

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

THE POLITICS OF ART-MAKING

A Socialist-Feminist Critique

A thesis submitted to
the Department of Sociology
Massey University

in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

by

Christine Maree Cheyne

1985

ABSTRACT

In this thesis I wish to respond to the claim that there is a need to elaborate a proper and useful relationship between sociology and art; that is, to find out what, if any, limitations there are to a sociological analysis of art. To a large degree, sociological approaches to literature have provided insights useful and similar to the present focus of artistic production.

There are some who claim that sociology cannot replace or substitute art criticism, that the aesthetic merit of any work is beyond the scope of sociological analysis. This is a position which I consider to be flawed. Even those who correctly criticise the reductionist tendencies of some sociological approaches nevertheless do not properly acknowledge the changing nature of what is considered to be of aesthetic quality.

To ask the question 'What is art?' is, in fact, to ask about that which is considered to be art by society, or - more correctly - by certain of its key members. Consequently, a range of definitions of art and related practices are excluded.

In this thesis, I focus on women's experience, in the light of the evidence of the way in which women's art has traditionally been ignored or devalued.

The origins of aesthetics as a distinct discipline (the study of the nature of art) are seen to be linked to other social and historical developments; that is, the prior and accompanying constitution of art itself as a self-contained discourse and practice. Feminists, in particular, whose focus involves a concern with cultural production, have pointed to the way in which art is socially-constructed. They have sought to address the way in which the dominant discourse about art has contributed to the disadvantages and inferior position experienced by women in the arts and, indeed, to the wider societal oppression of women. Through the arts, male-defined representations of the world are valued, and the very notion of 'artist', as it has been commonly held, has reinforced women's secondary status.

A socialist-feminist critique is outlined, in terms of its challenge to conventional art-critical practices. It recognises the constraints imposed on women by art critics in their gatekeeping capacity. The role of the state in the patronage of the arts is seen as another example of the political nature of cultural production, and the discourse within which the state's role is defined and practised is seen to be a political and ideological exercise.

A socialist-feminist approach requires the validation of women's realities, in particular, and a general rejection of representations that distort or mystify social relations in the interests of hegemonic ideologies. In addition to the critique of the content of images, it seeks to transform the structural elements of cultural production.

To generate a specific prescription, of a conclusive and exhaustive nature, for a genuinely democratic form of art practice is inappropriate. Instead, for the requirements of an authentic socialist-feminist critique, the political nature of cultural production and the changing conjunctural aspects of cultural production are to be fully acknowledged and incorporated.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Numerous persons, in various ways, have assisted me in the completion of this thesis, not all of whom I will be able to mention here, or adequately thank. There are some people in particular to whom I wish to express immense gratitude. To Bev James, my primary supervisor, for her insistence that the project would be completed when it was, and for her valued and necessary criticism and confidence in my endeavours, go special thanks. Steve Maharey has also been faithful and helpful in a supervisory capacity. Many times I wished for less rigorous demands from them in terms of theoretical sophistication and clarity of written expression, but their genuine interest and positive support saved me from too much despair. Allanah Ryan has been a constant source of encouragement and companionship of inestimable worth.

I wish, also, to thank my fellow graduate students in the Sociology Department who have been a valuable source of solidarity and enthusiasm. In particular, the support of Peter Chrisp, and the efforts of Barbara Shaw in diligently and willingly proof-reading, are much appreciated. Thanks are due also to Kay Saville-Smith for her contribution to the proof-reading.

I am most grateful to staff at the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council with whom I've had contact, especially Jo Seton and Jenny Rouse of the Resource Centre, for ever-willing assistance during the course of the research.

I wish to acknowledge those who provided me with the subject of my research. These include the staff in the Sociology Department at Massey University who have imparted to me a profound commitment to sociological enquiry, particularly within the Cultural Studies problematic. In addition, those whose engagement with different modes of signification, including drawing, painting, and writing (especially the poetry of, and critical exchange with, one beloved writer) has delighted, challenged, and intrigued me, must be acknowledged. Albeit unwittingly and unintentionally, they have provided the impetus for this investigation.

Many other friends have sustained me, in a multitude of ways, especially in these last few weeks. Without naming them, I wish to say how important has been their care for me. This particular research effort has been compelling in its complexity, and enriching in a variety of ways - and is, in reality, unfinished.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	(i)
Acknowledgements	(iv)
Table of Contents	(vi)
INTRODUCTION	1
Art as a site of struggle	
Theoretical and Methodological Considerations	
Outline of Chapters	
CHAPTER ONE	18
Towards Understanding the Arts in New Zealand	
Sociological Approaches to Art and Culture	
The Cultural Studies Approach	
Hegemony	
Art as Discourse	
The State and Cultural Struggle	

CHAPTER TWO

54

Feminist Theoretical Perspectives

Radical-Feminism

Socialist-Feminism

Feminist approaches to the arts

A Socialist-Feminist Approach to the Arts

CHAPTER THREE

100

The Women's Art Movement

The Women's Art Movement in New Zealand

Discrimination Against Women in the Arts

Art Critics as Gatekeepers

CHAPTER FOUR

145

The Cultural Infrastructure in New Zealand

Arts Council Funding

The Political and Ideological Aspects of State Patronage

Official Discourse

Theorising the Role of the State

CHAPTER FIVE

197

The present debate

The future direction of the women's art movement

APPENDICES A to F

219

BIBLIOGRAPHY

231

INTRODUCTION

Art as a site of struggle

This thesis seeks to examine the process of defining 'art' and the way in which art becomes a site of cultural struggle, a basis for a dominant group's hegemony. It shall be concerned with understanding the implications of prevalent definitions of art for different groups in society. For example, it has often happened that there has been controversy over purchases by art galleries. The various groups involved will not concur on the artistic merit of a particular work. What constitutes 'art' for one section of society may be totally irrelevant in the experience and social expression of others.

It is clearly acknowledged even by those who uncritically assert the superiority of traditional forms of art (ballet, opera, sculpture, painting, classical music, theatre, literature) that one needs to acquire appropriate skills for appreciating those art forms. On the other hand, there are those who claim that the aesthetic quality of those artistic products is minimal

2

or non-existent for some people, and that other creative pursuits are more meaningful and valuable. The outcome of this is to question the differential allocation of value and reward to various art forms and artists. This may be considered to be the 'politics of art'.

One significant concern within this broad focus is the receptivity of gatekeepers in the arts to the work of women artists. Art is socially-constructed, and that art is embedded in social structures and social relationships. In particular, we shall be concerned here with what constitutes 'good' art. It is quite apparent that for certain groups (especially the working-class, non-European cultures, and feminists) both the traditional forms of art and the established canon of art (that is, those pursuits that are valued and deemed to be legitimate art) are irrelevant (in terms of expression of the realities of those groups), and that these traditional forms are exclusive of other types of art. These are the artistic and literary products which become valid objects of academic and critical study, of reproduction and publication, of preservation and reservation in museums, art galleries, and libraries. Lauter, in looking at the impact of race and gender in the shaping of the American literary canon since the 1920s, defines the canon as:

"... that set of authors and works generally included in basic American literature college courses and textbooks, and those ordinarily discussed in standard volumes of literary history, bibliography, or criticism... The literary canon is, in short, a means by which culture validates social power." (Lauter, 1983:435)

The 'politics of art' approach includes examination of class- and gender-based differential treatment of art and its producers. A basic theme is that women's socialisation, and the structural constraints which they experience, place them in an inferior position in relation to men who work as artists. Women's traditional exclusion from the world of art and the frequent, even systematic neglect of women artists is not a result of any natural, inherent disability. Despite massive resistance to the ideas of women as artists, and even if theirs wasn't the accepted product, some women nevertheless have produced work which has, though often retrospectively, been accorded recognition.

The claim that I shall be examining in this thesis is that the things which are considered to be 'real art' or 'great art' and those who produce such things are the outcome not of some intrinsic quality, but are so defined because of the way in which they serve the interests of those who are powerful. In particular, I wish to challenge those definitions that have excluded or misrepresented women. Often, such definitions have been justified through appeals to biological factors; women's biological difference from men has been upheld as the source of their alleged artistic incompetence. Here, I shall be identifying extrinsic forces, societal power structures which have their origins in economic inequality but which also have ideological manifestations.

It becomes evident that

" ... in the arts as in a hundred other areas, things remain stultifying, oppressive, and discouraging to all those - women included - who did not have the good fortune to be born white, preferably middle-class and, above all, male. The fault lies not in our stars, our hormones, our menstrual cycles, or our empty internal spaces, but in our institutions and our education - education understood to include everything that happens to us from the moment we enter, headfirst into this world on meaningful symbols, signs and signals."(Hess and Baker, 1973:7-8)

Moreover, art may be used by a particular group in society for the purpose of maintaining the group's hegemony. In this thesis, I examine the contention that that 'great art' serves as a symbol of bourgeois culture, a means of perpetuating bourgeois power.

The thesis thus challenges the prevalent idealist understanding of art as something that is universal, which transcends society, social production, and social receptivity, and which becomes part of a 'Great Tradition' (as in the Leavisite approach to culture). Leavis (1960) believed that there was such a thing as a 'Great Tradition' - a collection of literary works which were unquestionably of a superior quality due to their formal attributes, a collection to which new works would be added if they conformed to the same standard. Leavis did not believe that literary criticism could be subjected to philosophical or sociological analysis, that categories of literary criticism could not be challenged by any other

methodological approach, precisely because they were the critic's intuitive response to a reading. Eagleton (1976:179) describes this feature of bourgeois criticism as "intuitionist rhetoric". This notion of a 'Great Tradition' necessarily implies an idealist conception of art, as criteria of aesthetic worth are not to be traced to relations at the material level of society. In challenging the notion of the 'Great Tradition', which is legitimated by art/literary criticism, Wolff (1983:16) claims that

"... aesthetics can take no reassurance from criticism that 'the great tradition' really is great. The great tradition (in literature, art and any other cultural form) is the product of the history of art, the history of art history, and the history of art criticism, each of which, in its turn, is the social history of groups, power relations, institutions and established conventions..."

In looking at how art is socially constructed, I will use the feminist approach to cultural production and examine discrimination against women's art and women artists. I will argue that there is not 'open entry' to the Great Tradition, and that the notion of the Great Tradition serves the ideological hegemony of the economically and politically powerful.

While seeking to debunk conventional definitions of art, the definition of artistic practice used in this thesis is derived from a particularly western concept of art. Therefore, the thesis does not engage with the implications of Maori and other

kinds of work, although it will be noted that one of the actions of the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council has been the establishment of a Maori and South Pacific Arts Council (MASPAC).

I am particularly interested in the criticisms made by the women's art movement concerning women's relationship to the art-world. The 'second wave' of feminism in the 1960s saw the emergence of the women's art movement, especially in Australasia, North America and Britain. The movement has drawn attention to the documentation (or, more correctly, the lack of documentation) of women artists by revealing the extent to which art history has ignored or devalued women. It has identified a hierarchy of the arts in which women are to be found predominantly in the art forms which are considered to be of inferior status, usually those activities secondary to 'great' art, the crafts. Indeed, the familiar phrase "art and crafts" embodies the distinction between the two activities and conveys the order of the two - with art ranking first.

The women's art movement has generated inquiry into the opportunities for exhibition of women's art work; the availability of professional training for women; attitudes towards the professionalism of women artists; and the involvement of women in the arts and in various arts organisations, as critics, teachers, and as gallery directors/curators. It has influenced the content of art by encouraging new subjects and themes. It has sought to reclaim the work of women and to assert its validity and proper status. To this end it has promoted the establishment of alternative systems such as women-only galleries, women's art journals, and

women's art networks.

In addition, there has been recognition, by both art historians and contemporary artists, of the discrimination against women artists manifested in the disproportionately lesser share of the financial resources for artists going to women. These exclusions will be seen to reflect more generalised practices of women's oppression in our society and thus to dismiss them as chance events, or the results of individual choice, is impossible. The art-world is a series of institutions and practices inscribed within a society whose dominant discourse is overwhelmingly patriarchal and bourgeois. The point is not that gatekeepers in the art-world necessarily have consciously sexist attitudes (although this is possible), but that gatekeepers are both located in, and accept, a position of service to the interests of a society in which women are economically and politically marginalised. As with any imposition of a judgment which normalises one particular form or practice, alternative forms and practices are subsequently marginalised.

Within the women's art movement, a smaller group has advocated a specifically feminist approach to women's relationship to art. A distinction between women's art, or women artists, on the one hand, and, on the other, feminist art, or feminist artists, is not a trivial^{matter} of semantics. It is a fundamental difference in political motivation, and one that must be constantly held in mind throughout this thesis.

I will go on to define the two terms in more detail, but here it will suffice to record Carole Shephard's observation (1983:25):

"There are many many women involved with art making but most perpetuate the stereotypes produced by men for many centuries."

The activities of feminist artists take place largely because of, and despite, the resistance of the mainstream art world.

The thesis, then, specifically addresses itself to the practice of women's art, in response to the traditional invisibility or devaluation of their work. It recognises patterned processes of exclusion and oppression which suggest that art may be used effectively to reinforce social structures and relations which operate to allocate power to those of a certain class, gender, and race.

For the purposes of this thesis, the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council, as the established source of policy regarding arts activities and financial resources (which are, in fact, public monies) will be considered as representative of the 'mainstream art world'. For the year ended 31 March 1983 the Arts Council had an income of just over \$5 million, and despite its keen desire to be recognised for functions other than solely funding (for example, policy-making, administration, promotion, and education) the Arts Council remains the major source of financial assistance for New Zealand artists and its monetary grants are the focus of much public interest, to the relative exclusion of its other activities. The thesis shall examine the distribution of funds to visual artists only. By looking at the mechanisms of

exclusion from and inclusion of particular artists in the number who apply for and receive Arts Council grants, it will be possible to map out the conditions for successful applications for funding. Such factors as the membership of the visual arts adjudication panel, the aesthetic criteria employed, and the nature of the cultural infrastructure (including the process of seeking a grant) combine to create a situation which reinforces the hegemony of the state and which thereby disadvantages certain (oppositional) kinds of art.

The primary focus of the thesis is on the discriminatory effects of the Arts Council's activities. The Arts Council's response to feminist art will provide one instance of 'censorship' of art that criticises the existing hegemony. Feminist art historians and sociologists of art have demonstrated that bias of the male art establishment, and this thesis will employ the methods and theories of a feminist critique of cultural products.

