

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

Alienation and Apology: A Postcolonial Study of Rushdie's *Fury*

**A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Masters of Arts in English**

By

Rehana Khatun

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

February 2009

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY
Central Department of English

Letter of Recommendation

Rehana Khatun has completed her thesis entitled “Alienation and Apology: A Postcolonial Study of Rushdie’s *Fury*” under my supervision. She carried out her research from 2065/02/29 to 2065/08/10. I hereby recommend that her thesis be submitted for viva voce.

Mr. Pam Bahadur Gurung

Supervisor

Date: March, 2009

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY
Faculty of Humanities and Social Science

Approval Letter

This thesis entitled “Alienation and Apology: A Postcolonial Study of Rushdie’s *Fury*” by Salman Rushdie submitted at the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University by Rehana Khatun, has been approved by the undersigned members of the research committee.

Members of the Research Committee:

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head
Central Department of English

Date: _____

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Pam Bahadur Gurung, lecturer, Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, for his guidance to complete the work. His scholarly guidance, valuable suggestions and instructions made this project a reality. I am deeply indebted to him. Any attempt to express my gratitude to him in words is bound to be inadequate.

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, Head of the Central Department of English, Kirtipur, for the approval of this dissertation in its present form. I am highly indebted to my respected teacher Ghanshyam Bhandari for his valuable ideas and suggestions. My special thanks go to my teacher Mr. Bal Bahadur Thapa for providing me constructive guidelines and valuable suggestions in the beginning of the thesis without his suggestions and instructions, the work wouldn't have been completed.

With due respect, I would like to express my gratitude to my family members for the continuous supports and encouragements they provided me to materialize this research work. My special thanks to my friends Indra, Kamal, Namrata and Prakash. Whenever I needed, I found them by my side. I acknowledge them here with humble gratitude.

At last, lots of love to my family for their smile which strengthened my inspirations.

Rehana Khatun

Date: March 7, 2009

Abstract

Fury deals with the problems of alienation in postcolonial context imposed by the hegemonic colonial discourse. A person from Eastern Hindu society, Malik Solanka, goes to the West where he gains material access but suffers from alienation because of the cultural displacement. As he moves from one place and culture to another place and culture, the problem of alienation gets intensified in his life and family. After the ruin of his family, he realizes the importance of family and he is apologetic towards his mistake.

Contents

| | Page No. |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Acknowledgements | iii |
| Abstract | iv |
| I. Salman Rushdie's Postcolonial Perspectives in <i>Fury</i> | 1 |
| II. Postcolonialism Alienation and Feeling of Apology | 19 |
| III. <i>Fury</i> as a Discourse on Alienation and Apology of Postcolonial Context | 26 |
| IV. Conclusion | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Works Cited | 45 |

I. Salman Rushdie's Postcolonial Perspectives in *Fury*

This thesis has explored Salman Rushdie's *Fury* from postcolonial perspective to show how Rushdie has dealt with the problem of postcolonial alienation in the non-western context. The main character in the novel, Malik Solanka, 55 years old ex-academician of Indian descent, has a serious drinking problem. Solanka, who lives in Britain with his English wife and four-year-old son, is a creator of Little Brain, a highly popular mechanical doll that tells philosophy. It indicates the materialistic American world in which Solanka could not easily adopt himself because his root is from the east. One night, after a particular heavy bout of drinking, Solanka suddenly finds himself standing over the sleeping bodies of his wife and son with a carving knife in his hand. His drinking problem signifies his loneliness. He had grown up in Indian Hindu culture in the east. Later on he is married to an English lady and settled in London. Due to disbalance of the two cultures (east ,west) in his life he feels lonely and he is alienated even in between the great mass of people. Confused and alarmed, he decides to leave his family and head to New York where he hopes to escape the inner demons that he believes drove him to almost murder his family. After moving to New York, the process of alienation begins in his life.

He depicts the presence of matter over spirituality in America. By seeing the domination of matter in America, he thinks that in our life matter has overlapping effect on spirituality and harmony. In the novel, he has been uttering the words, "Eat me America and give me peace" which shows that peace in the world of matter is hardly possible to get (44). He was a successful businessman in America but couldn't find peace over there because it's materialistic world. Later on he thinks that he may get peace in London with his family than in New York. It shows that the eastern culture is still alive inside him so that at last, he has to remember his family. He needs

their love, aid. He wants to rejoin their emotional bond. He is away from his family and homeland in a materialistic world so he finds that in that new world he is isolated. So, inside him there is a feeling of apology as he is alienated in New York despite his attempt to find peace and order in his life. Similarly, Solanka lying on his bed with his hands around his ears, trying to banish the noise of Manhattan, “a city of half truths and echoes that somehow dominates the earth” (44). It’s hard not to catch the tone of confession once again, the sound of a request for absolution: if a general fury is less culpable, because he has merely been dipped, like the novel, is the madness of the times.

The main character, Malik Solanka has been arrived from India to London and after sometimes he goes to New York in search of peace and order in his life. He has been thrice displaced. He has abandoned his homeland so he has to face a lot of difficulties as a diasporic character. There is the language in which Solanka makes his observations. For an Anglicized Indian profession, a former fellow of King’s college, Cambridge who has never before lived in America, Solanka’s diction has gone peculiarly native. Solanka uses “gotten” and not “got”, and thinks of one man as “his pal, his best buddy,” and recalls getting “jiggy beside a big-assed Puerto Rican girl,” and talks of “Shrinks” and “head-doctors,” of “industry mavens”, of “goddamn” noise and “the cheesiest daytime soap” (7-8). When he complains to Neela about American power, he jitters explosively like someone trapped in a Philip Roth novel:” But, Solanka wanted to say, rising to the bait, what’s wrong is wrong, and because of immense goddamn power of America, the immense fucking seduction of America.” (68). One way of manufacturing a proper American ‘Fury,’ clearly is with the frequent oiling of the word ‘goddamn’.

In this way, as a diasporic character, he has to face linguistically problems over there in America. He can't totally escape his root language. The words like, "Eat me America give me peace" "a city of half truths and echoes that somehow dominates the earth" etc. shows clearly the problem of dislocation Solanka has to live with (44).

There is another interesting character in the novel, Majnu Ali, who is called as Beloved Ali by Solanka. He is a taxi driver. He is a non-western character and he hates the westerns a lot. While going to Columbus Solanka met him as a taxi driver and made him aware too. He is from east so he isn't totally ready to accept the western culture. He is speaking Urdu language "meri madri jaban hai" which means, it's my mother tongue (66).

In Columbus Solanka was haunted by his past. There is a sentence: "Even the stores here abouts had Indian names: Bombay, Pondicherry, Everything conspired to remind him of what he was trying to forget- of, that is, home, the idea of home in general and his own life in particular. In not Pondicherry but, yes, it can't be denied, Bombay" (70). The stores here remind him of his homeland as it has Indian names. He always wanted to forget it but he couldn't because his root, his originality always follows him although he wanted to go away from it. It's impossible to erase our originality. To get away from the memories of his hometown he went into a Mexican-themed bar with a high Zagat's rating and ordered a shot of tequila.

