

Above all, the Australian troops, like the bushmen before them, were loyal to their mates. Gerster notes that mateship was a 'commonplace reality' in all the armies of the Great War, and not, as is suggested in many books, an Australian monopoly.

Gerster believes that the 'heroic myth', born at Gallipoli, was conceived on the veldt during the South African war — a view I advanced myself about the New Zealand military identity. 'Banjo' Paterson was an Australian war correspondent in South Africa, so perhaps he was one of the inventors.

The aggressive response of Australians to the Great War was in marked contrast to the anti-war attitudes of the best imaginative British and European literature, for instance in Erich Maria Remarque's *All Quiet on the Western Front* or in the poetry of Siegfried Sassoon, Robert Graves, or Wilfred Owen. The author emphasizes this point but fails to notice that the literature seems to have had little if any effect on the European psyche: Germans and British were as warlike as the Australians in 1939.

Gerster quotes Dan Davin in the preface to his war novel, *For the Rest of Our Lives*, saying that 'it is easier to introduce fiction into fact than fact into fiction'. Almost all the war memoirs and, indeed, novels are ambiguous in the respect that fact and fiction are intertwined. For instance, though the author speaks of the 'myth' of heroism, surely many of these soldiers were, in fact, heroes. The praise was not all self-praise. British writers, like John Masefield, were quick to praise the Australian (and indeed, New Zealand) troops in extravagant and romantic terms. He wrote that the Anzacs 'walked and looked like kings in old poems'.

One sad and tragic aspect of the war is that it was often true, as General Sir Ian Hamilton wrote, that men lived through more in five minutes on the crest at Gallipoli than in five years of Bendigo or Ballarat. D. H. Lawrence said in his novel, *Kangaroo*, that 'the war was the only time they ever felt properly alive'. That was certainly true of many ex-servicemen I knew from the Great War, and of many veterans with whom I came home in 1945.

In this book New Zealanders almost never appear, though they do help the Aussies to burn the brothel district in Cairo. The word 'Anzacs' invariably means Australians, as it does in the film, *Gallipoli*. No reader would learn that the letters 'NZ' meant New Zealand.

KEITH SINCLAIR

University of Auckland

A Man's Country. The Image of the Pakeha Male. A History. By Jock Phillips. Penguin Books, Auckland, 1987. 321pp. NZ price: \$30.

ACCORDING TO Jock Phillips the stereotype of the New Zealand male was forged on the colonial frontier, tempered on the rugby field, and with some minor additions from the public houses and racecourses, cast into a definitive mould by the experience of war. All was not well though: fresh from the battlefield, the pub, and the sports field, Kiwi blokes were thrown into the coils of domesticity, and in the conflict between the bracing and sympathetic male world and the debilitating and unsympathetic feminine realm of home and family was born much of the deep-seated misogyny of New Zealand culture.

In response to a rapidly growing feminist literature Dr Phillips has cast his eye over the historical development of New Zealand society with a view to examining the creation of a distinctive national stereotype of the ideal man. By rendering masculinity problematic — as the sociologists would say — he hopes to illuminate hitherto neglected areas

of historical enquiry. However, while accepting the validity of the project, one may find certain aspects of its execution less than satisfying.

Much of the material is not new, and in many places the treatment is over-long and at times it is rather repetitive. Given that the defining rituals of the male culture described are rather close to the clichéd trinity of Rugby, Racing, and Beer, with the predictable additions of warfare and colonial do-it-yourself, the sections tracing the development of Kiwi Jokerism could have been condensed. Considering the sexual division of labour which has been a hallmark of the paid work-force in New Zealand, it is surprising that more attention was not given to paid work and work-based culture as a defining ritual of male culture. In some places models taken from overseas literature are used rather uncritically; in particular the link made between urbanization and increased social acceptance of rougher elements of male culture could be examined more closely. Some readers may find the use of psychological speculation rather intrusive, as in the suggestion that the six o'clock swill was a reflection of a massive desire for oral gratification, or when Nancy Chodorow's post-Freudian object-relations theory of the formation of gender identity is used to explain male ambivalence towards the family. The section examining the conflict between a family-based female-dominated set of values and male culture is potentially the most interesting and original part of the book, yet this material is treated rather cursorily.