Theoretical and Methodological Considerations

The position of women artists is one that is increasingly emerging as a focus of concern of the women themselves, of feminist scholars in general, and of many art historians, some critics, and a few arts administrators. As shall become clear, the position of women artists, particularly in relation to government funding, has been addressed critically by the arts councils of Canada and Australia. In New Zealand there have been two major occasions on which the matter has been examined. In

September, 1983, a seminar, convened in part by the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council, on 'Sexism in the Arts' took place; and in May, 1985, a seminar on 'Issues in Feminist Art' was organised in conjunction with a gathering of Australian and New Zealand artists in Auckland. At both these events the need for research into the position of women working in the arts has been articulated along with demands for non-sexist criticism of the arts and various other forms of action. The present study represents a preliminary enquiry into the political and ideological aspects of the real, though very sketchily documented, discrimination which women artists experience. It stands as a piece of research in the 'sociology of art', grounded in a feminist epistemology. The 'sociology of art' is defined here, and elsewhere (for example, Wolff, 1983:27) as including

"... a variety of approaches to the arts which insist on comprehending them in their social and historical location, seeing them as constituted in specific conditions and practices of production and reception."

The particular sociological approach of this thesis incorporates the materialist categories of feminist and marxist criticisms. There are, of course, other sociological approaches to , for example, reception aesthetics (as in the work of Jauss, 1982) which asserts that a work of art has no fixed meaning, but instead emerges out of the act of its reception. As such, what is deemed art is a dependent variable. Likewise, a work of art has no absolute, unchanging value: its quality is to be evaluated at each different moment of its reception. The meaning of 'reception aesthetics' is, then, the process of

establishing aesthetic worth in the reception of a work of art or literature. Reception aesthetics necessarily confronts some clearly fundamental questions about the relationship between artists, the arts and society. Criticism is made of certain unexamined, profoundly conservative, assumptions about art that guide those who assert the purely inherent 'artistic' nature of particular works that exists independent of the act of reception.

The research for this thesis has been both theoretical and empirical. Any research strategy must, of course, strive to recognise and articulate its assumptions. According to a Marxist epistemology, it is not possible to occupy a neutral, disinterested locus of observation, so that any subsequent conceptual system is founded on a set of values. Moreover, because, for Marxists, society is class-based, the values defined are class-based. They represent class interests. Socialist-feminism is predicated on the belief that not only class, but the social position of gender provides a similar set of values, so that reality for women is different from men's reality.

The theoretical component of the thesis falls into two parts. Firstly, there is an examination of the Cultural Studies problematic, and its fundamental belief that culture is a site of struggle. Work within the Cultural Studies problematic has most frequently examined objects and process of working-class culture, or oppositional cultures, such as the study of the development of the popular press (Open University Popular Culture Course Team, 1982a), the construction of meaning in advertising (Open University Popular Culture Course Team, 1981), and the impact of

mass media. The Cultural Studies approach has reacted to the narrow, elitist conceptions of culture propounded by such writers as Leavis (1960) and Arnold (1961), and the stress that had previously been placed on great works of art has now been displaced by a view which militates against the allocation of priority to any particular area of culture. Consequently, there has been a welcome and necessary flood of work in areas of cultural practice that have been peripheral or devalued.

Overall, Cultural Studies is concerned with the ideological and political aspects of culture and the significance of cultural production as a site of struggle. Studies not only of oppositional culture, therefore, but also of practices more readily identified with bourgeois or 'high' culture are significant to this wider concern. This study of the cultural infrastructure, discourse surrounding the arts in New Zealand, and the state's involvement in the arts, will generate further understanding of the ideological hegemony through cultural practices and formations. While Cultural Studies theorists reject bourgeois definitions of art, it is nevertheless true that art remains as a social construction.

Firstly, then, it is the nature and impact of this social construction and its potential for re-articulation that I want to investigate. The theoretical contribution of Antonio Gramsci will be the basis for understanding the role of cultural practice.

Mouffe (1981:182) describes Gramsci's position:

"For Gramsci culture is not an ideological state apparatus and the issue is not to make a clean sweep of bourgeois culture. It must be transformed and submitted to another principle of articulation. This means that the organic intellectuals of the proletariat must be able to engage with the heights of bourgeois culture and engage with its most eminent representatives... Unfortunately, with a few exceptions, this form of activity has not been *very prevalent in the working-class movement where the characteristic stance has been defined* by sterile denunciations of the class character of bourgeois culture and to the construction of the greatest possible distance from it."

Secondly, I shall provide an outline and evaluation of the major feminist perspectives, particularly in regard to the understanding of cultural production and reproduction. I then develop a socialist-feminist analysis of cultural production to examine the political and ideological nature of the Arts Council as a powerful influence on artistic expression in New Zealand.

This socialist-feminist framework for studying social phenomena will be employed for the reason that it provides, as I shall argue, a more legitimate view of reality. The assumption is that whereas the oppressor-group's view of reality is ideological, thus concealing the fuller experience of groups in society, the view of reality of oppressed groups, on the other hand, is more comprehensive because it reveals not only the experience of the oppressed but is able to more adequately explain the standpoint of the oppressor-group(s).

The empirical aspect of the research involves analysis of documents and textual material: statements by the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council, discourse about the arts by other commentators, statements on artistic work by arts critics; and examination of the structure and activities of the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council. This includes investigation of the funding practices of the Arts Council. As well as looking at the general position in regard to the source of funding and distribution priorities, I have gathered data on the allocation of funds to visual artists and the different experiences of male and female artists. This process of gathering material took place from late 1983 to early 1985. During that time, I also engaged in some conversations with Arts Council employees - specifically M. Volkerling (Director), J. McCormack (Visual Arts Advisory Officer), and J. Seton (Resource Officer). From these, I sought information concerning the process of applying for funds, the attitudes of the Arts Council to criticisms of its funding practices, and awareness about tendencies of discrimination against women.

As mentioned above, I attended a seminar on 'Sexism in the Arts' in late 1983, at which the experiences of women who were involved in the different art forms (music, theatre, literature, as well as the visual arts) was the focus of enquiry. During the course of the seminar there was powerful evidence of discrimination against women in many areas relating to art-work: training, teaching, funding, criticism, exhibition. It was evident that in subtle and not-so-subtle ways, women artists encountered disadvantages similar to those experienced by women in so many other areas of life.

It appeared that a feminist strategy is not straightforward, for the very nature of art, as it is understood, is part of the structured oppression of women. The matter of an authentic feminist artistic practice therefore demands a profoundly self-critical approach.

The major difficulty in the course of the research has been the overwhelming lack of research already existing. There have been few sources of useful data about the population of artists, for example, and about the response of New Zealanders to the activities undertaken or promoted by the Arts Council. I was even told that figures used by Arts Council representatives to indicate the degree of interest in cultural activities frequently had no basis in research but were based on individual, untested assumptions. This has been a constant frustration, but at the same time the employees of the Arts Council with whom I have had contact have been very willing to assist with providing material, including such things as the minutes of Visual Arts Adjudication Panel meetings, and examples of applications by artists for funding.

My relation to the visual artists themselves, whose practice has been the focus of this theoretical work, has been ambivalent. My role as academic and sociologist (two activities which are perceived by artists as being incompatible with their own endeavours) has been one other source of limitation in this research. Finally, my own individual physical and social distance from the art-worlds of Auckland, Christchurch and Wellington have similarly complicated the research process.

Outline of Chapters

The thesis begins by considering ideas about the arts in New Zealand. Chapter One seeks to identify socio-historical factors in the history of New Zealand since British colonisation that have shaped the place of the arts in this society. Integral to this process is the nature of the discourse about the arts in which critics and historians of art and literature have engaged. The chapter examines the relationship between art and society.

The second chapter outlines the contribution of a specifically socialist-feminist approach to cultural production. I describe the features of socialist-feminist theory and argue for its greater logical and practical usefulness over radical-feminism.

In the third chapter, I examine the women's art movement in New Zealand and present some of the issues with which women in the arts have engaged. I shall be striving to make explicit the theoretical underpinnings of this movement, and to show how these have influenced the development, up to the present time, of a feminist critique of the arts.

In the fourth chapter, I consider specifically the impact of state involvement in arts patronage. Not only is the state's role described, but it is also analysed in terms of the way in which state intervention in the arts constitutes a source of hegemony.

In the concluding chapter, I assess the contemporary state of development of the women's art movement and outline a socialist-feminist critique of cultural practices and products.

To summarise, the focus of the thesis is two-fold: firstly, I address the ideas about art: and, secondly, I look at the particular social relations surrounding the production of art. The process and the goal shall be to develop a socialist-feminist critique of the art establishment in New Zealand (including commentary on, and criticism of, the arts and state patronage) for the purpose of providing a more democratic administration of, and participation in the arts.

CHAPTER ONE

Towards Understanding The Arts in New Zealand

This chapter seeks first to describe the rhetoric and assumptions which shape commonly-held ideas about 'the arts' in New Zealand. There has been prolific writing on the status of artists, and on the interest in the arts (including literature) shown by New Zealanders (McCormick, 1940; Curnow, 1960; Chapman, 1976). This has created a discourse within which ideas about the relationship between art/artists and society have been formulated and, indeed, prescribed. Secondly, I shall attempt to critique this reconstruction of the relationship between the arts and society by literary historians and literary critics, in order to lay bare the tendency towards, on the one hand, the mystification of art (separating art and society), and the indifference (even, sometimes, the hostility) shown towards the arts and towards artists. The apathy or resistance directed towards artists might be considered to be inextricably connected

with the isolation of artists which has been generated by the prescriptions of those concerned to implant or nurture 'high culture'. Beatson and Cox (1982:354) discuss the perceived division between everyday life and cultural activities. They state that this split

"... was even more marked in 'new' countries such New Zealand and where what culture there was did not grow out of the first-hand experience of society but was largely imported from England."

The description of the historical context in which cultural production has emerged will usefully situate and illuminate the experience of women artists, which will be considered in a later chapter.

New Zealand's historical frontier society experience has contributed to contemporary ideas both about the status of women (including the nature of relations between men and women, and the nature of women's work), and about the place of the arts. The early settlers, predominantly from the British working-class were preoccupied with the struggle for survival in the difficult physical environment. This is described by Curnow (1960:20):

"The nineteenth-century colonists achieved their migration bodily but not in spirit. It was only within severely practical limits that they could regard New Zealand as a goal rationally) proposed and attained: emotionally (or sentimentally the landing at the antipodes presented itself to them ambivalently. Even as they proclaimed their emancipation, they heard the

trap closing behind them. The shock of so distant a migration, and the recoil of imagination from realities, were to be transmitted through two, three, even four New Zealand generations before poets appeared who could express what it meant to be, or to have become a New Zealander."

Similarly, in Pearson's view (1974:138),

"... these land-hungry settlers were not a reading lot. From the 1890s until the accession of a Labour Government in 1935, their values dominated the country - the values of the puritanical hard-working small farmer. It was a morality hostile to the imagination, to art, even to reading..."

Without wanting to accept uncritically the assumptions concerning the artistic aspirations of the first generation New Zealanders, it is nevertheless undeniable that there has been a certain degree of alienation experienced doubly by women who have worked as artists or writers. These women, as artists, have encountered the indifference, sometimes even opposition, of the larger population to artistic practice, and, as females, they have faced a certain degree of misogyny from their male counterparts.

Phillips describes the development of 'male culture' in New Zealand, the segregation of the sexes, and "the feelings of threat and paternalism with which males have treated New Zealand women" (1980:218). He demonstrates how this separate male culture has resulted in women's experience becoming cast as a

departure from the male norm, and their exclusion from the rewards of power and respect. The same theme has been developed in the work of Simone de Beauvoir (1983), who elaborated the concept of 'alterity' - man as subject, woman as 'Other'. This social construction of woman necessarily has effects on the receptivity of people to the work and the self-expression of women, including women's art-work. The different experience of men and women is a contrast drawn most sharply by Horrocks in referring to the influence of male culture on the work of early male writers (1984:112):

"The links between the artist and the male pioneer encouraged 'Real Men' attitudes in the work of some writers... Art was most real when it was robustly masculine. Fairburn [in The Woman Problem and Other Prose, Auckland, 1967] warned that homosexuals and feminists were corrupting art in various ways ..."

Robert Chapman (1976:76) presents the difficulties, as he perceives them, of New Zealand writers. His analysis can be extended to the condition of practitioners of other forms of art, besides literature:

"... this type of homogeneous society had no acknowledged place for authors, that is, it had ready no paradoxically named 'declassé' division of the middle-class. Also there is not a separate class which is, as a matter of habit, an informed audience."

Horrocks (1984) describes certain historical factors that have produced an attitude and rhetoric surrounding New Zealand's literary culture. (Again, the ideas that are discussed in Horrocks' paper apply similarly to wider cultural production.) He talks about the need felt by New Zealand cultural producers to create their own national culture. They were hostile to culture imported from overseas, and Curnow¹ in particular expounded over and over the importance for New Zealand literary work to be grounded and rooted in New Zealand soil. It was not until the 1930s, however, that it was considered by observers that New Zealand had any nucleus of literature. Before then, there had been only isolated achievement.

Curnow (1973:159) is one such commentator who has sought to examine the consequences of the so-called "thinness and recentness of New Zealand high culture". This perceived absence of an indigenous literary/artistic heritage may have shaped the relationships between artists themselves and between those involved in art-work and those not. On the other hand, Fairburn (1956:146) attributes the indifference of New Zealanders to cultural activities to the effects of state patronage which has fostered

"... the willingness of so many artists, writers, and intellectuals to allow themselves to be sealed off in a sort of "aesthetic world" from the general processes of society and to become a charge on the state."

A causal factor in the change away from a seemingly 'uncultured' condition, which has been identified by at least two

local commentators, is that of economic security. McCormick (1940) describes the impact of the prosperity generated by gold and refrigeration in the southern parts of New Zealand in the late 1880s and 1890s, although he notes that in fact formal public education in the fine arts had been established several years earlier, in 1870 in Otago and eleven years later in Canterbury. In 1882, the Fine Arts Association of New Zealand was established. The School of Design opened in Wellington in 1886 and the New Zealand Academy of Fine Arts in 1889. During the 1870s and 1880s, art societies had been set up in the main centres. These early art societies offered moral support and a degree of financial support for artists, and contributed to the consolidation of art as a feature of social life.