Another major character Neela and Solanka were walking in the Bedford street apartment. There they found "India was insisted upon everywhere in that street in the overemphasized manner of the diaspora: the filmi music, the candles and incense, the Krishna and milkmaids calendar, the dhurries on the floor, the Company school painting, the hookah coiled a top a bookcase like a stuffed green snake. Neela's Bombay alter ego, Solanka mused, pulling on his clothes, would probably

have gone for a heavily Westernized, Californian-minimalist simplicity but never mind about Bombay” (208). There they heard the Indian filmy music, puja was done there, everywhere there they saw Indian look, Indian culture and tradition. India was alive over there. It’s a type of cultural resistance. The Indians in Bedford street apartment oppose strongly and they refrain from accepting the culture, tradition of the West, America. In America, India was alive because the Indians over there couldn’t forget their motherland, culture, tradition, language. Though they were neither active agent of colonization nor passive victims of persecution they were living abroad in diasporic situation.

In this connection by talking about *Fury* Homi K Bhabha argues, “The ambivalence of mimicry and colonized identity can purpose a means for national resistance acting as a living reminder of the paradox between enlightenment, philosophy and colonizing practice” (2-9). Talking about the overwhelming power of capitalism Arif Dirlik argues, “Many postcolonial theorists’ disregard for ‘colonial’ Meta narratives of capitalism or nation disables any serious engagement with current economic oppression that operates under capitalistic imperatives” (1-9). Another Critic Anne McClintock argues, about capitalism, “the contemporary economic hegemony of U.S. based multinational corporations’ can exert a coercive power as great as any colonial gunboat” (1-9). Timothy Brennan says, “the reassertion of U.S. national identity at precisely the moment that the break down of national borders is vigorously and messianically announced” (1-9). Another critic Anne McClintock, focusing on gender problem, suggests, “ignoring gender difference ultimately elevates, masculinity [. . .] as the invisible norm of postcolonial discourse” (7-9).

Yes, there is overwhelming power of capitalism in *Fury* as depicted by Arif Dirlik, Anne McClintock because Solanka, a successful businessman, is searching for

spirituality in the materialistic world of New York but he couldn't get it. Solanka is trying to accept it completely. He "lay wide-eyed and rigid in his comfortable bed, listening to the noises of distant fury" (258).

But, as a researcher I have tried to do extensive study of *Fury* by applying the post-colonialism as theoretical tool. As I have described above, I have tried to show the feeling of apology inside Malik Solanka as he is alienated socially and culturally in New York despite his attempt to find peace and order in his life.

While Rushdie is attempting to satirise the greed, insensitivity and depravity of various celebrities and individuals in New York City, his observations are glib and not designed to encourage readers to investigate the underlying causes of the dysfunctional behavior the novel describes. There are numerous references to *Fury* but the phenomenon is never actually defined or made cogent.

The semimystical description appears with regular monotony throughout and together with manufactured horrors, unconvincing plot and grotesque characters makes the book tedious and pretentious. Early in the novel Rushdie writes: "Life is fury, he'd thought. Fury—sexual, Oedipal, political, magical, brutal—drives us to our finest heights and coarsest depths. Out of furia comes creation, inspiration, originality, passion, but also violence, pain, pure unafraid destruction, the giving and receiving of blows from which we never recover. The Furies pursue us; Shiva dances his furious dance to create and also destroy" (30-31).

Of course, all this weightless volume of reference is supposed to be part of 'the fury' the white noise to Solanka's black noise. We are often asked to picture Solanka lying on his bed with his hands around his ears, trying to banish the noise of Manhattan, "a city of half-truth and echoes that somehow dominates the earth." It is hard not to catch the tone of confession once again, the sound of a request for

absolution: if a general fury surrounds Solanka, then perhaps his own sharp fury is less culpable, because he has merely been dipped, like the novel, in the madness of the times. And why should we blame Solanka for leaving his wife if he is inflamed, poor fellow, by nothing less than the instability of the fin-de-siecle? Perhaps the problem with the abandoned Mrs. Solanka who, we are told, wanted more children, unlike her “furiods” husband was that she was just not furious enough? Too “English”, and not sufficiently “American”?(44-45)

In general, Rushdie’s observations pound a wilderness between incredibility and banality. Certainly the form of the novel is not suited to his screaming color-range. Like a good number of contemporary novels, *Fury* makes use of the idea of an overloaded flur a man goes out to record, with all the writer’s fineness of observation on his side, what the writer would have seen were the writer able to speak autobiographically, like the “I” of a Romantic poem.

The flur, of course, was born in Romantic poetry the Wordsworth of *The Prelude* quite as much as Baudelaire before being born again in modern prose in Benjamin, and in *The Notebooks of Malte Laurids Brigges*, and even in *Nausea* and *Mrs Dalloway*. To this tradition, the contemporary novel adds the plausible idea that such a flur is not merely the writer’s agent, but is in some ways a too-porous scout who has lost his way. The old maps have gone, and the new signs are unreadable; and so the modern flur is driven mad by the indecipherable abundance of contemporary signification. Bellow’s Herzog stands on a sidewalk grate in Manhattan, and feels the roughened surface “like Braille under his feet.” The world purs in illegibly: it is Braille for those who cannot read it, the wrong answers to the wrong questions. Rushdie would like to add Professor Solanka, furiously reeling from fury, from “the everywhere-ness of life,” to this literary inheritance (48).

Yet this is a difficult form to sustain, because it is managed and propelled largely by writerly tact and brilliance. In ordinary hands, where such brilliance is missing, the flur novel becomes merely a chance for the writer to have his say about some matters that occupy him; the novel becomes a series of ambulatory essays of variable interest and quality. *Fury* is a failure of this kind, because Rushdie lacks the literary fineness that is needed to keep descriptive analysis interesting. The prose is, without exception, flat and unoriginal, so that the details that Solanka observes lack any flame. And the analysis is itself often startlingly banal. Here is Solanka-Rushdie on TV ads:

The commercials soothed america's pain, its head pain, its gas pain, its heartache, its loneliness, the pain of babyhood and old age, of being a parent and of being a child, the pain of manhood an women's pain, the pain of success and that of failure, the good pain of the athlete and the bat pain of the guilty, the anguish of loneliness and of ignorance, the needle-sharp torment of the cities and the dull, mad ache of the empty plains, the pain of wanting without knowing what was wanted, the agony of the howling void within each watching semiconscious self, No wonder advertising was popular. It made things better. It showed you the road. It wasn't part of the problem. It solved things. (34)

Apart from suffering the inconvenient disadvantage of being completely untrue, this passage is just a piece of 'writing'.

Worse, the flour novel, if weakened to pointlessness by limited literary talents, is entirely nullified by the magical realist or cartoonish impulse. If the flour is not an empiricist or an idealist, but only a candy-colored animator, he might as well not go

out onto the streets at all. Rushdie might reply that, far from failing at realism, he does not even attempt it, because he does not believe in it hence the ‘magic’ of his rollicking, unrealistic exuberance. To which the proper retort is that representation is both a realism and a magic. Fiction is itself chimerical, the manufacturing of inventions; and the effect of adding magic to chimera is not a kind of doubling of the chimerical, not a mere raising of the fictional temperature, but merely a mirage-like false heat, resulting in total disappearance. For this reason, Schlink the plumber, the octogenarian European Jew, literally disappears into his vividness before our eyes. His complexity, his social history, his secret wants and sadnesses, his actual comedy; all this is abolished by excess as great noise becomes finally inaudible.

The irresponsibility of this kind of ‘lively’ writing becomes more apparent the nearer it aspires to conventional realism. For the nearer it reaches the real, the greater the surface of the real that it desecrates. Solanka sees a “middle-aged-African-American woman sitting on the next bench,” eating her way through “ a long egg salad hero, advertising her enjoyment of every mouthful with loud mms and uh-huhs,” the unwitting condescension of this vignette, the garishness of its minstrelsy these blacks, the passage seems to scream, for them even a sandwich merits a gospel chorus! Is optimistically balanced by the wised-up correctness of the terminology: the lady may carry on like a crazy mama, but she is still an “African-American woman” of course (54).

