

Foucault's Concept of Individuality in Hardy's *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*: Tess and Angel as Prototype Failures of Foucauldian Subject

Nasser Maleki

Associate Professor
Razi University
English Department
Kermanshah-Iran

Sayed Mohammad Anoosheh

Associate Professor
English Department
Yazd University Iran

Nahid Jamshidi Rad

MA, Shahid Beheshti University
Tehran-Iran

Abstract

*According to Foucault's dynamic view of power relations, individuals or subjects in every society are free and dynamic. Power produces individuals who act, and are not simply objects upon whom others act. For Foucault individuals and groups are neither preformed before they engage in power relations, nor unchanged by those relations, and this is how our participation in power relations literally makes us who we are. Put differently, an individual is not passive and victim of power relations, but free to succumb to the demands of power relations or use the possibilities before him and practice his own ethics. To Foucault subjects can practice every individual's freedom through applying the strategies of 'care of the self'. Considering such a postmodern hypothesis in mind, this study examines Foucault's stance towards the concept of individuality in *Tess and Angel*, the protagonists of Hardy's *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*. The study is explored through analyses, but the question of manifestation remains in the realm of speculation because cross-pollination of thoughts can never be proven conclusively.*

Key words: Foucault, Individuality, Failure, Tess, Angel.

1. INTRODUCTION

The present article is divided into two parts: a detailed lay out to Foucault's concept of individuality and power relations which is then followed by extrapolating these concepts in Tess and Angle the failed couple protagonists of Hardy's *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* in a Foucauldian bedrock. The unfortunate destinies of these characters failure as advocated in Hardy's *Jude the Obscure*, we believe, is firmly grounded in Foucault's concept of power relations and individuality. Whereas most researchers, in comparative studies, try to show parallels between the underlying usages of a term in two kinds of texts, we explore the influence and manifestation of a postmodern philosophy on Tess and Angel, the two protagonists of Hardy's *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*, written much earlier than the emergence of Foucault's concept of individuality, it also ends by speculating, albeit inconclusively, on facts for the above phenomenon.

1.1. FOUCAULT'S CONCEPT OF POWER RELATIONS AND INDIVIDUALITY

In Foucault's view some of the most important things that power produces are individuals. Foucault used this term in at least three different senses. First, in what one might think of as the grammatical sense, that is, power produces subjects who act, rather than simply objects upon whom others act. The distinction is between an active agent rather than a passive victim. Second, as an echo of the sovereign-subject relationship, power produces subjects who are tied to others by modifiable bonds of obligation (Allan, 1999). And third, power creates subjects as a philosophical term for a self: a person (or group) with an identity and self-understanding –in Foucault' more pejorative formulation, a subject "tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge".

Thus, who we are, how we relate to ourselves, even our very identities and actions are all products of power-products of our interactions in human relationships (Cited in Piomelli, P.436).

For Foucault individuals and groups are "neither preformed before they engage in power relations, nor unchanged by those relations" (Piomelli, P.437); in Foucault's view our participation in power relations literally makes us who we are. For him it is the push and pull of human relationships that shape us as individuals and groups- as others seek to manage us, we succumb to and resist those efforts, and in turn we seek to steer the conduct of others, as well as to mold ourselves. Foucault stated in one of his lectures in 1976:

The individual is not to be conceived as a sort of elementary nucleus, a primitive atom, a multiple and inert material on which power comes to fasten or against which it happens to strike... in fact it is already one of the prime effects of power that certain bodies, certain gestures, certain discourses, certain desires, come to be identified and constituted as individuals (Cited in Piomelli, P. 438).

Hence, individual to Foucault is dynamic and capable of change. S/he is not the absolute slave of the living conditions; but there is enough space to act and perform one's own ethics. The individual that Foucault has in mind is a free subject who can either succumb to the norms of society or act in one's own way. Since according to Foucault power is dynamic and productive, and resistance is inherent to it the individual has the space for acting in the power relation in a way that s/he can be far from the docile body who simply acts as the normalized society demands. The Foucauldian individual is one who can be both as the slave of normalization and as the free subject who acts according to his/her own ethics while still lives within the normalized society.

