolonial novel par excellence. The novel shows how Egypt and the Egyptians were terribly affected by the British occupation that started formally in 1882.

Anti-colonial novel may be a more convenient classification of *Sunset Oasis* since Taher shows the terrible and dangerous damages made to all aspects of life in Egypt during their long occupation: "their impact and damage were structural, moral and political, ... In this respect, anti-colonial literature is enormous," (Al-Musawi, 2003, p. 8). Taher draws a picture of colonial characters, British army officers, Alexander the great as the ancient Western colonizer, and Irish and Egyptian characters to show the inhuman impacts of the Western project of Imperialism on human nature. Consequently, this type of novel is a tool for resisting colonialism.

In *Sunset Oasis*, the occupation of Egypt started as European and focused on the economic and political aspects of life. The rulers of Egypt, through their debts from the

European countries, paved the way to “the domination of the Europeans, who has even become ministers of the country’s government and were employed in every ministry” (Taher,2009,p. 20). Through economy, the European imperial country dominated Egyptian life's economic, political and other sides.

With the break out of the Urabi Revolution, European occupation is mainly British. The British imperialists and governors developed their occupation to be mostly military. During the Urabi Revolution, the British army, navy officers, and soldiers proved war criminals. Mahmoud Abdel Zaher, The Egyptian police officer, the main character, remembers:

Talat says in a choking voice, “It’s slaughter not war’,  
and I reply, “you’re right. ‘We see the British ships  
shelling the fort as though carrying out a leisurely  
review, with three large ships in a geometric formation  
pointing their guns at the fort and then shelling it very  
precisely,... . (p.51)

The fort and the guns were old, and the Egyptian soldiers were little enough to consider the British ships attack as a leisure activity. Clearly, the Egyptian fort did not form any threat to the three large British ships. However, the British ships fired the fort with their shells and caused heavy casualties. Many people were killed, and so much blood was split in Alexandria, north of Egypt.

In Taher's novel, the terrible and damaging effect of the bloody Western colonizer develops and is broadened in place and time. Mahmoud remembers Catherine’s stories about the tragedies that the British imperialistic army caused in Ireland:

How they had seized the best lands and farms and given them to the British settlers, who had taken control of two-thirds of the islands. They had banned the Catholic inhabitants from owning land and holding government positions.  
(p.97)

Simply the British imperialists stole the Irish best lands and gave them to the invaders. The real owners of the land became poor and marginal in their country.

Other Irish people had worse treatment from the British colonizers, who

dispersed them around the world, to the point that their migrants came to outnumber those who remained in the county. On one occasion, they drove off sixty thousands of them, men, women and children, and sold them into slavery in the West Indies. (p. 97)



**The "Demonic Other" and the Colonial Figures in Kipling's *The White Man's Burden* and Taher's *Sunset Oasis: A Comparative Study***

The British criminals enforced most of the people to leave their country. The British colonized turned many free thousands of the Irish people into slaves. They drove them like cattle and sold them away from their home country.

The bloody British colonizers committed war crimes when they killed many Irish people in massacres. Catherine, the Irish wife of Mahmoud, comments on her sister Fiona,

Her mood always worsens when the conversation turns to something that reminds her of the British and their massacres in Ireland and especially Conraugh, our province, on which the British declared open war time and again. (p. 267-268)

The bloody colonizers, the British, killed many people in Ireland, their neighbourhood as well as in Egypt. The British war- criminals covered vast areas of the earth, in the East and in the West with the blood of the innocent old people, women and children.

Taher also extends the picture of the bloody colonizer back in history. The character of the Western bloody colonizer of the ancient times, Alexander the Great is given a separate part of the novel to talk about his dreams and the aims of his imperial project. He is also the topic of a long argument between Catherine and Fiona. Catherine's research aimed to find the tomb of Alexander in the oasis. Fiona sees that, "There's no need for us to go digging on his memory up. We have of his like and inheritors of his mantle!" (p. 268-269). Fiona means the British and the other Western colonizers.

Alexander the Great had been as bloody as his inheritors the British imperialists. Fiona proves her point of view through historical evidence. She explains, "he split a great deal of blood and destroyed many cities – what he did at Tyre on Mount Lebanon is a sufficient example... he killed thousands of its people, by slaughter and crucifixion" (p. 267). The colonizer, either in the ancient times or at present, is the same, spills the blood of some innocent people and turns the others into slaves.

