

Sandra Bartky (1990) accounts for the ways in which patriarchal power has modernized through the dissemination of normative modes and practices of feminine embodiment. Women have internalized demands that they attain a certain body size, enact proper feminine bodily comportment, and display their bodies as ornaments. These practices indicate the docility of the female body under the disciplining regime of patriarchal power.

Bartky suggests that women's bodily discipline is motivated by a "pervasive sense of bodily deficiency" (72), compounded by the omnipresence of an "anonymous patriarchal other" (72). Bartky also gestures towards the ways in which practices of femininity secure a feminine identity: how "woman's consciousness of herself as a bodily being" (77) and her sense of knowledge and capacity are rooted in her internalization of "patriarchal standards of bodily acceptability" (77). Women's sense of individuality and being-in-the-world is a key motivational factor in their practices of feminine embodiment, and thus a *desire* to achieve proper femininity operates alongside a sense of deficiency in the constitution of feminine bodies through disciplinary practices. Given women's subjective attachments to femininity, Bartky suggests "a genuinely radical feminism that questions the patriarchal construction of the female body [and] threatens women with a certain de-skilling" (77) might not be politically feasible. However, she also calls for the "deconstruction of the categories of masculinity and femininity" (78) and goes on to celebrate the resistance of communities that have "rejected hegemonic images of femininity" (82). Is there a contradiction here? To what extent might de-skilling or perhaps *re-skilling* be necessary for feminist resistance? [250 words]