Perhaps Rushdie, in comparing his characters to film actors and the like, is making a point about the society of spectacle, about the ineradicably mediated nature of the contemporary American world? Look, even Professor Solanka cannot escape this corruption: he sees Jennifer Lopez and immediately thinks of Madonna! But to poison a whole book is a very lengthy way of making a point about a single modern

germ. Besides Solanka supposedly dislikes all this “fury”; it is he who condemns this “retro age,” “this age of simulacra and counterfeits” (142).

Alas, the contradictions of Rushdie’s book (we are told also that the terrifically knowing Solanka apparently felt “alienated” by “the anonymous faces in magazines, faces that all Americans somehow recognized at once”), the unlikely vulgarities of Professor Solanka, taken alongside his equally incredible American argot, are so distorting that they abolish him as a character, and leave him only as a figment of Rushdie’s painful confessional urge. Alas, *Fury* does not seem to present Mr. Solanka’s Planet so much a Mr. Rushdie’s Planet, which is all secret numbers for Nobu and fancy houses in the Hamptons. One sees now why Solanka-Rushdie reverently calls New York “a city of half-truths and echoes that somehow dominates the earth”(44). It is because Solanka’s idea of Manhattan is no deeper than the idea of the man who is “a Raul Julia lookalike”(119). Indeed, the Manhattan of *Fury* is a city of half-truths precisely because Solanka-Rushdie peoples it with cartoons: Schlink is one of those walking half-truths.

And not just Manhattan. America, too, is seen as a totally materialistic world in this book. Solanka, you recall, has come to America to be devoured... He has come to America as so many before him, to receive the benison of being Ellis Islanded, of starting over and later Solanka returns to this theme:

He had flown to the land of self-creation. The country whose paradigmatic modern fiction was the story of a man who remade himself, his past, his present, his shirts, even his name for love... his old self must somehow be canceled, put away for good. And if he failed, then he failed, but one did not contemplate what lay beyond failure while one was still trying to succeed. After all, *Jay Gatsby*, the

highest bouncer of them all, failed too in the end, but lived out, before he crashed, that brilliant, brittle, gold-hatted, exemplary life.(82)

There is luxurious condescension in the trite prayerfulness. Perhaps Rushdie is unaware of the disdain that menaces his apparently laudatory words. The idea of America as a place of amnesia and unknowing represents a perfect coincidence of old-fashioned European dismissal and new-fashioned postmodern naivete in the older vision, America is disapprovingly seen as the country with no real history; in the postmodern vision, America is approvingly seen as the country with no real history, as one enormous inauthentic Disneyland, handing out Mickey mouse ears to its grinning immigrants.

Rushdie seems not to realize that this might be a land of real names rather than a playground of floating signifiers, that some actual Chips and spikes live in America, that amazingly enough they have histories, even American histories, and do not stride forgetfully through clouds of unknowing why, they might even know enough to not know what Nobu is! And Rushdie, solemnly deciding that America's founding modern myth is Gatsby's self-creation, seems unaware that there was the slightest tincture of irony or moral censure in Fitzgerald's novel. It is as if Solanka were saying to himself: Gatsby did it, so I do it, too. But the force of Fitzgerald's story was that Gatsby's life, however 'brilliant,' was failure not because it crashed (Rushdie's apparently consequentialist standpoint), but because Gatsby's ambition itself was corrupt.

Given these moral tremors, which speak brokenly throughout the novel, it seems preposterous and surprising when Solanka-Rushdie begins to plume himself up as a moralist towards the end of the book, excoriating America's corruption by materialism. Suddenly Solanka has forsaken fascination with fashion, and is deciding

the world, and ringing the metaphysical emergency-bell: “ All around him, the American self was reconceiving itself in mechanical terms, but was everywhere running out of control [. . .] for the real problem was damage not to the machine but to the desirous heart, and the language of the heart was being lost.”(183) (The upholstered syntax, the placement of the word “everywhere” “everywhere running out” denotes an antique moral seriousness and hauteur.)

Dazzled by the lovely and ardent Neela, Solanka appears to discover a conscience. He reflect that “behind the facade of this age of gold, this time plenty, the contradiction and impoverishment of the Western human individual, or let’s say the human self in America, were deepening and widening.”(86) All of a sudden Manhattan becomes the Metropolis....wealth which was mistaken for riches and the joy of possession for happiness, where people lived such polished lives that the great rough truths of raw existence had been rubbed and buffed away:

O Dream-America, was civilization’s quest to end in obesity and trivia, at Roy Rogers and planet Hollywood, in USA Today and on E!... or even at the unattainable table of Jeans-Georges Vongerichten and Alain Ducasse ? Yes, it had seduced him, America; yes, its brilliance aroused him, and its vast potency too, and he was compromised by this seduction. What he opposed in it he must also attack in himself. It made him want what it promised and eternally withheld. (87)

But it is too late to be coming on like Dreiser in sister Carrie, flaying the corruption of ‘The Walled City.’ This is supposedly a moral castigation, and perhaps a form of confession, but is it not really cousin to the earlier condescension? For Rushdie’s view of corrupted America is as vulgar as his vision of uncorrupted America. The uncorrupted “devourer” the savior and erase of the self, was Mickey Mouse; the

corrupted civilization, against which he supposedly pits himself, is Roy Rogers, and possibly Alain Ducasse. Take your pick. But Fury speaks the language of corruption anyway, and so it has no rock, no Dreiserian sidewalk or Bellovian altitude, from which to lurch this ethical armada. It has apparently been corrupted by the very corruption that it decries. It is Rushdie-Solanka, after all, who seems to have his head filled with Tony Soprano and J-LO and Alain Ducasse. Perhaps the corruption here lies in knowing enough about such tiny figures to accuse them of being corrupted in the first place? Who will corrupt the corrupters? And so Rushdie manages the remarkable feat of being simultaneously Euro-condescending and American-debased.

It mainly deals with the problem of alienation one has to face in a post-colonial context. It has been divided into four chapters: Introduction, Discussion of tools, Analysis of text and conclusion. To conclude, we can say that division of culture leads one to alienation. Because of the cultural displacement and hybridization or diasporic situation brought by the colonial context either in their own land or in the foreign land alienation emerges in one's life. Slowly and steadily if one is adapted in 'others' culture the sense of alienation could be erased.

II. Postcolonialism Alienation and Feeling of Apology

Postcolonialism, as discourse of resistance, critiques the Eurocentric colonial scholarship or ideology and explores the orientalist representation and its historical, political and social biases and politics of hegemonization. It is an umbrella term that covers all Latin American, Caribbean, African and Third World studies. It deconstructs the binarism of colonialist practice of 'we' and 'other' and tries to establish critical approach in understanding the problems inherent in orientalist discourse.

Postcolonialism as a concept enters into critical discourse in its current meanings in the late 1970's and early 1980s. But both the practice and the theory of postcolonial resistance go back much back, indeed to the origins of colonialism itself. Many genealogists of postcolonial thought, including Bhabha himself, credits Said's *Orientalism* as the founding work in this field. Postcolonial studies, thus, directs its critique against the cultural hegemony of European knowledge in an attempt to reassert the epistemological value and agency of non-European world.