The colonial figures in Taher's novel include, beside the bloody colonizers, characters such as the Sarccassian, captain Wasfi, the Irish, Catherine and the Egyptian police officer, Tal'at. All these figures are spoiled by the terrible project of Imperialism. Alexander the Great and the British leaders were innocents once upon a time. They were not born killers, but when they believed in the idea of imperialism, they became war criminals. They destroyed the cities and killed many people, and sold more others as enslaved people. Catherine, Wasfi and Tal'at respond to the imperial project with different degrees as a result of the colonial discourse and propaganda.

Captain Wasfi Himmat Niyazi is a model of the colonial character. He is an Egyptian police officer, but he has a European origin, he is Circassian: "The same European origin, ... identical customs bring them sentimentally closer to the colonizer. The results are definite advantages the colonized certainly does not have: better job opportunities". (Memmi, 2003, p. 58)

Wasfi, like the other Circassian officers in the Egyptian army and police, enjoys special privileges. Mahmoud comments on Wasfi's rank in the Egyptian police: "Captain ? at his age? I didn't make his rank till I was a few years past thirty and he looked twenty-five barely. What was going on ?" (Taher,2009, p. 206). It is the corruption of the government under the control of British occupation.

The British occupation of Egypt was military, economic and cultural. The British used "The political and economic power to exalt and spread the values and habits of a foreign culture at the expense of a native culture" (Tomlinson, 2002, p. 3). Although he always stresses his "Egyptian" identity, Wasfi was subject to colonial discourse and British propaganda. Fiona confirms: "He is extremely cultured and speaks English exactly like the English... he behaves exactly like an English gentleman" (Taher, 2009, p. 209). He imitates the English and behaves exactly like the English people. He assimilated with the English culture.

The influence of the English Imperialism on Wasfi is clearer in his views about the Urabi revolution and about the idea of imperialism. In a dialogue between them, Mahmoud criticized the British because they banned teaching the Egyptian history at schools. Wasfi defends the British point of view: "So as to spare the students study of the period of civil conflict and treachery ... the pollution of their winds' ...that of Urabi and his fellow mutineers" (p. 239). Wasfi sees that Urabi Revolution is treachery and pollution, Urabi and his officers and soldiers are mutineers. He adds: "Urabi betrayed his sovereign the Khedive and spread anarchy through the country. Fortunately, however, his rebellion ended in crushing defeat?" (p. 239). Urabi, Wasfi thinks his revolution helped chaos and disorganization in the country.

The British succeeded in growing up such figures to defend them and represent the imperialist views and ideas in the Egyptian society. Wasfi tells Mahmoud that the new Khedive will like the British: "Our government cannot do without the British. We need them" (p. 286). The Egyptians, in Wasfi's point of view, could not govern themselves, they could not do without the British Imperialists. If culture "is a way of seeing things, a way of thinking." (Engleke, p. 27), then the British Imperialist project in Egypt succeeded in imposing their culture on characters like Wasfi and turning them into colonial figures, who accepted the killing of the innocent people and the stealing of the wealth of the country.

Cathrine, Mahmoud's Irish wife, is another example of a character who assimilated with imperialism. More than that, she admired the ancient terrible Western imperialist Alexander the Great's character. Despite her Irish people's suffering from the British imperialists, she chooses Alexander to be the topic of her research in ancient Egyptian history. She sees that Alexander "built new cities everywhere and tried after invading Asia to unite East and West" (Taher, 2009, p. 267). She gives a blind eye to the massacres that he made everywhere and repeats the imperial lies about helping the peoples of the world and uniting them.

Being Western, white, Christian, and her late observed racist inclinations may explain Cathrine's admiration of Alexander the Great. Unconsciously, maybe, she adopted his attitudes towards the peoples of other races. After the accident of Ibrahim, Mahmoud comments:

It astonished me that Catherine does not feel any regret, or pangs of conscience... Christian, however, goes on reading her book and reviewing her drawing as though nothing at all has happened and she seems amazed at my insistence on staying by Ibrahim's side all the time.  
(p. 151)

Taher shows Catherine as the white racist who does not care about the coloured colonized, Ibrahim. She does not look at Ibrahim as a man who was hurt because of her. She neither feels any regret nor understands Mahmoud situation.