Foucault believes that one cannot get rid of the normalization process and the normalized society unless one makes a self, an identity that is purely self-made and conscious of the condition surrounding one. Foucault proposed "care for self" as a way of overcoming the normalized self imposed on individual by power relation. "*Care of the self*" is a series of technologies and activities by which one gains self-knowledge and skills in order to improve oneself. In order to practice "care of the self" in the way that Foucault recommends, we need to intensify our relations with ourselves and with others. Foucault's care of the self is a social practice: self creation is not practiced in isolation but by being in dialogue with other people around. In *Care of the Self*, Foucault states that: "[care of the self] constituted, not an exercise in solitude, but a true social practice ... The care of the self -or the attention that he advocates to the care that others should take of themselves- appears then as an intensification of social relations" (cited in Infinito, P. 12).

In *What is Enlightenment*, Foucault described three elements which are decisive in ethical self formation (cited in Infinito Pp.14-17). Here we will consider each of them briefly: Firstly, an environment that encourages experimentation with the self is needed (Infinito, P. 14). Ethical self-formation requires a type of safe, experimental environment where individuals can participate in the ongoing production of themselves. It needs a space within which subjects can try out alternative modes of being a self in front of others and where they can both witness and generate for the experiments of other selves. Secondly, an awareness is required of one's current conditions as defined by the given culture and historical moment (Infinito, P. 14). We understand our present condition and identity by investigating the historical epoch into which we are born and its discourses. Foucault supports the idea that by seeing our world and our identity as a product of accidental, arbitrary and man-made games of truth, we can gain a more useful understanding of our past and present situation. Such an understanding prevents us from glorifying the present by giving it a universal significance or abandoning it in search of something better. We know that we always remain in the world, but we should not give in to it and miss our chances for bringing change. In this way, though we criticize our condition, we do not despair and obtaining a good understanding of our past and present we can gain the ability and reason for change. Foucault states that:

That criticism is no longer going to be practiced in the search for formal structures with universal value but, rather, as a historical investigation into the events that have led us to constitute ourselves and to recognize ourselves as subjects of what we are doing, thinking, saying, ... And this critique will be genealogical in the sense that it will not deduce from the form of what we are what it is impossible for us to do and to know; but it will separate out, from the contingency that has made what we are, the possibility of no longer being, doing, or thinking what we are, do or think (cited in Infinito 15).

What he means by this is that building an understanding of present reality through genealogical inquiry is necessary for creating a possibility for change. Thirdly, the subject should have an attitude or disposition to critique (Infinito 14). According to Foucault, critical attitude is the willingness to hold at the same time, both the reality of the present and ourselves and the idea of ourselves as an object of purposeful elaboration. This means that we should accept to see ourselves in a sphere where the substance of acceptance and substance of change coexist.

As we mentioned earlier in this paper, Foucault's first suggestion about how to resist society's normalizing effects is by denying the self which is imposed on us by power relations. Since we are subjects created by the effects of the disciplinary power, we are tied to our identities; to be able to resist power, we should resist these normalizing effects by denying our identity. Foucault believes that the ability to resist needs a type of agency that can be developed by an ethic of 'care of the self'. 'Care of the self', as a series of technologies and activities by which one gains self knowledge and skills to improve one's self, requires an intensification of relations with one's own self and with others. The three decisive elements for ethical self-formation as were mentioned are: an encouraging environment for experimentation with the self; an awareness of one's current condition as defined by the given culture and historical moment and, an attitude or disposition to critique (Martin, 1988). These elements will now be discussed in case of Tess and Angel respectively.

2.1. TESS: PASSIVE OR ACTIVE

According to Foucault, freedom is the result of actions that every individual performs in relation to others; it means that freedom and ethics are somehow interrelated (Infinito, P. 2). So, one important element for self-formation is an environment that encourages experimentation with the self. In order to have ethical self-formation there should be a space where one can perform different and alternative modes of being a self. In addition this space should be a safe one so that all individuals can participate in the continuous production of themselves with others. Tess lives in a society that allows enough movement and mobility in both sides of the class border. She is from a class with enough opportunities for change and resistance. She belongs to an

“independent, intermediate class ... that was more responsible to the pressures of education and industrialism than the ordinary laborious, and more likely to have an indigenous culture. It was so mobile society in both directions. Its members might lose everything, through the constant fluctuations in rural society, but they could also hope to rise out of their class through marriage or education or indeed through sheer energy” (Williams, P. 115).