After the publication of Edward Said's *Orientalism* in 1978, Postcolonialism formally has occupied its place among other theories such as feminism, psychoanalysis, post-Structuralism etc. This school of thought critically analyses the history, culture, literature and other such discourses that are specific to the former colonies of England, France and other European imperial powers. As it is indicated in Said's *Culture and Imperialism*, postcolonialism tries, on the one hand, to reveal European colonial dominance upon the colonized people that has not been seemingly underwritten in the major canon of the western intellectual disciplines and on the other hand, it resists upon that dominance. This kind of reading of the European texts, in Edward Said's term, is "contrapuntal reading", that unearths the problematics

inherent in the colonial discourse and destabilizes its possibility of universality and hegemony (*Culture*, 66). In order to analyze the colonial exploitation Edward said takes assistance of Foucaultian idea of 'knowledge' and 'power'. As he argues in *Orientalism*, westerners unknowingly impose "authority over the orient" by means of their different discourses (i). At this point, all the major canons of European literature are 'discourses' out of which 'knowledge' is imparted to create 'power'. So as the resistance against monolithic western system, postcolonialism itself can be taken as a "discourse". Thus Postcolonialism is highly practical school and evolved within a distinctly post modernist climate of Derrida and Foucault.

Further it studies the ideological and cultural impact of western colonialism and in particular its aftermaths such as cultural displacement, hybridity, syncretism, diaspora, migracy, blasphemy, translation and globalization ultimately dealing with the problematics of such postcolonial alienation by, as Leela Gandhi says, revisiting and interrogating the colonial past:

Postcolonialism can be seen as a theoretical resistance to the mystifying amnesia of the colonial aftermath. It is a disciplinary project devoted to the academic task of revisiting, remembering and, crucially interrogating the colonial past. The process of returning to the colonial scene discloses a relationship of reciprocal antagonism and desire between colonizers and colonized. (4)

The political experiences and practices of the colonial past are theorized from the enlightened perspective of the present. It helps to know "cultural and political identities of colonized subjects" (5). It "diagnoses the material effect and implication of colonialism over the native land, culture and people" (26). So, postcolonialism can be defined as a discourse of resistance that tries to "write back" and work against

colonial assumptions and ideologies.

While writing back to colonial assumptions and ideologies, it also critically analyses the cultural displacement that has been resulted by the encroachment of the colonial culture. The voluntary or forcible movement of people from their homelands into new regions, is a central historical fact of colonization. Colonialism itself was radically diasporic movement, involving the temporary or permanent dispersion and settlement of millions of Europeans over the entire world. The widespread effects of these migrations continue on a global scale. One of the effects is hybridization.

Tackling the history of nations and colonies from the perspective of the 'liminal spaces' between dominators and dominated, in *Nation and Narration*, Homi K Bhabha insists, "all cultural identity is essentially and originally hybrid" (19).

'Liminal space' means the site of conflict, interaction, and mutual assimilation that every encounter between cultures involves. Cultures and nations, do not construct themselves out of their own essence; they do so through interactions with other cultures. Bhabha argues, "We all come to the colonial encounter or the global encounter with something that you might call your culture"(43). More than simply a fancy name for multiculturalism, hybridization describes the emergence of entirely new cultural forms. The oppressed culture is not simply rendered mute, but rather participates in the formation of an identity that is neither purely that of the colonialists nor that of the colonized; it is a 'third space' that is mutually forged. This is not to say that the powers in play are equal; it is simply to say that colonial relations never involve the simple imposition of one culture on another. They involve rather a struggle in a constantly shifting space that results in all kinds of dominations, but at the same time creates the possibility of displacements and subversions that simply creates the feeling of alienation because one cannot totally escape from his/her root culture. One cannot

completely adopt the 'others' culture. To escape from root culture is impossible.

Alienation is a feeling of separation or isolation. In Social science alienation is associated with the problems caused by rapid social change, such as industrialization and urbanization, which has broke down traditional relationships among individuals and groups and the goods and services they produce. Alienation is most often associated with minorities, the poor, the unemployed, and other groups who have limited power to bring about changes in society. There are different types of alienation such as social alienation, political alienation, Marx's theory of alienation brought by capitalism.

Social alienation is the individual subject's estrangement from its community, society, or world. In sociology and critical social theory, alienation refers to an individual's estrangement from traditional community and others in general. It leads to the difficulties in understanding and adapting to each other uniqueness.

Despite there are different types of alienations, post colonial alienation refers to the psychological, cultural and physical sense of no where of the native people because of the cultural displacement and hybridization or diasporic situations brought by the colonial context either in their own land or in the foreign land. Colonialism leads to the alienation of the native people in their own land too because in colonialism their own country is captured and ruled by the colonizers. Wherein they are treated as outsiders. There is domination of the colonizer's culture, language, fashion, style, education etc making the native people wonder whether their own culture, customs and traditions, religions and race are inferior to the colonizers that ultimately leads to mimicry, hybridity to the diasporic situation and alienation with the feeling of apology of being nowhere. Postcolonial alienation is the process of devaluing or abandoning one's own culture or cultural background due to the colonial

encroachment.

When the colonizers leave the colonized lands, the former colonized people suffer from such problems of alienation in post colonial situation. They suffer from dislocation, placeless ness, fragmentation and loss of identity. It is here that the post-colonial crisis of identity comes due to the psychological gap imposed by the colonialism that brings crisis to identify the active sense of self has been eroded by dislocation resulted by the epistemic violence, migration, the experience of enslavement and transportation in which they have been forced to be translated in between the native culture and foreign culture as what we call hybrid culture wherein they become mimic man imitating and reflecting the colonizers lifestyle, values and views but at same time not being satisfied they fall into sense of alienation and feeling of apology. In *Of Mimicry and Man* Homi K. Bhabha argues:

Mimicry is, then, the sign of a double articulation: a complex strategy of reform, regulation and discipline, which ‘appropriates’ the other as it visualizes power. Mimicry is also the sign of the inappropriate, however, a difference or recalcitrance which coheres the dominant strategic function of colonial power, intensifies surveillance, and poses an immanent threat to both ‘normalized’ knowledge and disciplinary powers. (86)

Here, Bhabha is defending ‘Mimicry’ in Postcolonial context. He is saying that ‘Mimicry’ doesn’t have only negative impacts but it is also a way of reformation, regulation and discipline. In the same way in *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory*, Padmini Mongia says:

This cultural escape is an original form of rebellion which manifested itself in religion, in folklore, in art and singularly in Caribbean

literatures', the people in search of their identity becoming aware ' of the validity of their African heritage latent in our society.' (92)

Here, we find that the Caribbeans are in search of their own religions, artistic, literary identity after the independence because in the colonizer's culture , educational, religious domination, the Caribbean find themselves alienated. Their culture, tradition has been overlapped by the colonizers culture and tradition and recently after independence it cannot be changed or erased. Alike Bhabha, Mongia is also somehow supporting 'others' culture. For Mongia cultural escape is a form of rebellion. For both of them it is a way to construct a new culture, its not the way to complete destruction. The process of adoption always takes place in hybrid culture. Slowly and steadily one can adopt it as it is a way of reformation. Later on they start to enjoy it and the sense of alienation is 'erased' under such circumstances in Postcolonial context too. In this way, there comes the feeling of resistance. Resistance in such a postcolonial context, is grounded in the multiple and contradictory structures of ideological interpellation or subject-formation which would call down the notion that resistance can ever be 'purely' intended or 'purely' expressed in representational or communicative models. For Cudjoe and Harlow: "resistance is an act, or a set of acts, that is designed to rid a people of It is oppressors, and it so thoroughly infuses the experience of living under oppression that it becomes an almost autonomous aesthetic principle"(78).

