

scope, there may well be inaccuracies uncovered by scholars with long-term institutional support and a less pressured time frame for research. For myself, I was greatly impressed by the judiciousness and flair with which Coney, in particular, used materials in areas with which I was familiar.

The highlight of this book is undoubtedly the rich photographic record which appears within its pages. These give a marvellous sense of lives lived (and lost — as in the sad photo of Mrs Gilmer of Nelson and her baby, who died during childbirth). Little girls in frilled caps from a church home train to be domestic servants, bridal parties from different eras pose for the camera, Flossie Le Mar, jujitsu expert demonstrates how to deal with dangerous men (in 1913), photographs from 1898 onwards show Maori women organizing hui, a vast array of women, Maori and Pakeha, appear in action shots of a range of sporting activities, and one particularly fascinating cluster of images shows an Auckland woman, Emily Binns, her home and changing family role over the span of 40 years. Caption writing is an art in itself, and here Coney shows a sure hand. For me, it was the images from these photographs which constituted the book's most lasting impact, and which gave a very real sense of connection with the women in New Zealand's past.

Where does a book such as this stand in relation to New Zealand women's history? So much published work in the field in recent years (and 1993 was certainly no exception) has been biographical. Valuable (and marketable) as this is, one is often left wondering what it all amounts to. *Standing in the Sunshine* contributes to this increasing mass of biographical data, but it was with some relief that I turned to the short, concise essays on topics such as women's health, education, political involvement and work. These make no pretence to comprehensiveness, but provide for new readers a tantalizing introduction to fields which are still under-researched. For the academic historian, *Standing in the Sunshine* provides a lesson in crisp writing, attractive formatting and the intelligent use of pictorial materials. Its detail will, hopefully, be productive of new research. We still await the broad, integrated and, hopefully, theoretically informed books which will inspire debate and move New Zealand women's history on to a further stage of development.

MARGARET TENNANT

Massey University

Gender, Culture & Power: Challenging New Zealand's Gendered Culture. By Bev James and Kay Saville-Smith. Oxford University Press, Auckland, 1994. 2nd ed. 120 pp. NZ price: \$25.95. ISBN 0-19-558321-3.

IN 1989 Bev James and Kay Saville-Smith first published *Gender, Culture & Power: Challenging New Zealand's Gendered Culture*, a short book outlining their interpretation of the history of men and women in New Zealand. In it they rejected the primacy debate — the idea that one hierarchy determines all social experiences — yet went on to argue that just as Britain is a class culture and South Africa a racist culture, so New Zealand is a gendered culture. By this they meant that, in New Zealand, the inequalities of class, sex and race are expressed through the structures of masculinity and femininity. They hoped that through their analysis of the past and present gendered nature of New Zealand society their study would help 'to facilitate the pursuit of a fairer society'. In 1994 a second edition

of *Gender, Culture & Power: Challenging New Zealand's Gendered Culture* appeared. What has changed?

The immediate answer to that question is 'not very much'. Indeed many of the pages are word for word the same. Some of the statistical information on issues like employment and violence has been updated and the 1989 subheading 'The Gendered Culture: creating order or disorder in the 1980s?' has been changed to 'The Gendered Culture: creating order or disorder?' but the content of the section remains the same. There is a new section, 'Consumer Sovereignty and the Gendered Culture', and some fairly major revisions to the sections 'Violence as an Instrument of Male Authority' and 'Female Culture: being the victim'. And of course the cover is new. But is this enough to warrant a second edition? *Gender, Culture & Power* was a product of its times. Its 1980s feel was reflected in the use at the beginning of the book of Murray Ball's *Footrot Flats* cartoon to epitomize gender relations in New Zealand. By 1994 Ball had ceased to produce the cartoon strip, and was infamous for his suffrage year publication *The Sisterhood*. Yet in the second edition of James and Saville-Smith's work Wal and Cheeky Hobson remain. The continued inclusion of the *Footrot Flats* section points to the larger problem with this work: too much of *Gender, Culture & Power* is outdated.

In the last five years the literature on gender has grown enormously. This is not reflected in *Gender, Culture & Power*. It should be. One of the most influential exponents of using gender as an analytical category is Joan Wallach Scott. Scott argues that gender is one of the important ways that relationships of power are expressed. This is what James and Saville-Smith are trying to argue for New Zealand. But rather than acknowledge or engage with the debates people like Scott are creating, James and Saville-Smith reiterate their 1989 references.

Readers more familiar with historical rather than sociological writings on New Zealand will find the first half of *Gender, Culture & Power* puzzling. James and Saville-Smith argue that the reason gender is the dominant motif in New Zealand is due to the struggle over land between Maori and Pakeha, and the struggle between Pakeha males and females. They argue that this led to two male cultures — the family man, and the man alone — and to a single female culture, the cult of domesticity. It will come as a surprise to many that they argue that these cultures were not imported into and adapted within New Zealand, but are indigenous. Before the Pakeha gendered culture was created, James and Saville-Smith portray a golden age for Maori gender relations. They argue that the imposition of the gendered culture had a 'fatal impact' on Maori society. Like many of their historical claims, they offer little or no evidence to back up their interpretation.

In the 1980s feminists began moving away from the idea that all women shared a common history and thus could be studied together as a united sisterhood. All women in New Zealand do not, and did not, belong to the cult of domesticity. Likewise, all men cannot be divided into the man alone and the family man. As the growing literature on masculinities makes clear, plurality must be acknowledged and understood. *Gender, Culture & Power* was part of the tail end of the 'sisterhood' phase. It is a pity that the book was not simply reissued rather than pretend to be a second edition.

CAROLINE DALEY

The University of Auckland