It was not long before efforts were directed to the building of art galleries. Canterbury's opened in 1889 and Otago's in 1890. Providing these institutions, however, was only half the task. The other half was to employ the facilities - in a period when local artists preferred, or felt compelled, to flee the country to study and practise.

In the face of discouragement, particularly the lack of training, publishing and exhibiting opportunities, and the small audiences, the tendency in the first century of New Zealand's European colonisation had been for artists and writers to emigrate. If they did not abandon the country entirely, at the very least some overseas training and experience became the norm. Such was the case, for example, of A.R.D. Fairburn, Katherine Mansfield, Frances Hodgkins, D'Arcy Cresswell, and Jane Mander.

The "poetic malaise of the nineteen hundreds and nineteen-twenties", as McCormick (1940:161) calls it, when explaining that this cultural displacement was experienced far more acutely by poets because of their "almost complete dependence on English literature", could be seen as pervading the practice of other artists. McCormick's own analysis of the situation is particularly perceptive. He says (1940:161),

"For New Zealanders, sometimes of the second colonial generation, to visit in their literary excursions solely a region of scenes, images, and ideas not merely foreign to them but, in some respects, contrary to the facts of their experience - this was different and more dangerous. The most serious effect was not, however, the occasional confusion of seasons in the minds of young readers but the creation of an abstract idealised, often sentimentalised 'literary' world, remote from both poles of reality, the English writer's and colonial reader's."

These literary historians and literary critics have thus been at pains to explain the deficiencies of (high) art in this country. This is summed up by Pearson (1974:12):

"So there is an aching need for art in our country. Of course, there is creation - in thousands of vegetable gardens and at carpentry benches in back sheds; the creative urge always goes to make something immediately useful or money-saving. But we need an art to expose ourselves in a perspective of place and time. But the New Zealander would shy from it because he is afraid to recognise himself."

Pearson's prescription is encapsulated in the title of his essay, 'The Recognition of Reality'. Beneath the surface of such prescriptions there are assumptions about what constitutes 'art' or 'culture'. It is firstly something produced by 'artists' (including writers) rather than something created or enacted by any person in his or her backyard. It is something that is not utilitarian or primarily commercial. These assumptions will be addressed later in this chapter, as we attend directly to the effects of 'high art'/'low (popular, working-class) art' distinctions, and attempt to critique the conventional literary-critical approach.

Oliver (1981), like McCormick, records the consequences of increasing affluence for the state of the arts in New Zealand in the 1940s and 1950s. He describes the significant indirect support for the arts through the provision of jobs (typically through the universities), a shorter working week, increasing personal incomes, and expanded arts content in education. He concludes (1981:449),

"Beneath it all lies a shift in the pattern of consumption, a shift towards the arts encouraged by a level of affluence sufficient to sustain the new appetite for paintings, books and performances."

Horrocks (1984:137) describes the anti-academicism which has characterised literary criticism, and which has called for a "down-to-earth culture, for a move away from 'theory' towards 'reality'." He proceeds to expose the hostile attitudes shown towards critic-theorists, those critics who have a theorised

practice, and seeks to re-assert the importance of theoretically-informed literary - and we may include aesthetic - criticism for contributing to a more adequate analysis of cultural products. Horrocks acknowledges an increasing interest in such an approach to aesthetic/literary criticism (1984:137):

"Theoretical approaches have become much more common in the last few years - not only in literature (in magazines such as And and Parallax, but also in writing about art, sociology (the Journal of the Cultural Studies Working Group), politics (The Republican) and other areas. It's possible (though far from certain) that my comments about the New Zealand quarantine of theory, the embargo on 'pretentious' forms of writing, will soon be out of date."

Sociological Approaches to Art and Culture

Here I shall move on to introduce the work of some of those who have attempted to theorise the relationship between art/culture and society. The first task of theorists is that of defining concepts; but, here, rather than attempt a definition of the elusive term 'culture' or the term, even more problematic, 'the arts', a goal which has defeated so many other writers, I shall review some of the literature which critiques the way 'the arts' are approached, in order to make explicit the assumptions that pervade both academic and lay notions about what constitutes art/culture. Specifically, the focus shall be on the connections

between these definitions and the hegemonic group in society.

By way of entering the study of the relationship between the arts and society, I shall turn to developments in Marxist theory as a source of a materialist sociology of art, which I consider to be more useful, and empirically verifiable, than idealist approaches to art. Within the Marxist theoretical framework two particular elements of Western neo-Marxism have profoundly influenced the course of theorising the non-economic structures and relations of capitalist societies. These are the Gramscian concepts of hegemony, historical bloc, and civil society, and the Althusserian concepts of the political, economic and ideological spheres. I shall address the Gramscian concepts more fully later in this chapter and in discussing the state in Chapter Four.

It is not possible for us to engage fully with structuralist theory (especially that of Althusser) here, and so we must accept some of the received criticisms and move to tentatively adopt some of the more theoretically adequate and practically useful theory of Gramsci. Connell's (1983:138-139) denunciation of Althusser, especially his focus on the politics of Althusserian theorising, is particularly severe:

"As a general theory of society, it is incapable of development except by ever more intricate exegesis of ever more abstruse concepts. For the sake of the working-class, who do actually need (and often want) a decent contribution to socialism from the intellectuals, it should be ditched, as soon and as thoroughly as possible."

Althusser's essay (1971) 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses' undoubtedly was of crucial relevance to the Cultural Studies project of defining culture, through its own particular emphasis on 'practices' rather than ideas, but in several aspects Althusser's theory departed from Cultural Studies through the former's lack of emphasis on cultural struggle, and its functionalist tendencies. Regarding Gramsci's contribution, Jessop (1982:142) argues that when one attempts to look at the operation of the state through levels of the social formation other than that of the economic mode of production, there is

"... a need to break with the cruder forms of state theory and develop more sophisticated analyses of the capitalist state and its role in social reproduction. It is here that the studies of Gramsci and the 'neo-Gramscian' school are most relevant for these theorists have investigated the dialectic of coercion and consent, the specificity of political and state crises, the institutional mediation of ideological practices and their social effectivity..."

The Althusserian thesis of the relative autonomy of the ideological sphere makes it possible for cultural practices to have their own effectivity, to exert some kind of influence on the social formation. Just as economic changes alter the system of gender relations throughout history, so also it is possible to argue that interventions within culture have some potential to transform gender relations. In other words, cultural struggle takes place.

What we have, then is a concept of culture which recognises a political dimension, but does not specify the particular way in which the forms of intellectual and artistic activity are related to economic and political processes. The question remains: what is the relation of culture to political struggle? To answer this, it is necessary to look at a theory of society which acknowledges the specificity and autonomy of cultural forms. The centrality of the Marxist contribution to studies of cultural and artistic production has been recognised by the Birmingham University Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS). It is to the work of the CCCS that we now turn.

The Cultural Studies Approach

Through the work of Cultural Studies theorists there has emerged a recognition of the structural and historical determinations of social situations; while human beings make their own history, they nevertheless do so under conditions which are not of their own making. Without conceding to reductionism or denying the specificity of the cultural level and its practices, cultural formations nevertheless demanded a more structural analysis so as to avoid idealist tendencies, which treated cultural formations without reference to determination. Chambers (cited in Barrett et al., 1979:202) states that the members of the CCCS see their central objective as

"... developing theories of cultural and ideological formations within the broad framework of a Marxist problematic without resorting either to economism or idealism."

The desire to escape economism was influenced by Raymond Williams' rejection of the base-superstructure metaphor.

In espousing a Marxist theory of literature, which he calls 'cultural materialism', Williams goes as far as to assert that there is not a distinction between base and superstructure. He considers this division as being incompatible with a materialist theory of society because it relegates cultural practices and institutions to a separate sphere, with the result that "... none of these [superstructural activities] can then be grasped as they are, as real practices, elements of a whole material social process." (1977:94)

The distinctive concern of Cultural Studies has been with the notion of the 'relative autonomy' of culture. This involves consideration of both the degree of separation of culture from economic and political activities, and also its effects on them. The first task of Cultural Studies theorists was to extend the definition of culture from the narrow usage which included only those artistic and intellectual pursuits which were deemed to be of a certain value or standard, to a broader definition which describes "a particular way of life, which expresses certain meanings and values not only in art and learning, but also in institutions and ordinary behaviour" (Williams, 1961:43). The particular nature of Cultural Studies has been one that has promoted recognition of a relationship between cultural form and

class. In Hall and Jefferson's (1976:10) schema, culture is defined as

"... that level at which social groups develop distinct patterns of life, and give expressive form to their social and material life experience."

The important distinguishing feature of this definition of culture from the less helpful, overly-broad sociological or anthropological definition is the identification of those activities which "give expressive form".

Cultural production includes those social practices which have signification as their primary social function. This is not to deny that all social practices signify, but it is to allow one to move from the abstract, all-encompassing, none-specifying, definition of culture to a more concrete recognition of cultural practice. This somewhat resembles Gramsci's understanding of intellectuals (Mulhern, 1980:33). For Gramsci, all persons are considered to be intellectuals, but not all in society have the function of intellectuals. Likewise, says Mulhern, it is possible to argue that while all social practices signify, not all have signification as their social function. Barrett et. al. (1979:10) offer this definition of cultural production:

"We see cultural products and practices in terms of the relations between their material conditions of existence and their work as representations which produce meanings. In other words, our concern is both with modes of production and with modes of signification."

Two major tendencies have emerged in studies of cultural production. These are structuralism and culturalism, as identified by Stuart Hall (1981).² Maharey (1985, forthcoming) argues that culturalism and structuralism, far from existing in opposition to one another, are in fact complementary. The dichotomous relationship between structuralism and culturalism indeed seems inaccurate, irrelevant and redundant in the face of the notion of determination. The practical consequence of determination is, for Williams, the setting of limits - determination provides the boundaries within which potential human practice is contained.³

The concept of determination is a fundamental component of Marxist theory, integrally linked with the processes of production and reproduction. But Cultural Studies, with its emphasis of human agency, has sought to overcome the reductionism of orthodox Marxism. Within any theoretical formulation there will be elements of both structure and agency. As Clarke et. al. write (1976:11),

"A social individual, born into a particular set of institutions and relations is at the same moment born into a peculiar configuration of meanings which give her access to and locate her within a 'culture'... These structures - of social relationship and meaning - shape the on-going collective existence of groups. But they also limit, modify and constrain how groups live and reproduce their social existence. So the existing cultural patterns form a sort of historical reservoir - a pre-constituted 'field of the possible' - which groups take up, transform, develop. Each group makes something of its starting conditions - and through this practice, culture is reproduced and transmitted."

At the same time as the determination of the base is articulated, it must be remembered that elsewhere (for example, in the Grundrisse in particular) Marx asserted the relative autonomy of those forms of social consciousness. Their dependence on the base is a highly mediated and complex one. The profoundly intricate nature of the dependence of forms of consciousness on the economic base must be exposed without diminishing the degree of autonomy. Culture is therefore seen as relatively autonomous and as a sphere of struggle between opposing groups, each seeking to control the process of the interpretation of meaning. The idea of contestation becomes a key element.

For the Cultural Studies problematic, the production of meaning that constitutes cultural practices is a contested process, a matter for struggle between different classes, races, age groups, genders. It directs one to a view of the social formation as the site where a dominant group or alliance of groups establishes hegemony over subordinate groups and is then able to impose its interpretation. The concept of hegemony is represented as cutting across the apparent dichotomy between the culturalist and structuralist paradigms by enabling a more dynamic and flexible conception of the ways in which the relationships between dominant and subordinate groups are ordered and, thus, how the cultures and ideologies of different groups are related to one another within any given social and historical situation. The importance of conjunctural analysis cannot be diminished in any attempts towards defining a more general theory of society.

Hegemony

Gramsci used the term 'hegemony' to refer to the situation where the ruling class establishes its dominance not only by means of economic strength and coercive methods, but also with the active consent of the dominated groups. This is a unique kind of domination in which the legitimacy of the ruling class is won in a way that makes it appear natural and normal. The dominant culture represents itself as the valid culture. A hegemonic group seeks to contain within its horizons all conflicts and competing definitions of reality. It does not need to specify the content of ideas, but the limits within which a diversity of ideas are contained.

Gramsci's conception of the particular relationship of hegemony (based on intellectual and moral leadership) to dominant groups is worthy of note:

"A social group can, and indeed must, already exercise "leadership" before winning governmental power (this indeed is one of the principal conditions for the winning of such power); it subsequently becomes dominant when it exercises power, but even if it holds it firmly in its grasp, it must continue to "lead" as well." (Gramsci, SPN:57-58)

A hegemonic group is able to define the boundaries of discourse. Yet, at the same time, the condition of the hegemony of one particular dominant group is not permanent, nor universal. It has to be worked for, reproduced and constantly reinforced.

Laclau and Mouffe (1981) argue that the concept of hegemony represented a rupture with economistic and reductionist forms of Marxism, but, in the light of the present stage of advanced capitalism, an even more radical departure is required - so that political subjects are not co-terminous with previously-constituted classes, but are in a process of construction as popular-democratic subjects. Through their articulation to a hegemonic principle, particular ideological elements assume a class identification which is not, however, a necessary inherent feature (Mouffe, 1981b:231).

The concept of hegemony is able to explain how seemingly subversive practices can be incorporated by the dominant group, their oppositional effects defused, and the long-term dominance of a hegemonic group be maintained. Indeed, as Buci-Glucksmann (1980:57) asserts,

"... the effects of hegemony are highly contradictory. The more authentically hegemonic a class really is, the more it leaves opposing classes the possibility of organising and forming themselves into an autonomous political force."

Particularly in the area of the arts, the interests of extending hegemony have made it possible to co-opt cultural products whose anti-bourgeois content has nevertheless become submerged, and the works have been appropriated by the bourgeoisie. This is confirmed by Franca Rame, an actress who works with and is married to Dario Fo, and who, according to McGrath (1981:35) "shocked the Italian theatre by leaving a highly profitable touring theatre circuit ... in order to work in workers' clubs".