Hence as Williams described Tess's class, she lives in a class which is mobile enough to encourage the individual for seeking alternative life. She “with her trained National teachings and Standard knowledge under infinitely Revised Code”, is a girl who has been introduced to new norms; those of middle class. Yet her education is not enough and she has not enough opportunity to study by herself. Her class offers her the ground for seeking change but her family; mostly her inconsiderate parents are a real obstacle to her. Whenever she wants to do something for herself, her family's needs make her to look back and put their need before hers. In a scene when her mother reproaches her for not being careful about her conduct with Alec, Tess blames her mother for not informing her about men and the fact that she has never had the opportunity for self-training as the ladies have: “How could I expected to know? I was a child when I left this house four months ago. Why didn't you tell me there was danger in men-folk? Why didn't you warn me? Ladies know what to fend hands against, because they read novels that tell them of these tricks; but I never had the chance o'learning in that way, and you did not help me!” (Tess, P. 52).

Her family is a true hindrance to her desires for any change: “she had hoped to be a teacher at the school” but “everyday seemed to throw upon her young shoulders more of the family burdens”. As soon as she leaves school she is to “lend a hand at haymaking or harvesting on neighboring farms; or, by preference at milking or butter-making processes” (12). In fact, her family not only provides her with no encouragement to move upward but they push her back by imposing on her more and more the burdens of life. She “felt quite a Malthusian towards her mother for thoughtlessly giving her so many little sisters and brothers, when it was such a trouble to nurse and provide for them.” Her mother was another child herself; “Joan Durbeyfield was simply an additional one, and that not the eldest” (20). Hence, she finds no chance for desiring more than what her condition offered her. However, Tess's failure to create a new self is not only due to her family. She herself also is not very eager to gain knowledge of her current condition and reality which is the second step to self-formation.

Foucault believes that obtaining a good knowledge of our present reality and trying to change it at the same time is the second step towards self-formation. The way we live in society, our cultural and social conditions construct our present reality. We all have to live according to the norms that prevail in our society and are produced by the disciplinary system of power. Our identity, the way we are and the way we act is affected by power structure and is produced by it. So if we are aware of the mechanisms of power and the way they act, we will be able to deal with them in more effective ways. If we accept the real world around us and gain sufficient knowledge about it we will be able to elevate our present reality to a better and more significant one. The most important thing about getting a good insight of our present reality is that we can change it with the knowledge we have about it. Foucault argues that at the same time that we accept our reality we should try to change it; this means that although we live in our present time and accept its reality we don't have to yield to it.

Concerning this step towards self-formation, one can say that unfortunately Tess fails to accomplish this second step as she did with the first one also. Tess does not have any effective knowledge of her time, the situation, limitations, and the possible opportunities of her present condition. She views life realistically and if she was not so bitter and cynical about her reality, she could see the opportunities as well as the oppressive forces of her condition. In fact, she sees the reality as it is but since she is too obsessed with the harshness and difficulty of her condition she can't even imagine of any change to it. Once her little brother asks her about the world they live in, she divides the world into sound and blighted stars and adds that they live on a blighted one; hence there is no chance for a better life but to change the star they live on! She sees the problems and difficulties of life but she can't think to change it to a better one. Since she is normalized to the idea of predestination; she can't think of any noticeable change to their condition and she believes her parents' dream of being a rich family through their rich relative is absolutely ridiculous: "examining the mesh of events in her own life, she to see the vanity of her father's pride; the gentlemanly suitor awaiting herself in her mother's fancy; to see him as a grimacing personage, laughing at her poverty, and her shrouded knightly ancestry. Everything grew more and more extravagant, [...] (17).

Tess's view of world is a cynical one and that is the key to her insistence on convincing herself of the futility of any effort to change the world and hence the absurdity of knowing the world:

What's the use of learning that I am one of a long row of only-finding put that there is set down in some old book somebody just like me, and to know that I shall only act her part; making me sad, that's all. The best is not to remember that your nature and your past doings have been just like thousands' and thousands', and that your coming life and doings 'll be like thousand's and thousand' (79).