Tal'at, the Egyptian police officer is a different example of the colonial figures. When he was a young officer, he was Mahmoud's friend and they, together, attended the British massacres in Alexandria during Urabi Revolution. He supported the Revolution, but he could quickly hide his views and take the side of the British. Mahmoud expresses his astonishment about Tal'at's last news:

Wasfi... ended his speech by saying that his excellency the deputy chief of police had send me his greetings. I asked him, 'who is that?' and he replied that it was His Excellency Brigadier General Tal'at Abdel El Aziz. (p. 207)

Taher doesn't show clearly either Ta'at could hide his thoughts, feelings and views or he changes his opinions and became convinced, as truly as Wasfi, by the false goodness of the British occupation of Egypt. Anyway Tala't, as some of the Egyptians, becomes a part of the

British Imperialist project in Egypt. He is promoted to a high rank and becomes one of the leaders of the police in colonized Egypt.

So, the British Imperialists and Alexander the Great are colonial figures because they are the owners of that antihuman idea. Wasfi, Cathrine and Tal'at are colonial figures who adopt Imperialism and see that they could achieve their interests with the imperialists. The colonial figures, then, are bloody killers, assimilated with imperialism, racists and some hypocrite colonized. These figures show the ugliness of Imperialism that turns all these characters into abnormal ones and spreads blood and corruption in the world.

#### **4.2. The Character of Mahmoud**

Mahmoud, the main character in the novel, is introduced to represent the colonized, who could not live smoothly with imperialism. He is aware of Egypt's economic, political and military British imperialism. He recognizes the tools of imperialism. He watches the British massacres against the people in Alexandria during Urabi Revolution. His support of the Urabi Revolution is the main cause of the dispute with his British leaders; the: "principal mode of indigenous agency was resistance to western control, while the typical western response was ... to construe it as out and treachery" (Childs, 1997, p. 26). He could not convince his British leaders that he did not support the Revolution, so they punished him.

The British leaders punish Mahmoud by freezing his promotions and sending him to the oasis, where there are many problems and dangers. Suffering an inner conflict that he did not insist on supporting the Revolution, he commits suicide. This also sends a negative message about Imperialism: either to fire the colonized in a massacre, corrupt him or enforce him to commit suicide.

#### **5. CONCLUSION**

Kipling, in *The White Man's Burden* draws a picture of the colonized, "The demonic Other". At the same time, Taher enjoys the privilege of the novel, its long text, to introduce a wide picture of colonial characters who are the victims of the imperialistic projects. Putting these two pictures together clearly shows the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized. Comparing the two pictures shows each side's attitudes towards the other side and towards Imperialism, especially when Kipling's identity as a soldier of imperialist power and Taher's as a son of a once colonized nation are considered.

Kipling sees the colonized through an imperial, racist and subjective perspective. The colonized, according to Kipling, is slow, lazy and hungry. The poet is a clear racist when he draws the colonized as the 'other'. He believes that the colonized are different. He is inferior in his physical and mental abilities as well as in his cultural traits. The picture is also subjective

**The "Demonic Other" and the Colonial Figures in Kipling's *The White Man's Burden* and Taher's *Sunset Oasis: A Comparative Study***

when the poet shows the colonizer as always benevolent and good while colonized is devilish and dependent all the time.

Taher's picture is more objective when it includes a variety of characters: Western colonizers such as Alexander the Great, the British colonizers in Alexandria during Urabi Revolution, Irish colonized Cathrine and Fiona, and Sarcassian supporter of colonization, Captain Wasfi. These different characters and many others give a comprehensive view of the imperial experience of the British armies and governments in Egypt or Ireland. The story of Alexander the Great gives the picture a historical depth.

Kipling's picture mostly focuses on the negative traits of the colonized to condemn and accuses him of being deceitful, blaming and complaining, while Taher concentrates more on the defects of Imperialism as an idea and project. His novel shows the terrible influence of Imperialism on man in general, either the colonizer or the colonized. The colonizers use race and religion to distinguish between peoples of the world and between people in the same society. Imperialism justifies invading, killing and stealing the people and the wealth of a country only because they do not have strong army, good economy or scientific progress. So Taher does not condemn man, he condemns man's evil actions.