She says,

"... it was just at the end of the 1968 season (a true record in terms of takings) that we arrived at the decision to leave the traditional structures of the official theatre. We had realised that, despite the hostility of a few, obtuse reactionaries, the high bourgeoisie reacted to our 'spankings' almost with pleasure. Masochists? No, without realising it we were helping their digestion. Our 'whipping' boosted their blood circulation, like some good birching after a refreshing sauna. In other words, we had become the minstrels of a fat and intelligent bourgeoisie. This bourgeoisie did not mind our criticism, no matter how pitiless it had become, through our use of satire and grotesque technique, but only so long as the exposure of their 'vices' occurred exclusively within the structures they controlled..." (quoted by McGrath, 1981:35)

This clearly points to the need to examine the social and historical conditions from which cultural products take their meaning.

The concept of hegemony has become especially useful for the analysis of advanced capitalist societies in which the bourgeois class has been able to maintain its power and to thwart the transformation to a socialist mode of production. Economistic theories have proved inadequate (because of the way in which economic relations overdetermine all social phenomena) and, instead, a theory of the sphere of culture and ideology has become increasingly relevant.

This ideological sphere is not merely a system of ideas, beliefs, representations, but a body of practices, relationships, and institutions. It is relatively autonomous - that is, it has its own specific dynamic and its own unique effectivity. The connections between the relations of production and ideological forms are to be understood, not in terms of relations of determination, ('in the last instance', or whatever), but in terms of the complex conditions under which hegemonic cultures are constructed. A dominant culture faces competing oppositional elements, and must incorporate these. Rather than being a monolithic tool of the dominant class, hegemonic projects are adaptive, flexible, accommodating changing historical conditions and oppositional struggles and embodying contradictions in its practice of making concessions to oppositional groups.

Hall (1981) outlines in detail the way in which ideology operates. According to his theory, ideologies are not comprised of separate elements, but are the articulation of a series of elements to produce a particular meaning. It is not a question of a class producing the form or content of a signifying practice, but, instead, of the manner in which a system of representation inscribes ideological positions. Moreover, these ideological interpretations are not determined exclusively by class contradictions and struggles. A single concept, thus, can be employed variously by different ideological discourses. The way change occurs, through ideological struggle, is by connecting the elements differently, to give a different meaning. As Hall (1981:33) says,

"Ideologies are therefore a site of a distinct type of social struggle. This site does not exist on its own, separate from other relations, since ideas are not free-floating in people's heads... ideology is a practice. It has its own specific way of working. And it is generated, produced and reproduced in specific settings (sites) - especially, in the apparatuses of ideological production which 'produce' social meanings."

Ideological struggle, then, is an intervention in the practices and institutions which sustain the dominant discourses of meaning in society. In this thesis, I shall be investigating the discursive nature of art and of state patronage of the arts. Ideas about art and about the involvement of the state as a patron of the arts will be seen in the light of their existence as discourse. Using this concept of discourse, the next task will be to examine the power relations that generate the dominance of a particular discourse. The process of achieving hegemonic status through consent is central to this capacity of a certain discursive practice to establish authority.

Art as Discourse

Art, according to Parker and Pollock (1981:115),

"... is one of the cultural, ideological practices which constitute the discourse of a social system and its mechanisms of power. Power of one group over

another is sustained on many levels, economic, political, legal or educational, but these relations of power are reproduced in language and in images which present the world from a certain point of view and represent different positions of and relations to power of both sexes and classes."

Wolff, too, acknowledges that the concept of 'discursive practice' is particularly useful for overcoming reductionist tendencies in sociological approaches to art and retaining the relative autonomy of the aesthetic from the social and political. Laclau (1980:87) defines 'discursive' as more than simply 'text' but as

"... the ensemble of the phenomena in and through which the social production of meaning takes place, and ensemble which constitutes society as such. The discursive is not, therefore, being conceived as a level nor even as a dimension of the social, but rather as being co-extensive with the social as such."

Ideology is seen to operate through the discourse of critics who condition the reception of art.

Gramsci's concept of the 'historical bloc' embodies the ideas of ideology being a source of struggle, between various competing groups, for hegemony. The class which achieves hegemony is that which can turn to its own use the existing ideological elements. It is a process of 'disarticulation' and 'rearticulation' of those elements which together, through the process of their combination and transformation, may come to signify bourgeois or proletarian culture - but of themselves, on

their own, do not. An historical bloc is the unity of diverse groups in such a way that a particular world-view is able to be established, although this is a world-view that is constantly modifying itself. Mouffe (1981b 231) defines an historical bloc as

"... a complex ensemble whose contents can never be determined in advance since it depends of a whole series of historical and national factors and also on the relations of forces existing at a particular moment in the struggle for hegemony."

The unity of any hegemonic project is not established once and for all, but is a matter of constant struggle, in which a certain discourse appropriates ideological elements for its own greater coherence and cohesion. Struggle always takes place within concrete historical forms/sites. The one necessary thing is that they be the most appropriate form for struggle. It is true that on occasions the struggle has been carried out in the 'high' art medium. It is problematic, however, for revolutionary and bourgeois forms to seek co-existence. Typically, those potentially progressive elements are subsumed by the dominant bourgeois culture. For this reason a discourse-theoretical approach, rather than merely a content-analysis approach to cultural production, is demanded:

"It should be remembered that painting itself is a particular form of production which reproduces particular social relations (the relations which establish its meaning and function) in bourgeois society. In any social change, art has at best only a

marginal role. To make paintings serve revolutionary ends, one has to make explicit (that is, unassimilable) revolutionary social relations! Now that means something of a different logical order than painted images of workers or whatever."

This last sentence is especially relevant in the light of recent efforts by those of the middle-class art establishment to produce work about or for the working-class. One example of such work is that of Glenn Busch, who produced Working Men, a large, glossy-paged collection of works gathered in an exhibition in 1984.

To recap, I have argued that hegemony is maintained by incorporating aspects of oppositional codes. Usually this means that the oppositional messages are trivialised, or negated, and that the opposition is weakened by being fragmented. However, incorporation need not always have such a negative consequence. If there were not contradictions, by which the dominant ideology could be questioned and countered, if representation was not a site of struggle for the production of a particular meaning, the same nihilism of structuralist theories which deny the role of agency would be acted out in the domain of art. Human agency is structured, but this does not mean that it is over-determined. The analysis of discourse, which is a means of incorporating diverse elements and articulating them in such a way as to reinforce a group's hegemony, is an essential tool of political and ideological critique. By it, the mechanisms which result in the successful or unsuccessful establishment and maintenance of hegemony can be perceived. What is of interest here is the type of discourse, and its implications for various groups, which

portrays the art world as a neutral and ahistorical terrain. This type of discourse is to be challenged by the view of art as a series of institutions inscribed within a society whose discourse is class- and gender-based.⁴

The State and Cultural Struggle

An important characteristic of cultural production in New Zealand has been the involvement of the state in arts funding. Historically (and more especially in Europe), the financing of artistic production is connected with the emergence of the patronage system. The patrons were not merely people who were devotees of the arts by a particular individual disposition or by a specialised education, but were public figures or institutions who were aware of the way in which art-work could be useful for signifying their power.

A significant element of neo-Gramscian theory is its focus on the state, as one of the principal forces which mediates between class relations and cultural forms. The state has the role of perpetuating and legitimating ideology that maintains inequality in a capitalist society. This activity, however, is not pre-given and unchanging and functionalist tendencies in explanations of the nature of the state are to be vigorously opposed. There are different modes and different degrees of intervention at different historical periods. Specifically, the state's role is that of conforming cultural practice to bourgeois social relations. The state therefore becomes a site of

struggle. In Chapter Four, I will focus more sharply on the issue of state patronage of the arts analysing, in the context of a Gramscian approach, the state's activity in terms of its contribution to the struggle to maintain a bourgeois and patriarchal hegemony.

One of the ways in which the state seeks to ensure the maintenance of the existing relations of dominance and subordination in capitalist societies is by legitimating bourgeois cultural practices and products. An example of this is the establishment of high culture, which by definition, requires a distinction from something that constitutes low culture. It is widely recognised that 'high' culture has served as an efficient means of inculcating and affirming bourgeois values. Similarly, even the illusory concept of 'cultural democracy' (which stresses community participation in artistic pursuits, the relevance of artistic activity, and better access⁵ to the arts for a greater number of people) has been beneficial to bourgeois hegemony, for it has again promoted the appreciation of 'high' culture. The idea of 'community' participation in the arts belies the unchanged hierarchy of art forms and values which is intrinsic to bourgeois cultural phenomena. New criteria must therefore be developed for evaluating art.

It is clearly evident that there are no fixed boundaries between 'high' and 'low' art, but that they are defined and re-defined through cultural struggle. Some previously low or popular forms have now become canonised as high art - for example, the novel, jazz, film and photography. There is an assumption that with the appropriate education all people will

come to appreciate the traditional forms of high art. Attempts to democratise culture are often merely working to expand access to the same 'high' art product. Cultural democracy thus may actually reinforce the existing dichotomy of high and low culture, as in the distinction between 'community arts' and their opponent, 'the arts'. The term, 'community arts', is in this way a euphemism for an activity of secondary importance.

The distinction between high culture and low culture, I would argue, must be explained by examining the economic, social, political and historical forces which have worked to establish it. The highness or lowness of cultural products is not an intrinsic quality, but is the result of judgments from without - judgments which reflect certain social processes. As Roberts (1983:285) says,

"The main issue to be considered in current debates on arts policies is not the accessibility of minority culture, but the legitimacy of the cultural activities of the majority. It is, of course, essential that steps be taken to remove whatever barriers prevent participation in minority culture by those whose interests are in those forms of expression. But it is of more immediate importance that the prevailing value system be changed to broaden the criteria by which merit is assigned to artistic works and, as a corollary, to broaden the representation on the bodies which formulate arts policies and distribute arts funding."

For feminist theorists, the 'high' art/'low' art distinction is particularly significant in that the work of women artists is overwhelmingly categorised as inferior to 'high' art which is

predominantly the work of male artists. This, and the art/craft hierarchy will be examined in Chapter Two.

'High' art, despite the token acceptance of some oppositional work, is an important instrument of bourgeois hegemony, which means that any struggle carried on within that context has to be secondary and limited. It is necessary to address the social meaning with which art is imbued. The work of Bourdieu (1977) develops the idea that the differentiation of aesthetic taste and access to 'cultural capital' is crucial to the reproduction of social divisions. In this sense, Bourdieu's theory may be considered as a type of reception aesthetics (Wolff, 1983:38). Art may be seen as having a symbolic value, as well as its economic value as a commodity, for it is a means by which the bourgeoisie represents its culture and thus its domination. In this way, symbolic systems are sites of class struggle, through which power is legitimised or delegitimised. For some, it is this relation of art to the ruling-class under capitalism that pre-empts or diminishes the potential of art to challenge bourgeois domination.

The foregoing discussion has indicated the importance of the social and historical conditions in which culture is produced, and the way in which cultural practices reproduce ideology. The theory of cultural practices and products which the Cultural Studies problematic has generated may be considered essential for developing a materialist sociology of art. Much of the work of Cultural Studies theorists has been in areas of cultural practice which have been peripheral or devalued, especially working-class culture, and has not been immediately useful for developing

criteria for evaluating what is of greater or lesser aesthetic quality. Wolff (1983:11) applauds the sociological approach to art for its evidence of :

"... the historical, ideological and contingent nature of a good deal of "aesthetics" and many if not all "aesthetic judgments"...[which make] problematic the unquestioned categories of criticism and aesthetics".

However, while insisting on the need for a sociology of aesthetics, she claims that aesthetic value cannot be reduced to social determinants.

Wolff criticises sociological reductionist accounts (that is, those approaches which see art as entirely a social construction) because they avoid confronting the precise matter of aesthetic experience. It is not sufficient for the sociologist to assume a stance of aesthetic neutrality. The concept of culture in the sense of the 'whole way of life' of particular sections of society does not distinguish between practices that are recognisably artistically skilful. Wolff does argue (1981:142-3) that sociology can make a certain contribution:

"... although I would agree that any aesthetic judgment is the product of other, non-aesthetic values, it does not seem to me to have been demonstrated that it is entirely reducible to these... The sociological study of art does not constitute a denial by exposure of aesthetic enjoyment and aesthetic experiences a denigration of cultural production, or an equalisation of all cultural products. The relative value of different works is determined within the discourse of

art and aesthetics, and is not amenable to appropriation by a different discourse (sociology), although the latter can throw light on the origins and development of the former."

She says that even though both the notion of 'art' and the discourse of criticism are able to be historically and socially located, there are works of art which display allegedly transcendent or universal qualities and consequently persist through time and appeal to people beyond the confines of their own social and geographical origin (Wolff, 1983:17).

I want to argue that the factors that enable certain works of art to span time and space in this way are the result of the use to which such products are put, that is, their role in legitimating the power of the dominant group, rather than intrinsic qualities which can be objectively assessed by the discipline of criticism at progressively future stages in their life. The whole idea of the timeless quality of art tends to reinforce as objective the judgements and the practice itself of criticism. Wolff very interestingly concludes her second book Aesthetics and the Sociology of Art (1983:108) with the concession that

"... whatever the direction taken by a sociological aesthetics, one of its most important obligations will be to acknowledge and investigate the specific social and historical conditions of aesthetic experience and evaluation. To that extent, if the debate is between sociology and aesthetics, sociology has the last word."

In this chapter, I have not attempted to produce a comprehensive account of cultural and ideological formations and practices that is non-reductionist. This remains an unfinished and intensely challenging task for Marxist theorists of all kinds. I have, nevertheless, sought to examine art within a materialist sociological framework. According to such an approach, it is not possible to conceive of art and aesthetics in isolation from their origins in society.

One such theory of art, not in the same vein as traditional Marxist approaches to aesthetics, is Dickie's 'institutional theory of art', which was used by Daly (1977) in her research on the impact of the New Zealand "artworld" in defining that which is legitimate. According to this theory, there is a social institution, the artworld, which decrees that certain products and practices are 'art'. Like labelling theories, it is an inadequate means of explaining why it is particular institutionally-located persons and groups (and not others) who determine the condition of art in their time, and why certain traditional forms are favoured. Daly's thesis is significant in that it is one of few pieces of research undertaken in the context of local art production and criticism, but her conclusion (1977:113) is in fact most inconclusive:

"It is people who determine the condition of art in their own time; they choose what they find lacking in significance, and they embellish the aspects of the tradition which they find meaningful and enchanting. The present condition of sculpture in New Zealand, and all the other arts, is of our own making, and its future too will be decided by all the members of the artworld here."