As it is observed in the words of Tess, she is against learning more -than what she has acquired through her bitter experiences- about life. She has already believed in predestination and hence to her learning does not help to change anything but make her sad. Thus, the environment not only does not encourage her to touch life more knowledgably but Tess's own cynicism prevents her to take advantage of the rare chances of gaining more knowledge about her condition. Tess's lack of awareness and lack of interest in the current conditions does not allow her to enter the scope of the third element, which is an attitude or disposition to critique. Foucault says that at this stage one should accept one's present reality and revolt against it at the same time.

According to Foucault resistance to power can be done in the framework which power itself has set for its subjects. This way the scope of one's action in relation to power is already determined. Thus, concerning this form of resistance and its possibilities and according to Foucault's definition, the subject's resistance will eventually be set by power. One should play according to the set rules even though one might have found new methods for playing (Rozmarin, 2005). The subjects can choose the kind of actions within the power-defined structure but s/he is still bound with the standards of the same power structure.

Subject needs to have a critical view, without it they would never be able to get free from the normalization. Criticizing the current norms and conventions helps the subject to know them consciously and study their benefit or damage to them. Through critically viewing the world subject first accepts the reality of norms imposed on them and then they can try to find alternatives to them. Concerning this last step to self-formation, Tess again fails to come to an effective critical view. In fact, Tess can't view world critically since she has already failed to know her condition. Since she does not know her limitations; the norms expected her to concern properly, she can't find fault with them and criticize them.

Thus, the only thing that she can do in face of her problems is to calmly endure them or through her efforts to be normal- that are not effective due to the fact that she is not well aware of the norms - she only exacerbates the condition for her. Tess's obsession with predestination and her normalized mind do not allow her to criticize the fairness of affairs. She accepts the condition, the reality of her life since believes that she deserves it. She all the time blames her for the sin she once committed and accepts all the torturous conducts of other-especially her husband- towards her. The only significant instance of her criticizing her situation is in the scene that she writes for Angel asking him to come back. She finally comes to conclusion that his treatment of her has not been fair and right:

O why have you treated me so monstrously, Angel! I do not deserve it. I have thought it all over carefully, and I can never, never forgive you! You know that I did not intend to wrong you—why have you so wronged me? You are cruel, cruel indeed! I will try to forget you. It is all injustice I have received at your hands! (315).

This letter is written to Angel when she is too pressed by the burdens of life and Alec's temptations, thus one may think that she has come to this conclusion only because of the harshness of her situation not through deep thinking; because at the last phase when she finds Angel back to her, she can't help it but to come back to him and rejoin him.

Tess is a poor docile subject that cannot resist the power relation since she has already succumbed to its norms and she never thinks of resisting them. However, since she is not even well-normalized and she has no reliable knowledge of the demands of her situation, as a working class woman, and then a married woman, she fails even to be a normal woman and enjoy her docile state (Freeman, 1982). In fact, Tess's problem is that her mind is not well prepared to adventure the process of self-formation yet she is not a common working class woman as her mother or her co-workers are to simply act according to the norms and live happily ever after! She has received some education providing her with new ideas different from those of her mother; and hence her class-(Morgan, 1988). In the novel Hardy puts her "between the mother, with her fast-perishing lumber of superstitions, folk-lore, dialect, and orally transmitted ballads, and the daughter, with her National teachings and standard knowledge under an infinitely Revised Code, there was a gape of two hundred years as ordinarily understood" (11)- however, this education is not enough to give her the necessary knowledge to look for something other than the bitter reality around her. She helplessly accepts the reality and condition she is subject to but she does not know what to do next. She ultimately decides to put an end to her controversial situation by murdering Alec which definitely leads to her own death.

3.1. ANGEL A FRAGILE NEW SELF

Regarding the self-formation and resistance Angel is more promising and closer to the subject that Foucault believes to be capable of changing his/her condition. Angel consciously and deliberately puts himself in the process of self-formation so that he can create a self that is free from the demands of norms and practices his own ethics. This process is not a simple one and Angel undergoes fairly so much difficulties to accomplish his goal. As Foucault holds that to practice resistance one needs to make oneself free from the self imposed on them by power relation. To step towards formation of a new self, first one needs to have enough space to move. In other words, one needs an encouraging environment to provide enough space for change and practicing new modes of being a self. Angel lives in a traditional family with well-established norms and conventions. He decisively stays against the norms of his family that has a serious outcome for him. He is deprived of going to university. However, the intensity of the norms and traditions of family is not so much to paralyze him absolutely and prevent him from practicing alternative ways other than those offered him by family.