So, resistance exists in different forms which can be categorized as political resistance, cultural resistance, literary resistance which can exists in the form of mimicry and escape. In this connection, Ranajit Guha argues that " the modes of subaltern colonial resistance far from being determined by forms and vocabularies borrowed from the dominant culture were rearticulations of pre-colonial traditions of

protest” (267).

Here, the terms-‘post-colonial’ and ‘resistance’ are positively shimmering as objects of desire and self-privilege, and so easily appropriated to competing, and in fact hostile, modes of critical and literary practice. Both terms thus find themselves at the centre of a quarrel over the kinds of critical taxonomies that will be seen to perform legitimate work in articulating the relation between literary texts and the political world; and to say this is to recognize that critical taxonomies, from cultural institutions which continue to police what voices will be heard, which kinds of (textual) intervention will be made recognizable and/or classifiable, and what authentic forms of post-colonial textual resistance are going to look like. Arun Mukherjee advances in exemplary form the argument that “post-colonial studies in literary resistance inherently totalizes dissimilar cultures when they consider the need of resistance to colonialism”. Mukherjee argues that “such a critical practice dangerously overlooks ‘realist’ writing of the colonial discourse and ends up privileging the kind of post-colonial writing which takes resistance to colonialism as its primary objective” (1-9).

Thus, the postcolonial thinkers view that there is possibility of resistance even within the sense alienation and apology in the postcolonial context wherein the resistance necessarily becomes complicit in the apparatus it seeks to transgress.

III. *Fury* as a Discourse on Alienation and Apology of Postcolonial Context

Fury by Rushdie can be analyzed as a novel dealing with the problematic of alienation in postcolonial context imposed by the hegemonic colonial discourse. The major postcolonial character Malik Solanka has been thrice displaced. He has moved from Mumbai to London and from London to New York. As he moves from one place and culture to another place and culture, the problem of alienation gets intensified in his life and family.

Malik Solanka is one of the Postcolonial characters depicted in the novel who is struggling in his alienated Postcolonial situation. He is the character who was born and brought up in Indian society of Hindu culture. This Hindu root of the character has impact over his spiritual sense of life and the world which comes in problem when he shifted to London and then America, the Western world dominated by materialism, brings the sense of alienation as because the western materialist culture has spoiled his spiritual based Hindu beliefs. This alienation puts him in ambivalence. When he is confused by the cultural differences he has to face and utters: "Eat me America and give me peace" (44). It highlights that peace in the world of matter is hardly possible to get.

Solanka is rather apologetic in the novel as he is alienated in New York despite his attempt to find peace and order in life. He is a failure. So the novel exhausts negative superlatives of Solanka, that's likely to make even its most charitable readers furious, is a failing apologia. Solanka is an Indian professor of history. He has married an English lady. They had a son of three-year-old. But later on they are separated. Their cultural root was different. One was from Eastern culture that focuses on spirituality and the other from western culture that gives importance to the materialistic world. The Eastern culture stands on the side of love, emotions,

feelings but the western culture is forced to stand on its opposite side. The westerner think that love, emotions, feelings are the unwanted elements of life that stops development in several fields so it mainly focuses on matter. In New York, he has been a successful business entrepreneur but the absence of his family always sticks in his mind and he has been very much disturbed by it. He is a man from east who has grown up in Hindu culture. Hindu culture gives a lot of importance to family, especially joint family, rather than money or anything else. But after moving to west, he got some western impact in his mind. So he started to focus on matter rather than his family. But after all he is from Eastern Hindu society, he could not accept the western life style completely so although he lives in New York his past family life in London always hunts him, he can't totally separate himself from his family. So at the end of the novel Solanka returns to London taking a suite at Claridge's, where he "lay wide-eyed and rigid in his comfortable bed, listening to the noises of distant fury" (97). The next day he spies pitifully on his estranged wife and son as they walk on Hampstead Heath. Malik Solanka feels bad when he sees Morgan, his friend, at his place.

We are often asked to picture Solanka lying on his bed with his hands around his ears, trying to banish the noise of Manhattan, "a city of half-truths and echoes that somehow dominates the earth"(44). It's hard not to catch the tone of confession once again, the sound of a request for absolution: if a general fury surrounds Solanka, then perhaps his own sharp fury is less culpable, because he has merely been dipped, like the novel, in the madness of the times. The novel ends with Solanka returning to London. The next day he spies pitifully on his estranged wife and son as they walk on Hampstead Heath. Malik Solanka feels bad when he sees Morgan, his friend, at his place.

The novel appears to be an apologia in part because it is nimbuses by a dirty cloud of reality. Many readers will know actual separation from an English wife and child, and has embarked on a new life in America, and has a beautiful Indian girlfriend whom he met at the lunch party of “Talk” magazine. Ranjit Guha, in his book *Dominance Without Hegemony*, says, “The modes of subaltern colonial resistance far from being determined by the forms and vocabularies borrowed from the dominant culture are rearticulations of pre-colonial traditions of protest” (267). The main character, Malik Solanka has been arrived from India to London and after sometimes he goes to New York in search of peace and order in his life. He has been thrice displaced. He has abandoned his homeland so he has to face a lot of difficulties as a diasporic character. There is the language in which Solanka makes his observations. For an Anglicized Indian profession, a former fellow of King’s college, Cambridge who has never before lived in America, Solanka’s diction has gone peculiarly native which indicates that he has not totally forgot his past, his reality. In America, he is just like a people from Subaltern group whose everything, culture, language and so on has been marginalized. Like a mimic man, he has to mimicry the American lifestyle, tradition and language but even after a hard attempt he could not totally forget his own tradition, language which is floating in his blood. He feels alienated from ‘theirs’ culture in his diasporic condition. Solanka uses “gotten” and not “got”, and thinks of one man as “his pal, his best buddy,” and recalls getting “jiggy beside a big-assed Puerto Rican girl,” and talks of “Shrinks” and “head-doctors,” of “industry mavens”, of “goddamn”(7). Noise and “the cheesiest daytime soap” (8). When he complains to Neela about American power, he jitters explosively like someone trapped in a Philip Roth novel: “But, Solanka wanted to say, rising to the bait, what’s wrong is wrong, and because of immense goddamn power of America,

the immense fucking seduction of America” (68). One way of manufacturing a proper American ‘Fury’, clearly is with the frequent oiling of the word ‘goddamn’. Here, his native dictions are rearticulations of pre-colonial traditions of protest.

Post colonial study focuses on the ideological and cultural impact of western colonialism and in particular its aftermath of accommodates itself to hybridity, syncretism, diaspora, migracy, blasphemy, translation and globalization etc. to bring the minority voice in to the centre, many people claim of the continuation of western colonization in different forms. For example Leela Gandhi claims:

Postcolonialism can be seen as a theoretical resistance to the mystifying amnesia of the colonial aftermath. It’s a disciplinary project devoted to the academic task of revisiting, remembering and, crucially interrogating the colonial past. The process of returning to the colonial scene discloses a relationship of reciprocal antagonism and desire between colonizers and colonized. (4)

Yes, it discloses a relationship of reciprocal antagonism and desire between colonizers and colonized. In *Fury*, we can’t find sweet relation between the diasporic character, Malik Solanka, and the materialistic world of America which is called by him as “a city of half truths and echoes that somehow dominates the earth” (44).