Dickie appears to assume that any person who sees himself or herself as an "officer of the artworld" can confer the status of art on an artefact. Daly (1977:20) recognises that this is not very helpful because it leads to no meaningful distinction between art and non-art. But again she fails to pursue the enquiry that her observations compel; that is, to find out why certain definitions are legitimate and publically recognised. She simply says:

"Nevertheless, through the workings of the social institution, "the artworld", the situation is held in control. We have preferences and make judgments about the quality of all those art works, categorising them as good/not good, exciting/boring and so on. We consider some persons better able than others to judge the worth of these works of art and we consider that exceptional works should receive appropriate public exposure." (1977:29)

Who the "we" are remains unanswered. Moreover, institutional theories do not offer any explanation of the nature of the aesthetic experience.

To insist on their social determinants is not to deny the specificity of the aesthetic element in certain products and practices, but it does mean that the aesthetic can and must be situated; it both is the effect of, and has effects on, social relations and structures. The primary significance of Cultural Studies is that it demands the introduction of a political analysis of culture. Sparks (1977:17) alludes to this distinctive feature of Culture Studies:

"The crisis of literary criticism was not, as is sometimes supposed, that it gave exclusive attention to 'great writers' and 'great works of art', and that this provided no basis for the study of 'popular culture'... The real origins of the crisis were quite precisely political. The dominant tradition was openly unashamedly and profoundly anti-democratic; cultural studies, from its inception, was a champion of democracy."

In the following chapter, I shall be exploring the development of feminist theory about art and art criticism, in response to the significant interest of feminists in cultural formations and cultural practice. Many of the themes which have been introduced here, in regard to the theory of ideology and the concept of hegemony, will be seen to be central to feminist cultural politics and strategies for change. In the third chapter, I shall examine the nature of the women's art movement in New Zealand, particularly its relationship to, and critique of, the cultural infrastructure. In Chapter Five, I shall also return to the issue of aesthetic value, and examine the contribution of feminist theory to the debate about the assessment of artistic worth. Of particular interest will be the contribution of Michele Barrett (1982), who has addressed this dilemma of defining and assessing aesthetic qualities without having recourse to bourgeois, idealist conceptions of art.

For the present, I have primarily sought, in this chapter, to bring into critical focus some conventional ideas about indigenous cultural production, and to argue for the need to

approach the phenomenon - that is, indigenous cultural production - in a theoretical manner, so as to become aware of the ideological processes and purposes of those conventional perceptions.

FOOTNOTES

(1) See, for example, the introduction to A Book of New Zealand Verse 1923-45 (1945) and the introduction to A Book of New Zealand Verse (1960).

(2) See also Maharey in New Zealand Cultural Studies Working Group Journal 1982,3:15. According to Bennett (1981b:25), the culturalist tradition was that which developed in Britain. Structuralism was a response to the translation of diverse cultural theories from Europe which emphasised the underlying structures which produced the surface appearances of cultural forms. These theories included the work of Barthes (in the areas of film and literary criticism), of Levi-Strauss (in anthropology), of Lacan (in psychoanalysis), and Althusser (in his work on the Marxist concept of ideology), all of whom trace the origins of their structuralist method to the work of Ferdinand de Saussure in linguistics.

(3) This is consistent with Marx's fundamental principle that all forms of consciousness are determined, to a greater or lesser degree, by the social relations that characterise the economic

mode of production of a given society. This principle is contained in the famous statement to be found in the 1859 Preface to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy:

"In the social production which men [sic] carry on they enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will; these relations of production correspond to a definite stage of the development of their material powers of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society - the real foundation on which legal and political superstructures arise and to which definite forms of social consciousness correspond. The mode of productions of material life determines the general character of the social, political, and spiritual processes of life. It is not the consciousness of men [sic] that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being determines their consciousness."

(4) It should be noted that Weir and Wilson (1984:84) have cautioned against certain tendencies in discourse-theoretical approaches, particularly in relation to the implications for the struggle of women:

"Within the promiscuous and agnostic world-view of the discourse analysts there can be no way of establishing social or political priorities, and hence no prospect of evaluating a genuinely emancipatory strategy. The result is a political relativism which cannot be progressive."

(5) According to Pearson (1982:109), the notion of access is not unproblematic:

"Access can mean simply allowing people entry to the inner sanctum of art - an entry that will lead to their becoming better and more civilised people. Access can mean no more than that which the professional classes find interesting and important should be made, in an unaltered form, available to the rest of the population."

CHAPTER TWO

Feminist Theoretical Perspectives

This chapter opens with an outline and analysis of two major feminist theoretical perspectives, radical-feminism and socialist-feminism. The reason for undertaking this theoretical discussion is to expose the assumptions that are embodied in each approach, and also to gain an understanding of the nature of the contemporary women's art movement and the nature of its critique of the art establishment. It will be argued that in fact the present general direction of women's art is founded on radical-feminist premises and, as such, does not constitute an adequate base for challenging the hegemonic processes of the art establishment. I shall move on to consider the opportunities for a more thorough-going critique that are afforded by a socialist-feminist approach to cultural production.

It must be emphasised that the terms 'radical-feminism' and 'socialist-feminism' are each used to incorporate a number of strands of theoretical work which share similar basic assumptions. However, it is important to appreciate the fact that each is not a uniform or homogeneous body of theory, but that there are areas of divergence among the various strands. In particular, the development over time of each body of theory has brought about changes. For example, some radical-feminists have recognised the inaccuracy of tendencies toward universalising women's experience of oppression.

Although it is not possible to provide a blueprint of what constitutes women's world-view (since women themselves do not constitute a homogeneous group), there are a number of identifiable features of a feminist epistemology and elements of a female perspective on reality that is distinctive because of women's position in the sexual division of labour. Furthermore, women's unique experiences of menstruation, pregnancy, childbirth, and lactation are part of their material reality and have epistemological consequences. In referring to these biological aspects, I am not establishing a biological determinism. Nevertheless, it would be false to exclude the biological dimension. Spender (1980:77) expresses it thus:

"The possibility of women and men generating different meanings can be conceptualised without recourse to biology as a form of monocausation (the product of a monodimensional reality)."

Of those who do assert the existence of meanings that are specific to women (for example, Adrienne Rich, 1980, and Dorothy Smith, 1978), Spender says that they should not necessarily be rejected because of such charges of biological determinism - for women and men are considered by these writers to be located in different positions in patriarchal society and this produces gender-differentiated meanings and world-views. She concludes (1980:78),

"... if women were to gain a public voice, they would in many instances supply very different meanings from those which have been provided, and legitimated by males."

This, however, does not overlook the very real cross-cutting of female experience by such attributes as age, sexual orientation, class and race. Without making claims about a homogeneous, superior female experience, one may describe a standpoint or world-view that is particular to women (especially their relationship to sexuality and domesticity, for example). Indeed, it is imperative that feminist scholars attempt this, in order to debunk the ways that women's experience has been distorted, mystified or repressed.

Radical-Feminism

The fullest extension of radical-feminist theory argues that there are psychological and biological differences between the sexes. This argument may have dangerous implications: biological determinism and reductionism. Biological determinism in regard to sex differences refers to the argument that the biological characteristics of males and females determine the manifestation of gender-differentiated behaviour. Reductionism refers to the tendency to reduce the cause of women's oppression to the biological facts of female experience.

For Firestone (1971), the most basic social unit is the biological family, which is seen as 'natural'. While there is undoubtedly some degree of relationship between human biology and human social organisation, Jaggar (1983) finds that it is strange that for radical-feminists and sociobiologists, the evolution of biology is not considered to be a historical process, but a natural one (dependent on genetic mutation for change). Without ignoring the critical difference between sociobiological and radical-feminist forms of biological-determinism, it is pertinent to make some comments about the political and ideological implications which are common to both theories. Because of the causal relationship posed between genetic factors and the social world, the potential for social change is severely reduced. Biological determinism is in fact used by sociobiologists to justify the maintenance of racist, sexist and classist structures.

As Jaggar (1983:107) says,

"Overwhelmingly, though not necessarily, such theories tend to encourage a sort of fatalism: either they claim that we must adapt society to take account of whatever basic unchangeable human propensities they assert, or else they claim that a society closely resembling the presently existing one is inevitable."

However, biological-determinist arguments are employed differently by radical-feminists and sociobiologists. The former acknowledge that biological givens are reinforced by social institutions which uphold male supremacy, but they do not agree that biology or anatomy are destiny. Radical-feminists (such as Firestone, 1971) anticipate that the freedom of women will become possible with the development of reproductive technology. The latter have used biologicistic arguments to claim that women's subordination is natural and inevitable, because biology is fixed.

Radical-feminists tend towards biological determinism in their perceptions of male biology. Because men lack the capacity to bear children, they are also deprived of a whole matrix of qualities that women are supposed to embody as a result of innate psychological features that are linked to their potential to give birth. This leads radical-feminists to celebrate those things that are uniquely female, particularly women's biological processes. Perceived psychological differences between men and women are traced to biological differences.

Without engaging in an examination of the complex process of the construction of gender identities, it suffices to say that women and men, being born into a gender-structured society, experience reality differently. At the same time, it is important to realise that the construction of gender is not reducible to the biological, nor to some innate psychological quality of femininity. Hence, women's particular way of acting and perceiving is not pre-determined once and for all, unchanging, or absolute. Radical-feminism, in allocating more causal primacy to the biological reproductive difference between males and females than to other divisions, thus tends towards a biological determinism.

Socialist-feminism

Socialist-feminists find these radical-feminist arguments untenable for the following reasons:

- they do not give sufficient attention to the diversity of women's experience of oppression through history and in contemporary societies;
- they do not offer an effective strategy for political change; women's reality becomes immutable, with hope being found only in a separate women's world; and

- the concept of a woman's culture, an essentially female form of acting is without material foundation.

Socialist-feminism itself is in a process of theoretical and practical development. In many ways it is close to the values and vision of radical feminism: in its rejection of the public/private distinction, a concern for ecology, and the transformation of sexuality and procreation. When these themes appear in feminist art-work, they are not exclusively the subject of either radical-feminism or socialist-feminism. It is the impact of the work of art, its relation to social change, that determines the feminist political implications of a particular work. For radical-feminists, the logical extension of the subject-matter of art is to construct a society where women and men are polarised because of their fundamental biological difference. For socialist-feminists, there is an awareness that struggle incorporates the eradication of class oppression - which generates divisions among the total female population, between bourgeois and proletarian women, and within the total male population, between bourgeois and proletarian men. Thus, the transformation of ideologies of procreation and sexuality, for example, though an issue for both radical-feminists and socialist-feminists, will ultimately work towards different ends for each.

The defining characteristic of socialist-feminism is its adherence to historical-materialism as a method for understanding social reality, so that even when some of the assumptions of socialist-feminists appear to tend towards radical-feminism (because they attribute different experiences and perceptions of

reality to women and men on the basis of physiological differences), nevertheless they can be distinguished from those of radical-feminism.

Socialist-feminism has extended the concept of the material base to include

"...the set of social relations which structures the production and reproduction of the necessities of daily life, the production of people, including the production of sexuality, as well as the production of goods and services" (Jaggar, 1983:332).

In contrast to mainstream Marxist and neo-Marxist theories, for which gender relations are unproblematic, it requires the dual focus on class and gender as bases of oppression, but it constitutes more than the supplementing of Marxist categories with feminist categories. This has been the traditional Marxist position - to make 'the woman question' an addendum, an auxiliary to the central 'class question'. The problem with this 'additive' approach, as socialist-feminists recognise, is that it implies that issues of gender and race merely multiply the degree of oppression that exists, whereas in fact they radically alter the quality of that oppression. Women's reality is perceived by socialist-feminists to be mediated not only by class location but also by patriarchy, the system of subordination in a world which is male-dominated, where men are assumed to be superior, and allocate themselves the necessary power to organise women's productive and reproductive labour, economically, politically and ideologically.

Socialist-feminism requires an understanding of the specific oppression of women in capitalist societies, but acknowledges that gender divisions preceded the transition to capitalism and will not necessarily disappear with the abolition of the capitalist mode of production (Barrett, 1980:9). While it is crucial to acknowledge that women's subordination pre-dated capitalism, it is entirely a separate activity to conceive of patriarchy as a system which has an existence analagous to bourgeois domination. It is clear that radical-feminist theories of patriarchy tend, on the one hand, towards biological determinism, because of their roots in biological differentiation, and, on the other, towards idealism through the construction of patriarchy as an ahistorical monolith.

It is Marx's metatheory, that is, the conception that a correct vision of class society is obtained from the position of the oppressed class (one of two major class positions under capitalism), as well as his critique of capitalism, that are the foundations for socialist-feminist theorising. Without establishing women as a proletariat, as they are so conceived in the traditional Marxist schema, feminist theorists see women as one major oppressed group, who have a similar capacity for generating a more accurate perception of social relations. And so, for Hartsock (1984:284),

"... just as Marx's understanding of the world from the standpoint of the proletariat enabled him to go beneath bourgeois ideology, so a feminist standpoint can allow us to understand patriarchal institutions and ideologies as perverse inversions of more humane social relations."

There have been lengthy debates about the concept of patriarchy. For some contemporary theorists it is used interchangeably with 'male dominance'. Originally, the term was used to describe rule by the male head of a family or tribe (usually the oldest male), but it is now taken to mean male supremacy generally, that is, the personal authority of individual males over females, and institutional arrangements which ensure the subordination of women. Male supremacy has been encoded in law and sanctioned by religion; women's inferiority was seen to be an aspect of natural law and divine will. To emphasise the universal structural source of women's oppression detracts from the necessary examination of historical and cultural variations in the manifestation of patriarchal power relations. Beechey (1979:66) describes the contemporary dominant usage of the concept:

"The concept of patriarchy has been used within the women's movement to analyse the principles underlying women's oppression... it has been used .. in the search for an explanation of the feelings of oppression and subordination, and in the desire to transform feelings of rebellion into a political practice and theory... Thus the theory of patriarchy attempts to penetrate beneath the particular experience and manifestations of women's oppression and to formulate some coherent theory of the basis of subordination which underlies them."

In the present study, the term 'patriarchal ideology' is used to refer to male-defined ideas and perceptions about the role of women. I am generally reluctant to use the term 'patriarchy' because of the implications that it is an

unchanging, absolute structure. It is hoped that the word 'ideology' (qualified by the descriptive 'patriarchal') embodies the realisation of the fluid, negotiable nature of relations between men and women. Like class relations, patriarchal relations are the product of continuing antagonism and struggle. Ideology is a contested phenomenon and as such is relevant to the theory of hegemony which carries substantial explanatory power in accounting for domination as organised consent.