In fact, his father though very firm in his own ideology and theological views, is not a bias man to force his son follow his example unquestionably. If Angel does not like to take Orders, he is not to go to Cambridge; it is true but he is not prevented from pursuing his own path by him. His father allows him to study according to his own taste as long as he remains a devoted Christian. Angel is not a revolutionary figure to attempt undone the whole norms of the system that he lives in. But he is a subject who wants to practice something other than the common norms within the very system he lives in. Hence, his resistance is endured by the power relation and is not rejected harshly. When he leaves his village for London, he soon finds out that he is not strong enough to practice his new ways at an absolutely different society. London undoubtedly is more tolerant than his village to his abnormal views and hence more encouraging to his plans, yet he cannot live there since he is not absolutely free from the norms of the society that he has been brought up there.

He is still associated to village life; his mind is still normalized by its norms and it is not possible for him to shed off all the norms all at once and substitute them with new ones. Hence, he comes back home to practice the alternative mode of being a self, the self-formation within the very system he has tried to resist it. He as a member of middle class was supposed to attend university through his parents' savings and since his family tradition was to enter University only to be a minister of Church, what he is against, he decides to practice other alternatives. He can be a farmer: "Farming either in the Colonies, America, or at home-farming, at any rate, after becoming well qualified for the business by a careful apprenticeship-that was a vocation which would be probably afford an independence without the sacrifice of what he valued even more than a competency- intellectual liberty" (73); he is from a middle class family and has the opportunity for practicing plenty of chances for living. It is true that his father desired him be a minister of church but he has never been too serious to force him. Angel has enough liberty to follow his own views. However to accomplish such a task-self-formation- an encouraging environment though necessary it does not suffice undoubtedly.

He needs to gain knowledge of his condition, history, and limitations as well as the opportunities available to him in order to be able to create his own ethics and invent a new self free from the norms. Angel who has consciously decided to resist power relation and practice his liberty by forming a new self, knows that it needs knowledge, enough knowledge about his condition, the culture that he had decided to evade and the possible alternatives before him. Angel has already started studying the books directly associated to theology and disciplines of church and not being satisfied by them, he has turned to philosophy and classical books. His turn to philosophy actually was the beginning point to openly resist the norms of family and declaring his independence from the imposed ideology by church. The dialogue between Angel and his father on the subject is quite informing that Angel has come to his decision after gaining enough information and knowledge about the disciplines of church; he resists church because he has found that she is not right enough:

"Look into this book, my boy," he said. "What do you know about it?"

"I ordered it," said Angel simply.

"What for?"

"To read". "What can you think of reading it?"

"How can I?" why-it is a system of philosophy. There is no more moral, or even religious, work published."

"Yes- moral enough; I don't deny that. But religious! - and for You, who intend to be a minister of the Gospel!" (72).

As it is understood from this dialogue and as the rest of it implies Angel has sufficiently studied religious books and had enough knowledge about church to stand against her discipline openly. He also after rejecting to take Order spends long years in "desultory studies, undertakings, and meditations" that make him to build up his theoretical basis of mind. This prepares him for entering the scope of the third element of self-formation that is to have a view or disposition of critique. Apart from his main critique which was aimed at disciplines of church, Angel after subjecting him to desultory studies began to "evince considerable indifference to social forms and observances. The material distinctions of rank and wealth he increasingly despised. Even the "good family" [...] had no aroma for him unless there were good new resolutions in its representatives" (73). It is due to this new critical view that he friendly treats the common fellow farmers and workers.

He no longer keeps distance from them, but the more he tries to know them, he finds out that regardless their apparent unsophisticated behavior and conduct and unlike "conventional farm-folk of his imagination-personified in the news paper-press by the pitiable dummy known as Hodge" they are "beings of many minds, beings infinite in difference; some happy, many serene, a few depressed, [...] some mutely Miltonic, some potentially Cromwellian; [...] men who had private views of each other, as he had of his friends; [...] men every one of whom walked in his own individual way the road to dusty death" (74). In fact, he grew "away from old associations" and finds something new in "life and humanity" (Ibid). Angel courageously began to go through the hard task of self-formation so that he can come to a new self of his own and resist the normalization strategy of power relation. Yet, this attempt is not something easy to be accomplished quickly and completely all at once. No doubt, such a grand task takes a long time and plenty of tests to firmly establish. Angel theoretically and mentally makes a good progress; however, when it comes to practice he is not very successful. The most important test of his theoretical changes is his encounter with Tess. His selecting Tess apparently proves his newly formed ethics of self; as a farm man he chooses a dairy maid as his future wife.