Neela Mahendra, another leading character of *Fury*, disguised herself as a revolutionary and joined to the gang of Babur, is the leader of revolutionaries in Blefuscu. They call it as “Free Indian Lilliput-Blefuscus: Filbistan” (192). Actually she is a journalist. She is doing all this only to be clear towards her root. In a foreign land she is searching her original identity. She is also close to Indian culture and she is trying to save her base culture in America too. To save the culture, tradition, language of her community she is fighting with the American government. Her community

can't easily adopt it with the colonizers culture. Her ancestors were from the little Indian village Titlipur but later on her great-grandfather had traveled with his brothers all the way to double speck in the remote South Pacific. The Mahendras had gone to work in Blefuscu, the more fertile of the two islands, and the centre of the sugar industry. Solanka loves her eagerly so he doesn't will to loose her. When Neela went back to Blefuscu from Manhattan, Solanka followed her.

Three weeks later he stepped out of a long-haul Airbus at Blefuscu International Aerodrome, into a hot but balmily breezy Southern hemisphere spring day. There he was treated strictly by an Indo-Lilly customs officer. The customs officer gazed vengefully upon their content of his cases. After that with a great flourish, the customs officer made a large chalk 'X' on Solanka's bags and he said to Solanka;

Indian people of Lilliput – Blefuscu have finally standed up for our right. Our culture is ancient and superior and will hence forth prevail. Let the fittest survive, isn't it. For one hundred years good –for- nothing Elbe cannibals drank grog- Kava, glimigrim, flunec, Jack Daniel's and coke, every kind of godless booze- and made us eat their shit. Now they can eat our instead. Please: enjoy your stay. (238)

Here, the custom officer says that the Indian people of Lilliput- Blefuscu are the fittest. 'their', in the paragraph indicates the American government. The Indian people of Lilliput – Blefuscu take them as the colonized and American government as the colonizer. They hate the American government. Earlier they had to depend on America for different things to survive but now they are independent, they feel proud for it. In the above given quotation, the custom officers is talking about the Indian people of Lilliput-Blefuscu and their right. He is saying that there own culture is

superior and they don't need others help to survive as they are the fittest. Now, they don't import but export. They are independent from every angle. It's a type of resistance in colonial context. The ex- colonized country loses its original culture, style, tradition and everything else . Their culture, language, fashion, style, education is dominated by the colonizer's culture language, fashion, style and education. In this context, there comes resistance. The native people show resistance over the colonizer's culture, language, fashion style and education.

Many genealogist of post colonial thought, including Homi K Bhabha, credit Said's orientalism as the base of this postcolonial studies.

We all know that Orientalism is a discourse created by the westerners about the non-westerns. It's all about superiority/inferiority, White/non-white, educated /uneducated , civilized/barbaric. The Westerners have created binary between the East and West. They call themselves as superior, civilized and the eastern as inferior, barbaric. To make the others (specially the East) civilized they began to rule upon them. They called it the 'civilization mission' in their language. But in fact they were exploiting the eastern culture, tradition and society as a whole. Only after 2nd world war, there came the flood of decolonization. During colonization period people were forced to think about their rights, originality, identity because of exploitative behaviors of the colonizers. The colonized people started to fight for it. But as a result of colonization, the westerners left the effect of hegemony in their ex-colonized countries.

Diaspora is another condition that we find in post colonialism. Diaspora signified a collective trauma, a banishment, where one dreamed of home but lived in exile. Other peoples abroad who have also maintained strong identities have, in recent

years, defined themselves as diasporas, though they were neither active agents of colonization nor passive victims of persecution.

There is another interesting character in the novel, Majnu Ali, who is called as Beloved Ali by Solanka. He is a taxi driver. He is a non-western character and he hates the westerns a lot. While going to Columbus Solanka met him as a taxi driver and made him aware too. He is from east so he isn't totally ready to accept the western culture. He is speaking urdu language "meri madri jaban hai" which shows his hangover to his original culture (66).

Similarly in Columbus Solanka was haunted by his past. There is a sentence:

Even the stores hereabouts had Indian names: Bombay, Pondicherry, Everything conspired to remind him of what he was trying to forget- of, that is, home, the idea of home in general and his own life in particular.

In not Pondicherry but, yes, it can't be denied, Bombay. (70)

The stores here remind him of his homeland as it has Indian names. He always wanted to forget it but he couldn't because his root, his originality always follows him although he wanted to go away from it. It's impossible to erase his originality. To get away from the memories of his hometown he went into a Mexican-themed bar with a high Zagat's rating and ordered a shot of tequila.

The condition of Solanka, here, is totally diasporic. Fifty-five years old Malik Solanka, 'retired historian of ideas, irascible doll maker', takes refuge in New York after leaving his wife and three year-old son in London. America for once, though, is not seen primarily as a place of second chances, of beginning again, even if in the course of the book Solanka is re-energized and reconciled to his past. While in London, he thinks that one day he may stab his wife and son, so he couldn't find solace, peace over there. He moves to New York, Manhattan but there he finds no

spirituality. Although he was a successful businessman in New York he couldn't find solace there because it's materialistic world. He loves his son a lot but couldn't go back to his hometown, London, with his family because of a horrified fury inside him.

Here, the main character, Solanka is somehow similar to the writer of *Fury*, Salman Rushdie himself is living on exile. But Rushdie's notion of self-exile situation has been criticized by Aijaz Ahmad. *In Theory* he says, "Rushdie aims at postmodern transformation of the modernist desolation of the self to the pleasures of the exiles" (238). Ahmed criticizes those intellectuals of the so-called Third World countries who have immigrated to the west for better professional opportunities but stereotype themselves as "exiles" or "diasporas". He is blamed to be enjoying his diasporic situation. Nobody forced him to leave his country, then why is he lamenting? Ahmad has accused him of being a bourgeois not Marxist because according to Ahmad, Rushdie is supporting romance not struggle. Solanka meets Majnu Ali second time, in a top form. At that time, he was screaming to a White Man. Ali says, "Hey! American Man! You are a godless homosexual rapist of your grandmother's pet goat"(175). Ali has left his homeland and came to a foreign country to earn dollars. He was there just to fulfill his dreams He's not happy over there. When a car of White man came unacceptably close to his taxicab he utters above sentence. He feels as if he has been dominated by the Whites in White Men's world so he wants to live in Islamic World.

A way of reading and rereading texts of both metropolitan and colonial cultures to draw deliberate attention to be profound and inescapable effects of colonization on literary production; anthropological accounts; historical records; administrative and scientific writing is known as postcolonial reading. It's a form of deconstructive reading most usually applied to works emanating from the colonizers

which demonstrates the extent to which the text contradicts its underlying assumptions and reveals its colonialist ideologies and process.

In New York, Mark Skywalker wanted to get honest opinion of Malik Solanka about his corporate –image campaign. Solanka gave positive opinion about it without knowing if it was in fact good, average or terrible. “THE SUN NEVER SETS ON AMERICAN EXPRESS INTERNATIONAL BANKING CORPORATION” was the heading of the campaign. Relating to this heading Skywalker probed, “As if the British won’t be insulted because of these lines? And said, “the line doesn’t come across as an insult to your country’s glorious past” to Solanka (35). At thin time Solanka experienced a strong desire to screech at this fellow with the damnfool alias, to call him names and perhaps actually smack him across the face with an open hand. Here, the point is, where was all this anger coming from? Why was he being caught off guard, time and again, by surges of rage that almost overwhelmed his will?

Although he was surviving in America and searching for peace and solace but England was immortally living inside his heart as England is his home town. He loves England. There was emotional bond between England and Solanka. He has left his family there. Solanka has come to America through migration from London.

Neela Mahendra is planning to make a documentary that would take her back to her roots. But things back home in Lilliput-Blefuscu were not good. People in the West thought of it as a South sea paradise, a place for honeymoons and other trysts, but there was trouble brewing. Relation between the Indo-Lilliputians and the indigenous, ethnic “Elbee” community- which still made up a majority of the population, but only just were deteriorating fast.