Gramsci's theory of hegemony is useful for analysing patriarchal ideology. It accounts for the form of patriarchal rule: that is, it is not a type of domination secured by physical force or similar coercion, but through the will of the dominated. The theory provides for a more sophisticated, more legitimate analysis than that of 'false consciousness'. It requires, for example, an understanding of the historical construction and maintenance of power. In particular, it allows for political action to undermine the dominant group's hegemony, thus accounting and allowing for change.

In contemporary debates on sex and class, one position is that patriarchy and capitalism are not analytically and practically distinct. The outcome of this conclusion is that the complex dynamic of the inter-relationship between the two must be submitted to further scrutiny.¹

As part of this rigorous scrutiny, socialist-feminism attributes substantial importance to the role of non-economic factors in the maintenance of power both in social relations in general, and specifically in power relations between males and

females. Women's oppression is political and ideological as well as economic; that is, the power of men is derived from their control of the means of production but also of the forms of signification in society. The study of cultural practice (including both art work and aesthetic theory) is significant because of the insights that can be gained into the maintenance of the dominant hegemony - how the dominant culture is able to produce and reproduce the existing social relations which reinforce the privilege of the dominant culture. The basic premise of this thesis is that the challenge to bourgeois and patriarchal authority is one that must be directed at the production and reproduction of the existing power relations through the practice of art and the products of artists.

Socialist-feminism incorporates many of the developments of twentieth-century Marxist theorists who, still within the definition of a materialist approach, seek to accommodate the autonomy and effectivity of elements of consciousness in opposition to earlier tendencies toward economic reductionism and determinism. This has made the nature of ideological practice the primary concern of socialist-feminists. This involves both the demystification of patriarchal and bourgeois ideology, and also the construction of women's consciousness as a necessary element in their political activity. Out of this emerged the interest in women's cultural production. Jaggar (1983:334-335) records this aspect of socialist-feminism:

"Socialist feminists view cultural work as a necessary part of political organisation for social change. They do not accept uncritically all aspects of women's culture, but seek to encourage those aspects which

explore new ways in which the artist and the community can relate to each other, which link women's oppression with that of other oppressed groups, and which emphasise the possibility of women's collective political action against their oppression. For socialist feminists, the creation of a woman's culture is an important way in which women can develop political self-consciousness."

Jaggar notes that socialist-feminist political strategies encourage a diversity of activity without particular activities receiving absolute primacy over others. The creation of a distinctive socialist-feminist artistic practice is therefore as relevant to social transformation as, for example, efforts to overcome women's exploitation in wage-labour. Guided by this, the present study seeks to reinforce the contribution of a cultural critique to the on-going task of dismantling oppressive bourgeois and sexist relations.

Such relations are predicated not merely on economic dominance, but on the operation of ideology to secure their hegemony. It is important to understand that a dominant ideology is not something imposed from outside, as if by force, but instead it is established hegemonically, which involves obtaining the consent of groups that are dominated. Cvitanovich (1984:12) acknowledges the reflection and perpetuation of oppressive ideologies within art and art criticism:

"The power to affect and legitimate the negation of women allows the patriarchy, the system that accords men a monopoly on power, to maintain a distortion of both artistic creation and interpretation. Through the projection of negative images of women positive

pictures of their opposite, men, are obtained."

The cultural critique thus challenges the images oppressive of women that are embodied in ideological products such as art and literature; it exposes the way in which women are disadvantaged in the actual relations of ideological production, in cultural practices.

Feminist Approaches to the Arts

There is a variety of processes in which meanings that serve to legitimate oppressive social relations are constructed. In the next chapter, I shall discuss in greater detail the feminist critique of the process of defining meanings, and, indeed, whole bodies of what constitutes knowledge. While there is general agreement that the position of women is structurally different from that of men, and that the material realities of women's lives are significantly dissimilar to men's, feminists nevertheless have not pursued adequately the epistemological consequences of this understanding.

In the area of the arts, for example, the project for feminists is to examine the flawed ideological basis of art criticism and art history. The strategy of recovering those women artists, writers and thinkers who have been neglected is, in fact, merely the point of departure. As Bovenschen says (1977:115),

"Art has been primarily produced by men. Men have neatly separated and dominated the public sector that controls it, and men have defined the normative standards for evaluation. Moreover, in so far as they come into contact with this sector at all, women have for the most part acquiesced to its value system."

Patriarchal (mainstream) art criticism has been premised on male perceptions of the world and specifically of artistic creation. With this power of definition, men have been further able to reproduce the subordination of women, through the images of women that were deemed acceptable, and through the prescription of particular kinds of creativity that are appropriate to women. Feminist art is not simply art by and about women, but it is a whole set of practices working politically against patriarchal and other forms of domination. 'Feminism' may be more or less consciously expressed in feminist art. More importantly, however, it characterises the relation between such art and the existing hegemony. It challenges the structural features of the representations of the dominant group, as well as the content of dominant cultural representations. As Parker and Pollock (1981:119) say,

"Art is not a mirror. It mediates and re-presents social relations in a schema of signs which require a receptive and pre-conditioned reader to be meaningful. And it is at the level of what these signs connote, often unconsciously, that patriarchal ideology is reproduced."

The crucial project for any feminist cultural practice is the creation of new meanings. Both socialist-feminists and radical-feminists are seeking to develop their critiques in this area of the production of meaning by women, and it is in such a context that this study of artistic production and practice becomes particularly significant. As mentioned above, women have not yet been able to construct systematic alternatives to the prevailing masculine science and ideology. They are still in the process of discovering ways in which their thought is constrained on both conscious and unconscious levels by assumptions that reinforce male dominance.

The art establishment (including artists, art historians, art critics) is able to be seen as a cultural site, where a particular view of reality is generated and promulgated as the 'truth'. The forming and maintaining of this view of reality based on the production of theories about aesthetic criticism and about the relationship between artist and society can be understood as the hegemony of the art establishment. Feminist artists constitute a challenge to that hegemony because of their perception of art-work, their methods - to the point where they may become a counter-hegemonic force. They challenge the dominant definitions of social reality and hence the existence and composition of dominant groups. Where the feminist critique has been fruitful, it has commonly been through exposing areas of contradiction in the dominant ideology (for example, the attack on stereotyped sex-roles was greatly strengthened by women's entry into non-traditional occupations in the paid work-force during the Second World War).

It is clearly argued and generally agreed by the different feminist theoretical perspectives that conventional sociological and aesthetic theories are inadequate because of their neglect of the standpoint of women. Women are either made invisible, "hidden from history" as Sheila Rowbotham (1973) describes the experience of women, or their experience is assumed to differ in no way from that of men (more correctly, what is specifically male becomes universal). Women's culture has been defined by negation, by their lack of maleness, and their removal from male experience.

Socialist-feminist or radical-feminist perspectives are reflected in the approaches of different feminist critics, although they are not necessarily articulated in such explicit terms by them. Women artists and critics themselves have responded to being excluded by developing strategies similar to those of radical-feminism (such as biological essentialism and separatism). This kind of approach is short-sighted because it does not challenge the basic organisation of art in society, and frequently it simply produces a parallel female art establishment.

Radical-feminism, because it emphasises the duality between female and male experience, stresses the uniqueness of women's artistic or literary production. In accordance with their belief that women have special characteristics and a particular vision arising from their female body, especially their biological capacity for mothering, and from their experience of patriarchal control, radical-feminists anticipate that women's artistic and literary styles, forms and contents will be substantially

different from those of male artists and writers.

The strategy of those whose sole concern is to elevate the status of the subjects of women's art, so as to make female experience (such as pregnancy, motherhood, domesticity), and the forms of women's art (such as embroidery, quilting) as equally valid as the subjects and styles of men's art, is limited and, in fact, opposed to a socialist-feminist approach. This emphasis on the subject of women's art constitutes 'content analysis'. The focus here is on the content of a particular artistic or literary product and the replacement of patriarchal messages, which reinforce women's subordination and male power, with feminist ones; that is, statements about the abilities and worth of women that are not defined by male interests.

Another way of approaching artistic/literary products, different from more conventional 'content analysis', have been textual analyses in the structuralist/semiotic tradition, which involve the deconstruction of texts and a reconstruction of the text which includes what was previously hidden (the images of character and behaviour entrenched in and promoted by patriarchal social structures).

The word 'text' is used here to denote any visual as well as literary work. A text, therefore, is any cultural product which embodies a meaning, not solely meanings which are encoded in the written word. Textual analyses have been very useful for feminists in uncovering the ideological operations of patriarchal ideology. It has further supported the belief that women are oppressed not only economically and politically, but also in the

forms of signifying and symbolic exchange in our culture. Whereas it is the function of ideology to naturalise and conceal the patriarchal character of texts, the function of such textual analyses is to de-mystify this process by uncovering the work of ideology, to make the invisible visible. As Gardiner (1982:631) says,

"... the main direction of radical-feminism is to look within the female text and the female canon for our own distinctive structures, patterns, images and codes."

Most significantly, radical-feminists do not accept aesthetic standards defined by males, and do not seek to evaluate women's work by those standards.

For radical-feminists, the goal is an alternative practice that enables women to withdraw from the dominant culture. It becomes a permanent counterculture, a refuge from and contrast to the patriarchal sphere. For various reasons, primarily its separatism and biological reductionism, radical-feminism is prevented from developing any other political action than this countercultural strategy (Barrett, 1980:4).

Socialist-feminism, as I have argued, offers a more comprehensive and more precise theory of the universal oppression of women, not in terms of the innate, biological difference of females, but in terms of its cultural and historical manifestation, and its mediation by the forces of race and class oppression. Socialist-feminism seeks to avoid both a mechanical economic determinism and also idealism in asserting the importance of the ideological realm. The central concern is to

trace the connections between (ultimately) the economic base, the power relations of society, and cultural practice. In contrast to radical-feminism, which tends to employ its critique within the boundaries of the artistic or literary work, socialist-feminism addresses itself also to mechanisms operating outside the product; that is, the conditions of its production. To this end socialist-feminist critics may make use of other Marxist, semiotic or deconstructionist strategies. The goal of socialist-feminists is to generate alternative institutions which strengthen women through ~~their~~ validation of women's experience and work, and to transform structures and relations of cultural production.

A Socialist-Feminist Approach to the Arts

In this next section, I shall be describing more fully and examining more closely the conditions of a socialist-feminist approach to the arts - giving recognition to those elements of such an approach that are to be found in contemporary practice, and also drawing out further aspects of a socialist-feminist practice. Much of the discussion in fact will be a matter of applying socialist-feminist strategies to existing, untheorised activities. To a certain extent, the development of a socialist-feminist approach to film (for example, Kuhn, 1982), which has been more consciously theorised than approaches to the visual arts, will be a model for the articulation of a socialist-feminist critique of artistic practice.

The most fundamental postulate of socialist-feminist theorists of art is that all critical approaches are political in their origins and functions. This is accompanied by the demand for a recognition of the ideological biases of conventional art criticism which purports to be objective, disinterested, beyond politics. As Greene (1981:33) says,

"To challenge the biases of the literary and critical tradition is to challenge the myths and stereotypes that circumscribe our lives - which is to challenge, more or less directly and explicitly, the social and political structures which those myths and stereotypes support."

A socialist-feminist analysis of art seeks to examine art-history in order to reveal the biases and inadequacies not only in regard to the position of women artists, but also in order to pose new questions about the discipline of art in all its aspects. The socialist-feminist approach departs here from a more conventional history of women's art. It is not sufficient merely to resurrect or rediscover women artists who were denied recognition in their own time. Nor is it simply a matter of claiming that women's art is valid, that it approaches the same greatness as men's art, though its subject matter and style may be different. These two strategies of a conventional approach to women's art do not challenge the fundamental misconception of what art is. A socialist-feminist approach questions the very definition of art. The purpose in researching the experience of women artists, therefore, is not simply to recover what has been lost, or to expose women's handicaps but, rather, the project is

undertaken in order to examine the functioning of ideology with particular reference to ideology about sexual difference.

A socialist-feminist critique of cultural production - works, institutions, and workers - has, as its necessary corollary, the prescription of what constitutes more acceptable (democratic, non-sexist) kinds of cultural products and processes of artistic production. Avoiding elitism in the arts leads ultimately to questions about the status of creative work, and about the hierarchy of the arts.

The socialist-feminist approach, like that of Cultural Studies, asks whether such categories as 'high' and 'low' are relevant, and what, in terms of a sociological approach, makes a person an 'artist'. These are questions which suggest a radical redefinition of human creativity. In this next section, I wish to examine the way in which women's artistic work has been devalued because of its classification as craftwork, which has an inferior value to that of art. Firstly, however, it is relevant to document the changing usage of the word 'art'.

Barnett (1982:18), in her research into the origins and usage of the two terms 'art' and 'crafts', has revealed that at an earlier time (that is, in the Middle Ages) the words 'artist' and 'craftsman' (sic) were interchangeable words. The church as the dominant power was the main outlet for works of art, and these were instruments for the expression of religious philosophy. During the Renaissance, there was a fundamental change in artists' perceptions of themselves in relation to society, as they attempted to apply the status and rewards of an

academic discipline to what had previously been defined as a craft. This redefinition was reinforced by the decline in the influence of the church and the effects of industrial technology, and the present meaning of 'artist' came into usage. According to this, an 'artist' is one who is engaged with purely aesthetic considerations, and not with functional concerns.

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with the development of industrialisation, and the consequent separation of home and work-place, women's opportunities for recognition as artists were substantially diminished. Art-work was carried out in the public sphere, to which men had access, while women were confined to the private, domestic realm of family and household. In addition, the effects of industrialisation served to intensify the emergence^{c_f} the role of the artist as one that was elevated and specialised. As Pearson (1982:5) says,

"These developments were both a part of the increased division of labour (artist being distinguished from scientist, technologist, artisan, skilled worker, etc.) and a reaction against the processes of industrialisation, the spread of utilitarianism and the growth of commercialisation."