However, the principle reason that he chooses Tess among the other girls; apart from her beauty, is her purity and her virginity which Angel considers to be more original than the other dairy maids. When he finds out about her past history with Alec he can't "stomach it" and whatever Tess tries to convince him of forgiving her is absolutely futile, because he is still obsessed with his old norms of conduct which has deeply been internalized by him. In fact, to get rid of the normalized self, it is not enough to change one's mind but one must put to practice the new views and go through a long and difficult practice of the new self so that can create a self truly of one's own and free from the norms. Angel, unfortunately so soon faces with a dramatic test of his ethics and being not enough ready for such a test he fails.

Angel has already shown some signs of the fact that he is not ready to accomplish such a big task; to test his new self against the norms of marriage institution with its old, well-established norms in his mind. In the scene that Tess points to her own knightly ancestors as an obstacle to their marriage since he claimed to despise the old families, his reaction shows that he is not still free from the norms of rank and social position: "I do hate the aristocratic principle of blood before everything, [...] for your own sake I rejoice in your descent. Society is hopelessly snobbish, and this fact of your extraction may make an appreciable difference to its acceptance of you as my wife, after I have made you the well-read woman that I mean to make you" (118). In other scene he decides to put Tess to a sort of teaching the norms of his own class; the middle class, so that when she meets his parent she looks appropriate or in Foucauldian term normal: "he judged that a couple of months' life with him in lodgings while seeking for an advantageous opening would be of some social assistance to her at what she might feel to be a trying ordeal- her presentation to his mother at the Vicarage" (128). One may consider this act as his over consideration for his mother and also his care for Tess that she be treated respectfully by his parents.

It can be true to some extent, no doubt he cares a lot about his family and Tess too, however it is indicative of his contradictory views and the fact that he is still concerning the social ranks and hierarchy so much; he still unconsciously cares a lot about the norms of society. In another scene when Tess confesses her sin to Angel, she tries to convince him of forgiving her by comparing her case with other women whose men ultimately got over the case and yet "the woman had not loved him as I do you", Angel's answer to her definitely proves his deep involvement with the norms of class difference: "Don't, Tess; don't argue. Different societies, different manners" (147). In fact, Angel is still entangled in the web of his old self and cannot so easily put them away. Hence, he decides to leave Tess and try to contemplate over the subject more so that he can come to a decision. His last remarks indicate that how much he is perplexed with the matter and he has too difficulties still to be able to get over the matter:

How can we live together when that man lives?- he being your husband in nature, and not I. [...] besides that's not all difficulty; it lies in another consideration- [...] Think of years to come, and children being born to us, and this past matter getting known- [...] Well think of wretches of our flesh and blood growing up under a taunt which they will gradually get to feel the full force of with their expanding years" (155).

He is not still ready to face society with his new ethics and new self made "self". However, what matters is that Angel has begun a task which is undoubtedly a courageous one and one that needs a great deal of effort and time to come to best results. After spending quite a long time in South America he finally can find the heart to face the reality of his choice and comes back home to take Tess's hand. He is too late and Tess is already lost. But, it does not mean that Angel's efforts have been useless, he at least was able to resolve his mental controversy and convince himself to face society. Of course, he still has a long way to attain the self that is strong enough to stand against the last normalized one; because the process of self-formation is not something to be done once for all but it is a continuous task that may take one's whole life. As already mentioned, the practice of resistance is directly linked to the practice of self-creation. Refusing what we are, the identity imposed on us by the power relation-through different techniques mainly normalization, is the first step to practice self-creation. We must de-individualize our self and create a self entirely different (Pickett, 1996). To create a new self, Foucault believes we should apply techniques of the self, to practice our liberty to invent new forms of subjectivity." (Cited in Piomelli, P.444). We have to promote new forms of subjectivity through the refusal of... [the] kind of individuality that has been imposed on us for several centuries."