'Filbistan' was once colonized. As a result, the native consider their own culture, customs and traditions, religion and race to be inferior to those of their master. They suffer from dislocation, placelessness, fragmentation and loss of identity. They became mimic men who imitate and reflect the colonizer's life style, values and views. After decolonization, independence itself becomes a word but not a real experience without the colonizer, the colonized see themselves as lost in their postcolonial society that fails to offer a sense of national unity and identity. That's why, the Indo-Lilliputians and "Elbee" have had problems between them.

Neela Mahendra's ancestors were from the little Indian village of Titlipur but later on her great grandfather had traveled with his brothers all the way to double speck in the remote South Pacific. They were girmityas, descendants of one of the original migrants- her great-grandfather-who had signed an indenture agreement, a girmit, back in 1834, the year after the abolition of slavery. As Neela Mahendra says:"My childhood bogeyman was the Coolumber, who was big and white and spoke not in words but in numbers and wuld eat little girls at night if they didn't do their homework and wsh their private parts"(156). Here, the "Coolumbers' where the sugarcane laborers' overseers. They exploit the migrated people in many ways. The migrated girls were exploited sexually. The particular one in Neela's family was a White man called Mr. Huge- Hughes, really, Neela suppose who was 'a devil from Tasmania, and to whom Neela's great-grandfather and great uncles were no more than numbers on the list he read out every morning. Her ancestors were numbers, the children of numbers. There, only the indigenous 'Elbees' were called by their true last names. It took three generations to retrieve Neela's family names from this numerical tyranny. Names of every individual was lost, they were known by numbers. Even the fundamental rights were grabbed away from them as they were immigrants. If it had

been there own motherland the case could be different. There fundamental rights would have been safe because they could have been the righteous citizens not migrated people. Being away from fundamental rights gives the feeling of alienation.

Once Neela and Solanka were walking in the Bedford street apartment. There they found “India was insisted upon everywhere in that street in the overemphasized manner of the diaspora: the filmi music, the candles and incense, the Krishna and milkmaids calendar, the dhurries on the floor, the Company school painting, the hookah coiled a top a bookcase like a stuffed green snake. Neela’s Bombay alter ego, Solanka mused, pulling on his clothes, would probably have gone for a heavily Westernized, Californian-minimalist simplicity but never mind about Bombay” (208).

There they heard the Indian filmy music, puja was done there, everywhere there they saw Indian look, Indian culture and tradition. India was alive over there. It’s a type of cultural resistance. The Indians in Bedford street apartment oppose strongly and they refrain from accepting the culture, tradition of the West, America. In America , India was alive because the Indians over there couldn’t forget there motherland, culture, tradition, language. Though they were neither active agents of colonization nor passive victims of persecution they were living abroad in diasporic situation.

Alienation also revolves around immigration. When people are shifted from one place to another or from one country to another they reach to the sense of alienation. Human alienation was accomplished through turning everything “into alienable, saleable objects in thrall to egoistic need and huckstering. Because of the various differences in culture, tradition, thinking, life style etc. alienation occurs in this condition.

Malik Solanka is alienated in New York despite his attempt to find peace and order in his life. Professor Solanka was seized by melancholy, his usual secret sadness, which he sublimated into the public sphere. Something was a miss with the world. The optimistic peace and love philosophy of his youth having given him up, he no longer knew how to reconcile himself to an increasingly phoney reality.

America is materialistic world and Solanka searches peace over there. It's nakedly capitalistic world. Everybody, as well as everything, was for sale. There is a sentence that proves it:

Commercials soothed America's pain, it's head pain, it's gas pain, it's heartache, it's loneliness, the pain of babyhood and old age, of being a parent and of being a child, a pain of manhood and women's pain, the pain of success and that of failure the good pain of the athlete and the bad pain of the guilty, the anguish of loneliness and of ignorance, the needle-sharp torment of the cities and the dull, mad ache of the empty plains, the pain of 'wanting without knowing what was wanted, the agony of the howling void within each watching, semi-conscious self.

(34)

In such money minded world how could Solanka get solace? It's impossible. His labour to achieve spirituality in such a materialistic world seems to be ridiculous. He is completely alienated.

Professor Solanka once utters, 'Eat me America and give me Peace' to the devil with this classical mishmash, professor Solanka silently exclaimed (44). For a greater deity was all around him: America, in the highest hour of its hybrid, omnivorous power. America, to which he had come to erase himself. To be free of attachment and so also of anger, fear and pain. But by seeing the domination of matter

in America, he thinks that in our life matter has been overlapped on spirituality and harmony. He was in America only to erase himself and to find spirituality but he unfortunately could not get to the things what he was in search of.

In America, he feels like an ancient sleeper, rising. Outside, in America, everything was too bright, too loud, too strange. The city had come out in a rash of painfully punning cows:

He was alienated, too, by the postage stamps, by the monthly, rather than quarterly, payments of gas, electricity and telephone bills, by the unknown brand of candy in the stores, by the words “candy” and “stores”, by the armed policeman on the streets, by the anonymous faces in magazines, faces that all Americans somehow recognized at once. In the indecipherable words of popular songs which American ears could apparently make out without strain, in the end loaded pronunciation of names like Farrar, Candell, Solanka gets to the feeling of alienation. The broadly speak e’s that turned expression into expression. Because of this, too, Solanka gets alienated as it’s different from the English language (pronunciation) of England. The Americans say, ‘I’ll gat the chack’ for ‘I’ll get the check’. (135-136)

It’s also different from the English language of England. It’s the unique style of capitalistic America. To be adopted in America has been very difficult to him because it’s not his homeland.

Alienation is the feeling of isolation. Sometime people feel the sense of isolation inside family too. When Malik’s father died, his mother Mallika, get married with a consultant at Breach Candy Hospital, Dr. Solanka. Dr. Solanka loves Mallika but he treats Malik as a step-son from the inner core of his heart. “He was locking

thoughts away, confiding only in whispers, only in the hours of darkness, to the dolls who crowded around him in bed, like guardian angels, like blood kin: the only family he could bring himself to trust''(223). The above sentence makes it clear that even inside family he has been alienated. He couldn't get sufficient love inside his family. His step father doesn't love him. Mallika doesn't understand it because in front of her he pretends to be a good father. At that time, Malik was alienated within the family. He was hated by his step-father. It's a kind of social alienation on which the individual subject's estrangement from its community, society or world. It's an individual's estrangement from traditional community, society, family and others in general.

Here, Malik is the individual and he has been estranged firstly by his family, step father and secondly by the capitalistic world, America.

Alas, the contradictions of Rushdie's book, the unlikely vulgarities of Professor Solanka, taken alongside his equally incredible American argot, are so distorting that they abolish him as a character, and leave him only as a figment of Rushdie's painful confessional urge. Alas, *Fury* does not seem to present Mr. Solanka's Planet, which is all secret numbers for Nobu and fancy houses in the Hampton. One sees now why Solanka-Rushdie reverently calls New York "a city of half-truths and echoes that somehow dominates the earth" (44). It is because Solanka's idea of Manhattan is no deeper than the idea of the man who is "a Raul Julia look-alike" (119). Indeed, the Manhattan of *Fury* is a city of half-truths precisely because Solanka-Rushdie people it with cartoons: Schlink is one of those walking half-truths.