A serious problem lies in the distinction between stereotype and experience. In the Preface Dr Phillips is careful to point out that he is not writing a history of male behaviour, although he feels that the stereotype he is discussing had a tangible impact on behaviour with which it 'constantly interact[s]' (p.viii). This thorny issue of the relationship between image and experience and the extent to which image can be discussed independently of experience needs clarification. Indeed, given Dr Phillips's conception of stereotypes as 'by their very nature. . . shackles upon individuals' (p.289), he needs to give more space to examining the interaction between image and experience. One of the recurring themes of the book is the contrast between the experience of New Zealand men and the myths enshrined in stereotypes of the New Zealand male. To sustain this contrast it is necessary to set myth against experience. This is done most successfully in the discussion of New Zealand men at war, where war diaries and memoirs are used to undercut the official images. In the later section of the book, where the focus has moved to the conflict between images of the family man and male experience of the family, the material used to build up a picture of male attitudes to the family is decidedly thin. Contemporary humour and fictional representations are the mainstay of the effort to get 'beyond the public trumpetings about family life and [hear] the attitudes of men among themselves' (p.252). The section dealing with the problems that returned servicemen had in reintegrating into civilian society is extrapolated almost entirely from fiction. In the Preface Dr Phillips argues eloquently for the acceptance of personal reminiscence as valid historical evidence; this makes the absence of oral history a striking feature of the later chapters. Had oral history been used it might have been possible to flesh out the written record and look more closely at men who chose to deviate from the norm, thereby producing a more subtle analysis. Indeed the tendency to drift away from discussing the impact of the stereotype on behaviour, except in rather general terms, creates a curiously undifferentiated picture of New Zealand men. The men we meet in the pages of *A Man's Country* are chosen as representative types or national icons, and while Edmund Hillary, Charles Upham, and Colin Meads are useful illustrations of stereotypes the technique does little to suggest the complexity of male responses to prevailing mores.

Dr Phillips's chosen task is not merely to delineate or dissect male culture; he also wishes to caution his readers and argue that there is a better way. He repeatedly admonishes us to remember that the male stereotype had 'victims', not least of them men

themselves, 'the innumerable men who were forced to do things for which they were not individually suited — play rugby rather than the piano, laying concrete rather than cook interesting meals, slave on an assembly line when they might have preferred looking after children' (p.289). After reading this book no New Zealand man will ever be quite the same again — or so the publisher promises on the back cover. While an author can hardly be taken to task for the excesses of his publisher's hyperbole, readers' responses to *A Man's Country* will in part be determined by their attitude to the evangelical mission interwoven with his analysis.

DEBORAH MONTGOMERIE

University of Auckland

The Fourth Labour Government. Radical Politics in New Zealand. Edited by Jonathan Boston and Martin Holland. Oxford University Press, Auckland, 1987. 261pp. NZ price: \$22.50.

IN THEIR introductory overview, the editors of *The Fourth Labour Government* quote David Lange's (1986) view that his government presented a real challenge to the political analyst. The Prime Minister told the NZPSA Conference that year that 'the complexities of a period of rapid change call for a new level of sophistication in political commentary'. He regretted that 'there is a lack of good in-depth political analysis' in the news media, a statement of fact which no one would seriously contest.

Boston and Holland present this collection of essays as a contribution to a debate which has, alarmingly, scarcely surfaced. They point out, however, that the volume does not cover many (one might say most) important areas of public policy; education, employment, health, housing, social welfare, energy, and transport, to name only those absences mentioned by the editors. They also admit that 'readers will find virtually nothing here on questions relating to gender, race, violence and environmental protection'.

Even further pre-empting the critical reviewer, Boston and Holland point out that in the areas actually covered such as wages policy, the reorganization of the state sector, and defence policy the analysis is 'sometimes limited and incomplete... partly because the precise nature of the government's approach had yet to be announced at the time of writing'. Indeed, given that all the contributions seems to have been written well before the end of 1986 for a May 1987 publication date, the title of the book is a misnomer.

What then is this book? In essence, it is a collection of think-pieces, the substance of which ought to have been published in weekly and monthly journals during the course of the government's first two years in office. Alternatively, the essays may be interpreted as working papers — what might be produced, let us say, for a weekend confabulation of social scientists seeking to locate the structural changes stemming from 20-odd months of government activity and to fashion tools for analysis which might have explanatory force. There are glimmerings of an agenda for future interpretations in most of the essays. But the constraints of space and time lamented by the editors vitiate much of the work.

Jack Vowles summarizes the shifts in the Labour Party's ideological underpinnings since its beginnings. He parallels this with an equally succinct account of alterations in the balance of electoral support and the composition of party activists and Members of Parliament. The two parts are, however, essentially unresolved; more time, more space, please. Nigel Roberts reviews the behaviour of opposition parties in difficult circumstances. He argues, cogently enough, that Downs's economic theory of democracy may