In his words "liberty is a practice ... Liberty is what must be exercised" (Ibid). Accordingly, Angel is an individual who resists the power relation through his claim for a new self and we cannot deny that he was able to fulfill his plan to a great extent although it was not practical enough to enjoy his life with Tess.

2. CONCLUSION

Regarding what said above we can conclude that Tess belongs to a category that almost never undergoes the process of self-formation which according to Foucault is the only way to resist power relation. Foucault holds that power and resistance are two inevitably inseparable entities. One cannot be without the other. Also, he believes that resistance is not attainable unless subjects are free and have a self other than what system has made for them through the process of normalization. Accordingly, Tess was shown to be a normalized subject who has deeply internalized the norms of her society, especially the moral codes of devotion to family and loyalty to husband. Yet, it was shown that she is not well normalized in that she has internalized norms without truly being aware of their demands.

Tess's failure to resist through achieving a self other than the normalized self, was found to be due to the fact that the three decisive elements that Foucault holds to be necessary for anyone desiring go through self-formation are not available to Tess. Her environment is not encouraging enough; although her class is mobile enough to allow her move up the ladder, her family hinders her. Her poor family puts her in critical situations that make her to sacrifice her own desires for their needs. Also, Tess's lack of effective knowledge of her culture, history and possibilities before her makes her to fail to recognize her condition well. She does not know the reality of her life; she only sees the dark side of reality, and hence she is not able to hold an effective critical view of world. Consequently, she finds no chance to experiment with a new self. Besides, she fails to be a normalized subject too because of her ill-normalization; her family never could give her enough instructions to behave normally. Whatever she knows come from her experience that mostly acquired by heavy cost.

On the other hand, Angel is an individual who has consciously decided to practice self-formation and get rid of the normalized self imposed on him by power relation. He is an individual that falls into the category of the free subject who has gone through self-formation consciously and has been able to create a new self. Angel has been able to take benefit of the three decisive elements-an encouraging environment, knowledge of one's current condition, and critical attitude- mentioned by Foucault as necessary for self-formation. However, as shown earlier, this new self is not strong enough to undergo difficult tests. Angel's new self successfully manages to resist the established norms of his family; taking Order and serving church, and practices his own alternative; to be a farmer. Yet, the fragile self which is still controlled by the internalized norms fails to face Tess's secret. As we said earlier, Angel's problem is that he has not been able to shed off all the internalized norms of his past self and unwittingly subjects his new fragile self to a test too difficult to pass. In fact, Angel fails to understand that creating a new self, needs to be clear of the past one first and then work on the new one by gaining enough knowledge and experience at different situations

3. REFERTENCES

- Allan, Barry. (1999). "Power/Knowledge". *Critical Essays on Michel Foucault*. Ed. Kalis Racevskis. New York: G K. Hall & Co.
- Foucault, Michel.(1995). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books.
- Freeman, Janet.(1982)."Ways of Looking at Tess". *Studies in Philosophy*, Vol. 79, No. 3. University of North Carolina Press, 311-323. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4174125>
- Hardy, Thomas. (1998). *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*. London: Penguin Group.
- Infinito, Justin. (2003). "Ethical Self-Formation: A Look at the Later Foucault". *Educational Theory*, Vol. 53. www.blackwellsynergy.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.17415446.2003.00155x
- Martin, L. H. (1988). et al. *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*. London: Tailstock.
- Morgan, R. (1988). *Women and Sexuality in the Novels of Thomas Hardy*. London: Rutledge.
- Pickett, L. Brent.(1996). "Foucault and the Politics of Resistance". *Palgrave Macmillan Journals*. Vol. 28, No. 4. University of Colorado, 445-466. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3235341>
- Piomelli, Ascanio.(2004). "Foucault's Approach to Power: Its Allure and Limits for Collaborative Lawyering". *Utah Law Review*, 395 <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1020819>
- Rozmarin, Miri.(2005). "Power, Freedom, and Individuality: Foucault and Sexual Difference". *Human Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 1 Springer, 1-14. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/440910>
- Williams, Merry.(1972). *Thomas Hardy and Rural England*. London: McMillan.