Solanka apologizes with his wife, Eleanor, for distracting her, whereupon she wept, a loud honking noise that squeezed at his heart, for he was by no means a heartless man. He had said to Eleanor that “I accept that what I have done must feel inexplicable to you. I am remembering, however, what you yourself taught me about the importance of the inexplicable in, ah, Shakespeare”(9). Previously, when both of them were in beautiful emotional bond, Eleanor had discussed about her doctoral thesis. In her thesis she had been supporting the claim that Othello’s love for Desdemona isn’t true love instead Desdemona is taken as Othello’s trophy wife, his most valuable and status giving passion, the physical proof of his risen standing in a white man’s world.

Eleanor didn’t want divorce from Solanka so divorce must be an inexplicable pain to her as he has turned to be Othello of her life. The only difference between Othello and Solanka is that Othello had killed Desdemona but Solanka had left Eleanor with a small child, Solanka had indirectly killed her. Eleanor is from west. But even after being a western lady, she didn’t want divorce from Solanka as she loves him and their son, Asmaan. But the eastern man, Solanka, wants divorce because he has been fascinated from the western materialistic world but later on he understands, after being too late. Later on they are separated and their family is ruined and Solanka has to live alone. He has been alienated once again from his family.

Money matters in America. Nobody knew how to argue with money and all the money were in the Promised Land. As we very person Solanka has been seduced by America. ‘Yes, it had seduced him’, here America has been personified. “It’s brilliance aroused him, and its vast potency too, and he was compromised this seduction. What he opposed in it he must also attack in himself. It made him want what it promised and eternally withheld. America is the world’s playing field, it’s rule

book , umpire and ball. America is the only game in town and the matter of America the only business at hand” (87). In America, everything is a copy, an echo of the past. It’s a retro world. It’s materialistic world so everything in America is for Sale. There is no value of emotions and feelings in that capitalistic world. Only the fittest can survive there. Everything in America is measured on the basis of money, property.

Fury is a failure, because Rushdie lacks the literary fineness that is needed to keep descriptive analysis interesting. The prose is, without exception, flat and unoriginal, so that the details that Solanka observes lack any flame. And the analysis is itself often startlingly banal. Here is Solanka-Rushdie on TV ads:

The commercials soothed America’s pain, its head pain, its gas pain, its heartache, its loneliness, the pain of babyhood and old age, of being a parent and of being a child, the pain of manhood and women’s pain, the pain of success and hat of failure, the good pain of the athlete, and the bad pain of the guilty, the anguish of the pain of wanting without knowing what was wanted, the agony of the howling void within each watching, semiconscious self. No wonder advertising was popular. It made things better. It showed you the road. It wasn’t part of the problem. It solved things. (34)

Apart from suffering the inconvenient disadvantage of being completely untrue, this passage is just a piece of ‘writing’.

It is one thing to write an allegory or an apologia about how America has compromised one’s soul, but it is quite another to publish a novel that so emphatically re-enacts that compromise.

Solanka came to New York to erase his past and find out peace and order in life. He has been removed thrice: Mumbai, London and finally New York. But he

couldn't find solace in his life. The novel ends with Solanka returning to London. The sentence "he spies pitifully on his estranged wife and son as they walk on Hampstead Heath" makes it clear that he is apologetic as his family has been ruined(257). It seems ridiculous that Solanka has gone to the West from East in search of spirituality.

Cultural displacement, hybridity, migracy, diasporic situation, translation, etc brings postcolonial alienation. Colonial relations never involve the simple imposition of one culture on another. They involve rather a struggle in a constantly shifting space that results in all kinds of dominations but at the same time creates the possibility of displacements and subversions that simply creates the feeling of alienation because one cannot totally escape from their root culture.

IV. Conclusion

After the textual analysis the researcher has come to the point that the voluntary or forcible movement of people from their homelands into new regions, is a central historical fact of colonization. After independence it resulted on postcolonization. Postcolonialism tries, on the one hand, to reveal European colonial dominance upon the colonized people that has not been seemingly underwritten in the major canon of the western intellectual disciplines and on the other hand, it resists upon that dominance. Further it studies the ideological and cultural impact of western colonialism and in particular its aftermaths such as cultural displacement, hybridity, syncretism, diaspora, migracy, blasphemy, translation and globalization. Postcolonialism can be defined as a discourse of resistance that tries to 'write back' and work against colonial assumptions and ideologies. While writing back to colonial assumptions and ideologies, it also critically analyzes the cultural displacement that has been resulted cultural by the encroachment of the colonial culture. Cultural displacement unknowingly leads to postcolonial alienation. Postcolonial alienation refers to the psychological, cultural and physical sense of nowherehood of the native people because of the cultural displacement, hybridity or diasporic situations brought by the colonial context either in their own land or in the foreign land.

Because of various diasporic character, postcolonial alienation could be found in *Fury*. Diaspora signified a collective trauma, a banishment, where one dreamed of home but lived in exile. Other people abroad who have also maintained strong, identities have, in recent years, defined themselves as diasporas, though they were neither active agents of colonization nor passive victims of persecution. In this condition there comes a feeling of alienation simply, mainly because cultural differences, one feels lonely. It is caused by industrialization and urbanization too which has broken down traditional relationships among individuals.

Fury by Rushdie deals with problem of alienation in postcolonial context. In *Fury*, Malik Solanka, the main character, is a professor of history and successful business person. *Fury*, a novel that exhausts negative superlatives, that is likely to make even it's most charitable readers furious, is a failing apologia. It tells the story of an Indian Professor, Malik Solanka, who has recently left his English wife and their three-year-old son, and flown from London to Manhattan. Professor Solanka, who has made a lot of money by inventing and marketing a puppet, comes to America desperate to erase his past, to start over again, and to bury the guilt he feels not only about his separation but about a moment of 'fury' in which he held a knife over his wife's sleeping form and imagined stabbing her.

But in Manhattan? The boiling, zany, money-fattened Manhattan of the end of the millennium? Professor Solanka finds not peace but only universal fury, and he obsessively wanders the streets, a tormented flaneur, angrily observing the madness of contemporary American life, inflamed by "the everywhere-ness of life, by its bloody-minded refusal to back off, by the sheer goddamn unbearable head-bursting volume of the third millennium" (48). The novel appears to be an apologia in part because it is nimbused by a dirty cloud of reality. It ends with Solanka returning to London but he is unable to reunite his family.

To conclude, we can say that it is not easy to forget root culture. It always remains inside us. But in this twenty first century there is a concept of 'global village' and we have to follow it for our development in various sectors. The dominating and dominated cultures, in postcolonial context, involve in struggle in a constantly shifting space that results in all kinds of dominations, but at the same time there is possibility of cultural displacement which gives the feeling of alienation because people cannot totally escape from their root culture.

Works Cited

- Ahmed, Aijaz. *In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures*. London: Verso 1992.
- Bhabha, Homi, ed. *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Bhabha, Homi. "Of mimicry and men." *In The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1994. 85-92.
- Brennan, Timothy. *At Home in the World: Cosmopolitanism Now*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard UP, 1997.
- Cudjoe, Selwyn. *Resistance and Caribbean Literature*. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1980.
- Dirlik, Arif. "The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism." *In Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation and Postcolonial Perspective*. Eds. 1994.
- Gandhi, Leela. *Postcolonial Theory: A critical Introduction*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.
- Guha, Ranjit. *Dominance Without Hegemony: History and Power in Colonial India*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Harlow, Barbara. *Resistance Literature*. New York. Routledge, 1987.
- McClintock, Anne. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Mongia, Padmini. *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory*. London: Hodder Education, 1966.
- Mukharjee, Arun. *Whose Postcolonialism and Whose Postmodernism?* Canada: A York University Press, 1990.