The specialisation of art-work as a practice (which is often overlooked as a historical phenomenon, a specific consequence of changed class relations with the emergence of capitalism) was institutionalised with the development of aesthetics as a separate discipline in the eighteenth century (see, for example the work of the German thinkers Kant and Schiller). The

characteristic of isolation - that is, the isolation of the art-world as a social institution and of the work of art as an object for study and experience - is what is most useful in distinguishing art from other cultural practices and products. According to Vogel (1974:4),

"Entry into any sector of the art world is difficult: requirements for a passport vary, and may include certain kinds of expertise, talent or taste, sexual, or ethnic, or class identity, the right sorts of social graces and tact, or the possession of personal wealth. An artwork must also pass a series of entrance examinations, based mainly on its attributes as an object in social and so-called aesthetic isolation. Within the art world, initiates are prone to experience, discuss, create, and present art as if it existed in a sphere essentially distinct from and above the ordinary life and consciousness of most people."

The same isolation has served to render the art-world immune to independent analysis and criticism. Art history and art criticism have not been treated as ideological products, and have existed as if untouched by social, cultural and historical forces.

The change of definition served to effectively exclude women in two ways. Firstly, the work of women was carried out in the home, as part of their domestic responsibilities. The things they produced were for utilisation by the household. Therefore women's work was classssified as craft; it served functional purposes rather than aesthetic ones. Slivka (1985:12) confirms this:

"Until the twentieth century, women were expected to be craftists, not artists - to make things that are beautiful, functional, decorative, and to contain no ideas, just like the women themselves - to be beautiful, useful, supportive, and to leave the ideas to the men."

She goes on to describe the particular predominance of women in needlecraft:

"Traditionally, the great population of women in needlecraft can be accounted for by the fact that needlecraft is homecraft in service to the family. Equally important, however, needlecraft is silent. You can't hear a needle when it pierces cloth; it's light; it doesn't take up much room; you can pick it up and put it down easily wherever you are; it does not require any elaborate tools or workshop or physical strength, an attribute discouraged for women except in childbirth. The social and political history of needlework reveals the aesthetic aspirations of women while it reveals the conditions under which they worked."

Needlework was thus fostered as a desirable activity at least for those who could secure the necessary time and materials. It was definitely favoured over other activities such as learning, and by it women were kept busy in a way that didn't compete with men. It meant that they continued to be confined to the domestic realm.

The contemporary re-valuation of women's embroidery and quilting work does not necessarily challenge the hierarchy of the arts, as Barnett (1982:20) points out:

"Only as crafts become more sophisticated, and any pure function becomes peripheral or obsolete, do they enter the realm of the special, precious and expensive... Here decoration rises above function, so by being hung on a wall to be looked at rather than used, ... work is transformed from craft into art, and in the denial of function gains status."

This removal of the utilitarian and functional elements in a particular product is crucial to its becoming a potential work of art. There are various consequences of the recent interest in women's craft-work. At the same time as there is a welcome recognition of the skills of women who have made patchwork quilts or have done embroidery and other such craft-work, there is the possibility that this recognition can be used to validate women's work in the home in such a way as to reinforce women's responsibility for, and confinement to, domestic labour. And, sometimes, in the process of admitting women's craft-work to the art-world, the fact that quilts and such things have been made by women, in the domestic sphere, for use, is obscured. They are made into art, and acknowledgement of their origins is down-played in order to assert their 'artistic' quality, that is, their non-utilitarian purpose.

The point of this is to illustrate the extent to which women's practice is not necessarily outside art history, but inside, according to a set of conditions shaped by male perceptions and interests. Thus, women have not been entirely excluded from art history, but they have been recognised to have a particular capacity for, and relationship to, art that is nevertheless inferior to that of male artists. With such a

position, women in the arts have reflected the same subordinate relationship to men that women in all areas of social life have experienced.

"Women's practice in art has never been absolutely forbidden, discouraged, or refused, but rather contained and limited to its function as the means by which masculinity gains and sustains its supremacy in the important sphere of cultural production." (Parker and Pollock, 1981:170)

Socialist-feminist criticism of the arts demands a conjunctural analysis, one that encompasses the wider process of meaning-production. This requires a study of the social and historical conditions in which a work of art is produced. Parker and Pollock (1981:14) insist that women's experience as artists changes over time with different social and economic conditions and that this is an important consideration in recording this aspect of women's history:

"Women's participation in the varied form of medieval art has to be related to particular historical factors, to the uneven development of religious and secular centres of art production, to amateur and professional work and to attitudes to women's membership of professional bodies such as the guilds which varied from guild to guild and from country to country. Moreover, women's economic participation in such productive units as the household workshop has to be distinguished from the social and the sexual roles preached at them by Christian theology."

Part of the insistence on the need to look at social and historical conditions of women artists is derived from the recognition that women artists do not necessarily have uniform experiences but that two women may make quite different responses to the dominant mode of representation. In the nineteenth century, for example, women's role was becoming increasingly circumscribed with accompanying restrictions for women artists reflecting the bourgeois ideologies of femininity and domesticity.

A socialist-feminist approach to aesthetics, then, emphasises the need for not merely a textual analysis according to feminist principles, but also a critique of the structural determinants of art practice. The antecedents of this kind of aesthetics are to be found in the categories of a materialist literary criticism. An example of a materialist literary criticism is that formulated by Eagleton (1976). Eagleton argues that notions of aesthetic value are to be traced to the social and historical context, the material conditions in which a particular work is produced and received. In this sense, his theory may be described as materialist. He writes (1976:166-167),

"There is no 'immanent' value... Literary value is a phenomenon which is produced in that ideological appropriation of the text, that 'consumptional production' of the work, which is the act of reading. It is always relational value... The histories of 'value' are a subsector of the histories of literary-ideological receptive practices."

Having set out in the preceding pages a description and analysis of different feminist approaches, arguing for the greater merits of a socialist-feminist approach, I now want to focus more directly on some particular issues to be considered, such as the problem of definitions of 'artist' and 'feminist artist', and the matter of a female sensibility.

The matter of the definition of 'artist' has been a perennial problem due to the impasse in the philosophical debates about the nature of art. Because art is a phenomenon that has been interpreted and practised variously, historically and cross-culturally, it would seem that the most fruitful course to pursue is that of a sociological approach to the arts. In any event, the complexity of the conceptual difficulties should not become a ground for abandoning definitions. According to Cornwell (1979:537), this inability to produce some operational definition of 'artist'

"... lends support (by emphasising the product, i.e. the work of art) to a widely held view that artists, through their work, answer some inner call, fulfil a vocation and exercise a noble cultural function... However accurate this view may be, it is incomplete. It obscures the fact that artists must live off their creations... In addition to their creative and cultural roles, artists are also workers."

The following definition of artist which has reflected a practical response as opposed to the persistent philosophical dilemmas, was accepted in 1977 by a Joint International Labour Organisation/UNESCO Meeting of Experts on the Status of the

Artist:

"any person with or without an employment relation, who devotes a qualitatively important part of his [sic] active life to the arts, asks for and accepts recognition as such within the society in which he lives, whether or not he holds membership in a professional association..." (Cornwell, 1979:538)

However, to define artists as workers does not eliminate all conceptual and practical difficulties - for example, artists do not constitute one uniform occupational group; artists' relationship to the products of their labour is qualitatively different from other workers'; their employment status is problematic: although their work is significantly independent, artists do not experience entirely the same conditions as self-employed workers.

The meaning of 'artist' is conveyed through its definition not only of what it is, but also of what it is not. As Barnett (1982:18) says,

"...everything that does not acquire the status of art is apportioned a negative status, negative, that is, to the positive of art. This becomes evident in examining the way in which both art and craft practices are written about, historically and now. A set of oppositions emerge, so that everything associated with art - culture, professionalism, the intellect, genius, authenticity, exclusiveness (and elusiveness) - assumes a positive reading, while the characteristics usually ascribed to craft - functional, skilful, decorative - take on negative readings, and craft becomes the decorative, or lesser arts."

Clearly, there are a number of difficulties associated with making a definition of 'artist' operational. These difficulties have, furthermore, prevented the satisfactory collection of data about artists. Researchers who recently carried out a study of craftworkers in New Zealand found that it was firstly necessary to identify those whose involvement in craft-work was vocational (Scotts and Mounsey, 1983:4). Accordingly, they specified a \$2,000 per annum minimum income limit from sales of a worker's own products, but even this was not entirely satisfactory.

Sometimes, for example, a particular worker might intend to pursue a craft activity as a vocation, that is, with a kind of professional involvement, as opposed to an amateur one, but may not earn over \$2,000 per annum from sales of the craft product. Frequently, women artists and craftworkers find that their primary 'vocation', at least temporarily is domestic labour. Thus, a definition based on a minimum income level is not always adequate for accommodating 'seriousness' of intent on the part of the artist. In the present study, similar definitional quandaries presented themselves, and it was clear that multifarious meanings were employed in the use of the term 'feminist artist', according to what constitutes feminist consciousness.

A generally-accepted definition is that feminist art is a sub-category of women's art. Feminist art is indeed art produced by women, but not all art produced by women is feminist art.

Even with this definition, there are still problems of clarity because the term 'the women's art movement' is more frequently used to refer to the emergence of feminist artists, particularly since the early 1970s. Lonie (1981:14) confirms this:

"Women's art, as a movement, must be distinguished from art created by women: the latter may embrace any style or pre-occupation, while the former is concerned with subjects arising out of a feminist consciousness."

The element of feminist consciousness is the critical factor in distinguishing between 'feminist artists' and 'women artists'. Carole Shephard says of herself (in an interview with Batten, 1983:25),

"The term feminist artist for me is the recognition and belief in women, in their work, their modes of expression, their heritage, their struggles, their lives, their identity, and their very real visibility. The term woman artist is not an adequate description."

And Jane Zusters, another New Zealand feminist artist, gives this definition:

"A feminist is a woman who does not subscribe to the patriarchal status quo and refuses to live her life in accordance with this. A feminist artist is a woman who applies these perceptions through her art and life whether it be obliquely or explicitly." (in an interview with Juliet Batten, 1983:26)

Often the same type of art critic who claims that there is no such thing as 'women's art' energetically dismisses 'feminist art' as an inappropriate artistic style or content. The self-conscious feminist commitment of feminist artists is considered disparagingly as 'political' in opposition to 'good art' or 'real art' which is 'non-political'.

At this point, the issue of a feminine or female sensibility is worthy of consideration. The notion of a particular sensibility is relevant to this definition of feminist artists. We have seen how women's work came to be overlooked because women were not able to be considered 'artists' in the same way that men were. With the appearance of the notion of a feminine sensibility, a new means of recognising women's work became possible. However, the prescription of a 'feminine sensibility' which women artists were supposed to embody in their work ultimately reinforced the devaluation of women's art, because of the very fact the women, who were considered to be generally inferior to men, produced the art. The idea of a 'feminine sensibility' further restricted women artists because work that did not conform to it would be discredited as being not the genuine art of women.

The concept of a female sensibility has some material foundation in that women's experiences in the world - physically, socially, psychologically - are different. For socialist-feminists, however, the difference is based on socialisation rather than inherent, unchanging biological dictates. In reality, the notion of a female sensibility has quite disturbing anti-materialist features. It tends to replace

social, economic and political determinants with absolute 'natural' forces. As Vogel (1974:23) warns, "... the female aesthetic seems... to be no more than a rehabilitated artistic ghetto." Tickner (1984:14) argues that the idea of a 'feminine sensibility' that emerged in nineteenth century criticism was "part of a (hegemonic) manoeuvre to contain the threat of increasing institutional opportunities for women."

Any sensibility changes with its social matrix. Women's use of the pastel medium or floral subjects can be explained by the easier availability of the material, and by the establishment of a tradition in such areas. Generally, women artists produce according to the conventions of the historical period to which they belong. Similarly, qualities like 'patience' and obsessive detail' arise not so much from innate female skill as from a long-standing, limited role-prescription. Leon Legrange, a nineteenth-century French critic, writing of the place of women in art, called forth seemingly universal absolutes, in fact conditioned by Victorian ideology, which concerned both the quality of women's art, and the specialisations (for example, flower painting), within which women artists were confined by the social structure:

"Male genius has nothing to fear from female taste. Let men of genius conceive of great architectural projects, monumental sculpture, and elevated forms of painting. In a word, let men busy themselves with all that has to do with great art. Let women occupy themselves with those types of art which they have always preferred, such as pastels, portraits or miniatures. Or the painting of flowers, those prodigies of grace and freshness which alone can compete with the grace and freshness of women

themselves. To women above all falls the practice of the graphic art, those painstaking arts which correspond so well to the role of abnegation and devotion which the honest woman happily fills on earth, and which is her religion." (quoted in Parker and Pollock, 1981:13)

The term 'feminist artist', for some artists and critics, requires the expression of explicit feminist statements in their work, and the manifestation of certain styles, within certain media - all of which amount to the prescription of a feminist sensibility. A socialist-feminist practice of art-work involves three fundamental tasks. Firstly, it demands a critique of traditional definitions of art, by using media in unconventional ways. Secondly, it requires an examination of patriarchal representations of women and women's experience, providing strong, positive images, especially of aspects of reality that are denied. Thirdly, it addresses capitalist and patriarchal forms of art production, exhibition, and consumption, rejecting the value of art-work which is derived from its status as a commodity. Instead, it seeks accessibility for potential artists and spectators to art-production, and strives for collective processes of production and exhibition. These features of a socialist-feminist practice nevertheless are not to be interpreted as exhaustive, nor as a prescription for socialist-feminist artists, but a set of basic conditions from which different practices and responses will emerge according to different social and historical constraints.

It is, of course, consistent with a socialist-feminist approach to advocate certain practices as superior to others because of their contribution to countering the oppressive tendencies of other practices. However, often the only difference between these who promote a 'feminist sensibility' and those in earlier times who promoted a 'feminine sensibility', is that the contemporary protagonists are women artists and critics themselves and less often male gatekeepers.² A socialist-feminist approach is concerned not so much with the prescription of a particular type of artistic product as with the conditions of its production and consumption.

In contrast to conventional approaches to art, a socialist-feminist one does not try to establish an orthodoxy, but is, instead, guided by the essential feminist value of the significance of personal experience. Because of the diversity of experience, it is difficult to assert as 'feminist' art a particular, recognisable style. A socialist-feminist approach is opposed to the exhibition of women's art to serve the interests of a governing critical ideology, or institutional requirements. With the emergence of the women's art movement, the showing of work by women has become sometimes a concession made by the art establishment, and at other times, a new commodity of the establishment. Much of women's art which originally was counter-hegemonic in that it set out to question the accepted point of view, to challenge the traditional visual art form, and to displace the traditional bases of aesthetic pleasure, has become incorporated into the art establishment. (See the following chapter for a discussion on the tensions between, on the one hand, the necessary and just recognition of women's work,

and, on the other, the co-optive tendencies of the dominant hegemonic group.)

