

Sandra Bartky argues that Foucault is perpetuating “the silence and powerlessness of those upon whom these disciplines have been imposed” (women) by treating the body as if it is not gendered in *Discipline and Punish*. She “examines those disciplinary practices that produce a body which in gesture and appearance is recognizably feminine” (65). Women are disciplined to be of certain sizes and proportions and Bartky writes that the “current body of fashion is taut, small breasted, narrow-hipped, and of slimness bordering on emaciation,” also emphasizing that this body type is more “appropriate to an adolescent boy or a newly pubescent girl than to an adult woman” (66). Women are disciplined to be recognizably feminine within certain proportions and “massiveness, power, or abundance in a women’s body is met with distaste” (66). According to Bartky, “ordinary women have normally quite different dimensions” than the slender ideal we are bombarded with (66) and “under this “tyranny of slenderness” women are forbidden to become large or massive; they must take up as little space as possible” (73). Perhaps Bartky means to refer to the ‘average’ woman because certainly women who naturally fit this “current body of fashion” are also *ordinary* women. Does the judgment on what “ordinary women” look like and the characterization of thin women as having bodies “appropriate to an adolescent boy” (66) represent the lateral violence that is a product of this “institutionally unbound” discipline and simply another “oppressive identification of female beauty”? (82). Does this lateral violence between women keep us from “widespread resistance” (81) that could potentially challenge the “currently fashionable modes or feminine embodiment”? (81).