In Kipling's poem, the readers hear only one voice; it is that of the colonizer, talking all the time of the good traits of the colonizer and the villainous picture of the colonized. The colonized is not given any chance to defend himself or even to explain his situation. While Taher succeeds by introducing a group of different characters to introduce a comprehensive point of view. The colonizers, as well as their supporters are given a chance to defend their views equally as the colonized characters.

Kipling's poem does not include any objective, scientific or historical evidences to prove the negative picture of the colonized. Many of the traits contradict human equality and even the colonial discourse. However, Taher's picture depends on many historical and social evidences. Moreover, Taher's introduction of evil characters on both sides, the colonizers and the colonized, gives his picture much objectivity and credibility.

Then, Rudyard Kipling in his poem, *The white Man's Burden* introduces a picture of the colonized as the "Demonic other". The colonized is the other, the captive, the slow, the heathen and the blaming side in the colonial relation. Bahaa Taher in his novel, *Sunset Oasis* presents a picture of a number of characters that introduce both the colonizers and the colonized to shed light on the negative and terrible effects of the imperialistic projects on the human nature and on the relations between the colonizer and the colonized.

The comparison between the two pictures emphasizes that Taher's picture is more objective, convincing, and humanitarian. While Kipling, in his poem, encourages a strong country (U.S.A.) to invade other weaker one, to kill to steal to hate and to be hated. Taher introduces a realistic picture of the Western project of Imperialism in the ancient and in the modern times, in the East and the West to show the terrible effects of that project. Taher gives the Western colonized point of view, side by side with the colonized one.

The paper recommends more studies on colonialism, post- colonialism as it has been a very dangerous Western project. It is very important to discuss Imperialism and the works of art that tackle its aspects, to learn from the past and to remind the peoples and the governments in our modern world of the terrible effects of such projects. Recalling the negative aspects of this historical relationship makes the world more attentive not to repeat such experiences. Imperialism is not only an idea of the past, it continues with its ugly and destructive faces in many parts of the world, where stronger armies kill weak peoples and destroy their houses. Imperialism also changes its faces to have economic and cultural aspects in the modern world.

### REFERENCES

- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (Eds.).(1989). *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and practice in post- colonial literatures*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. London: Routledge.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (Eds.). (1995). *The post-colonial studies reader*. Psychology Press.
- Childs, Peter & R.J. Patrick Williams.(1997). *An Introduction to Post Colonial theory*. London: Routledge.
- Dobie, Ann. B.(2012). *Theory into Practice: An Introduction to literary Criticism*. 3rd Ed. Boston: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- The Holy Bible. (1932) *Authorized King James Version*. Chicago Bible Society.1611.
- Kipling, R.(2013) *100 poems Old And New*. "The white Man's Burden" (111-113). Thomas Pinney. Ed. United Kingdom: Cambridge UP.
- Lackey, Michael.(2007). "Kipling's poems". *Journal of Modern Literature*. Spring. Vol. 30 No.3 pp. 21-0 . Indian UP.
- Memmi, A.(2003). *Portrait du Colonise Precede du Portrait du Colonisateur*. Translated by Howard Greenfeld. UK: Earthscan Publications.
- Al- Musawi, M. J .(2003) *The postcolonial Arabic Novel Debating Ambivalence*. *Studies in Arabic Literature*. Suzanne Pinckey StetKeyvched. Volume XXII. Brill: Leiden.
- Said, E. (1991). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books.
- Taher, B. (2009) *Sunset Oasis*. Translated by Humphrey Davis. Nasir City: Dar El- Shorouk.

**The "Demonic Other" and the Colonial Figures in Kipling's *The White Man's Burden* and Taher's *Sunset Oasis: A Comparative Study***

Tomlinson, J.(2002). *Cultural Imperialism: A critical Introduction*. Wang, Yufeng. The Cultural Factors in Postcolonial Theories and Applications Xiamen University of Technology, Fujian, ChinaLondon: Continuum. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 650-654.