There is, therefore, an unfortunately dangerous tendency by many in the women's art movement, who lack a consciously feminist commitment, to seek simply (overtly or unintentionally) a place for women in the existing male meritocracy of art. The kind of approach which attempts to prove that women's artistic and literary production is at least equal to the work of men is a liberal-feminist tendency.³

Liberal-feminist critics are concerned with the ways in which women are denied equal literary or artistic opportunity. This is manifested in such things as their lack of access to the artistic or literary canon, and their negatively disproportionate representation in influential institutions and in spheres which exercise critical judgment. The achievements of liberal-feminists in highlighting the sexism in image-making and in critical practice have, in fact, been taken for granted by other (radical- and socialist-) feminist critics who have attempted to develop more useful theories of women's oppression and more sophisticated methodologies.

Liberal-feminism suffers from the flaws of liberalism and its limited capacity for change. It does not challenge or begin to dismantle the ideological and political structures, of which discrimination against women artists is merely a symptom. Bowen (1977:83) is severely critical of such reformist tendencies:

"When a feminist art history is also consistently concerned with a similar authentication and verification of the authorship of 'works of art' we may on the one hand feel understanding and sympathy with the necessity of claiming women's work as their own, but we must also recognise the connection. The reasons may be different - the one a bourgeois inventory and price-listing operation, the other an assertion of the history of female creativity, but it cannot be denied that the results are the same: the acceptance of the need to categorise and inventorise works of art as commodities. I suggest that this similarity springs from a common frame of reference, that is, one which obscures the class basis of art as a human activity and, implicitly at least, accepts a bourgeois and therefore mystifying view of art as Art."

Art, according to socialist-feminists, as I have argued, is inscribed within a social, historical and political milieu - which means that art works and their means of signification exist as determinate material and ideological practices. What is needed, therefore, is an analysis of how art operates as a discourse within a specific cultural system. A consciously feminist art practice is a discourse in which patriarchal ideologies are internally criticised, made visible and opposed. Feminist artists may work within different institutional apparatuses, according to collective organisational methods (collaborative art projects), rather than the individualistic process of conventional art work, with its capitalist operating principles (by which the work of art is a commodity, produced by an inspired individual, for profit-making.) Not unexpectedly, feminist artists have encountered numerous difficulties in sustaining their oppositional practice, particularly with regard

to funding, technology (training and availability for women), and the exhibition and promotion of art.

At the same time, a socialist-feminist approach to art criticism must seek to be as thorough-going as the contemporary feminist critique of the sociology of knowledge described earlier in this chapter. The former must strive to imitate the latter's criticism not just of content, but of the epistemological basis of the social sciences and other bodies of knowledge, and embark on a similar engagement with the epistemological bases of art and art criticism.

Socialist-feminist criticism of the arts embodies the intention to depart from the established traditions of bourgeois-patriarchal art history which documents and implicitly and explicitly promotes (usually posthumously) the great artists. It questions the social processes which serve to produce and mythologise artistic geniuses. It uncovers the bourgeois interests for which art becomes a commodity - its economic value guaranteed and safeguarded by those who employ the 'artist-as-genius' notion to mystify the meaning, and elevate the source, of works of art.

The socialist-feminist analysis of art seeks to explain why art is thus mystified. It reveals how both the material (investment) value and the ideological function of art are vitally important. Art establishes bourgeois values and male control, in material terms, and promotes this hegemony through the control of image-production. Feminist film critics in particular have engaged in investigations of this process by

which women are constructed as a social category in visual production in such a way that male hegemony is maintained. To the extent that art constitutes a language of images (formulated views of reality), it is essential for those who rule to determine the definition, operation, and interpretation of those images.

A socialist-feminist approach, then, recognises that cultural factors do not exist independently of the class and gender system. Moreover, the interaction of the ideological with the economic and other aspects of society is historically specific. The concept of the 'politics of representation'⁴, by which is meant the consequences of image-making for power relations, confirms that cultural practice is a useful object of feminist analysis and intervention. Feminists are aware that both language and visual media influence a person's perception of the world, and can contribute to the construction of a reality in which women learn subordinate or egalitarian roles. The demands for inclusive language are premised on this realisation that our linguistic structures are important sources of oppression of women through their positioning - often their obscuring - of women.

The more fruitful line of enquiry for socialist-feminist scholars is to examine the reasons for women's particular practices, those factors which confined them to certain types of cultural intervention, rather than to enshrine a female sensibility, which will be found to be constantly changing. It may be true that their location in the domestic sphere has generated women's awareness of a mundane reality and has become

reflected in autobiographical work. At the same time, it would be true that had women not been constricted by domestic responsibilities their art would have been of a quite different, more abstract nature.

The claim that "art has no gender" has been used in a similar way to the idea of a feminine or female sensibility; that is, to exclude or diminish the significance of women's work. To claim that art has no gender obscures the differential relationship of men and women to the sexual division in society and the historically-varied consequence of this division for the art produced by women and men.

At the same time as this claim that art has no gender has been articulated, certain styles and subject matter have been valued and others consistently devalued, a division reflected in the gender of the artists, with women's art judged to be inferior, and 'women artists' posited as deviations from a universal category of 'artists', in which in fact only men have been represented. Julia Stanley (cited by Spender, 1980:20) has described this exclusion of women with her theory of 'negative semantic space'.

Even when women move beyond the narrow range of activities, in which they have traditionally been concentrated, to new roles, they do not receive the same positive status as the male incumbents of those roles. Women are still labelled as women and their femaleness stressed to reinforce their lack of maleness. Such is the case with 'lady doctor', 'female surgeon', 'woman lawyer'. In this way, the norm, the positive, still may not

apply to women. The term 'woman artist' is indeed used dismissively. It means, in effect, 'someone-less-than-artist'.

Despite their occupation of 'negative semantic space', and the prescription of a feminine or female sensibility, it is nevertheless true that women artists have progressed from an earlier context in which artistic creativity and femaleness were regarded as inherently incompatible to the contemporary situation where women are recognised to be skilful as artists. No longer is women's creative capacity to be channelled exclusively into child-bearing. Yet, the identification of the male, rather than the female, with artistic genius nevertheless remains. Fairburn (1967:38) was expressing such a belief when he wrote,

"There is no reason why any woman should not find satisfaction in playing the piano or painting pictures but to think that those can replace child rearing is hopelessly deluded."

An important complementary task to the critique of conventional standards and procedures is the development of a new form of expression to oppose the dominant mode. The new task becomes that of renaming women's reality, not as a deviation or a negation of a male norm, but as the product of the particular historical possibilities available to women (Westkott, 1979:423-424).

Any distinction made between deconstruction of existing forms of representation and the creation of new ones must be only a matter of degree rather than kind. The former implies the

latter if there is to be any communication of an oppositional message. But for feminist theorists it is an issue for substantial development. It remains to be discovered from where a female language is to be derived, and what authentic expression for women is. Obviously it has something to do with modes of expression/representation which value the subjectivity and experience of women. The critique of existing aesthetic criteria does not automatically imply a rejection of all possible standards of evaluation of cultural products. The focus of feminist critical theory now and in the future is to be directed to this concern to evolve valid criteria.

In this thesis, a socialist-feminist theoretical perspective is being employed to firstly evaluate the women's art movement in New Zealand, and its impact on the development of cultural practices and formations that are anti-bourgeois and anti-patriarchal; and, secondly, to focus specifically on the nature and consequences of state patronage of the arts through the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council for the maintenance of the unequal power relations, particularly along lines of class and gender. In the rejection of the myths and stereotypes of women that the dominant (sexist, bourgeois) means of signification conveys, feminist art will be produced. Feminist criticism of the visual arts and of culture and art in general constitutes an extremely important and potentially fruitful focus for feminist theory at the interface of culture and politics if, as Claire Johnston (1980:27-28) writes,

"we see ourselves as seriously engaged in ideological struggle rather than in the cosy business of providing cultural enlightenment from the margins of academia."

It is crucial to address those fundamental assumptions underlying the ontology (as well as the content) of art-work which may seem to be beyond implication in the maintenance of male hegemony.

FOOTNOTES

(1) In describing the socialist-feminist approach as one that emphasises both class and gender, this is not intended to trivialise the effects of race or other systems of oppression. On the contrary, socialist-feminism rejects the separation of class, race and women's issues, and asserts the relevance of women in every issue, just as every issue has class and race implications. As Jaggar (1983:341) states,

"On the socialist feminist view, it is necessary to approach all political issues with a consciousness that is explicitly anti-racist and explicitly socialist. This consciousness will change both the form and content of revolutionary political practice."

Socialist-feminists are seeking to transform the gender-blind categories of traditional Marxism "so that the proletariat can be seen to be comprised of women as well as men, of people of other colours other than white, and of children as well as adults. It must also be seen to labour in many places other than the factory" (Jaggar, 1983:379). And, while asserting the comprehensiveness of a socialist-feminist critique of art, I do not wish to dismiss the important contribution to the debunking of conventional Western bourgeois notions of art that is provided by commentators and practitioners from other cultural traditions and values, especially traditional Maori society, in which the whole basis for the production and consumption/receptivity of art is at variance with that of capitalist Pakeha society. There is a fundamental contradiction when the 'artistic practices' of the former have been appropriated by the latter, as Riley (1984:56) observes. Socialist-feminism, as a theory, is of profound significance for political movements, for the feminist struggle, and for the sociology of knowledge. It is not limited to a single population, females, or to the oppression of women alone. On the contrary, it transforms every aspect of reality and every field of knowledge.

(2) Gatekeepers are defined by Lynne Spender (1983:5) as

"... the guardians of culture... the ones who formulate the standards - and the justifications for those standards..."

I shall focus more sharply on the impact of gatekeepers in the next chapter.

(3) As with socialist-feminism and radical-feminism, liberal-feminism is not a unitary body of theory, but, because of its development over time, it contains some strands of thought which may be incompatible. However, there remains some commonly-held assumptions and commonly-shared inadequacies among those strands. Liberal-feminists have perceived their task to be that of extending to women the same rights that were to be allowed to human beings by virtue of their capacity to reason. They challenged the belief that women were irrational, in comparison with men. Liberal-feminists espouse the general liberal values of equality and abstract individual freedom. The problem with this is that individuals do not have such an abstract freedom, but are differentiated, usually by biological characteristics (for example, age, sex, race, physical handicap), with some being disadvantaged because of their difference.

(4) In addition to this explanation of the 'politics of representation', it is (at least as equally) important to investigate the issue of the 'representation of politics' - that is, the conscious incorporation of political statements into art. This is taken up later in the third chapter, in the discussion of acceptable and unacceptable political statements.

CHAPTER THREE

The Women's Art Movement

The discussion in the previous chapter outlined the nature of a feminist critique of society, and in particular the emergence of a feminist analysis of cultural production. As a fairly recent phenomenon, feminist criticism of the arts remains in a state of rigorous development. In this chapter, I wish to describe the origin and growth of the women's art movement in New Zealand, noting its relationship to the 'second wave' of feminism which began in the late 1960s. In addition, I shall be examining some of the charges laid against the art establishment by feminists, and evidence of discrimination against women artists (with reference to data relating to the situation in New Zealand, Australia and Canada). Finally, I shall look at the contemporary direction of the women's art movement and the nature of the struggles of feminist artists, in order to identify the necessary focus and strategy of feminist criticism of the arts.

New Zealand women artists have not been unaffected by the historical processes of discrimination against women artists which has operated since the time of the Renaissance in Europe (Harris and Nochlin, 1976). I shall briefly outline some of these historical processes, recognising that although they are not part of New Zealand's experience, they nevertheless produced an ideological construction of art and sex-roles which colonial New Zealand society inherited.

Societal norms regarding the acceptable (traditional) roles for women have operated to discourage and often to prohibit women from engaging in full-time artistic production. Much of the discrimination is institutional - for example, an essential stage in an artist's education was training in nude painting, but for women artists social convention militated against access to nude models. Ann Elias in a transcript of a talk given on the Concert Programme of Radio New Zealand (1/3/84) has noted the problems of women in this aspect of an artist's training:

"... since the Renaissance, the study of the nude figure, but particularly the nude MALE figure, was of paramount importance. And here lay the problem - it was socially unacceptable for a woman to study the nude male model - looking at and lingering over a naked man was out of the question although it is likely that ways and means were found by some women."

On the same theme, Juliet Batten, in Spiral 5, 1982:24-28, records the experience of Edith Collier, one of New Zealand's early women artists, who encountered, even in the 1920s, similar difficulties to women working in earlier times. Her father, obviously hostile to her painting nudes, burned the nude studies

Collier had done previously on a visit to Europe. Batten (1980) mentions a nineteenth-century engraving which shows women art students using a cow as a substitute for a nude model!

Women were disqualified from receiving the usual training because of their non-admittance to the Academy, and to places of higher learning in general. No longer was an apprenticeship an acceptable form of training. Instead, it was necessary to acquire a liberal arts education which included mathematics, history of art and literature, and foreign travel. Unfortunately, the majority of women in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries did not enjoy access to such education or such freedom of movement. For those who were somewhat more privileged - that is, women of aristocratic birth and upbringing - if they were allowed to travel and to study, it would typically be in the course of their attainment of marriage credentials. This was clearly a political end, and not for the women's own artistic or intellectual achievements. Thus, for women, the range of options was considerably reduced, and women were concentrated in certain spheres of activity due to those limiting social conventions.

The apprenticeship system and the need for enrolment at an Academy, the institution of higher learning in the fine arts, served to further deny women opportunity to pursue a professional career in art as they were disallowed and discouraged from the necessary education and practical experience. Furthermore, only the art produced within these official institutions was accorded recognition.

Images of women in nineteenth century books on etiquette and in other contemporary literature conveyed expectations about activities and occupations appropriate to women. Certain kinds of artwork were considered appropriate for middle-class women of accomplishment, and similar attitudes have survived to influence present-day views of women's work. The middle-class value of the 'lady-of-leisure' who was expected to enjoy such things as embroidery, drawing, or, more recently, pottery, as a hobby became significant as an indicator of class position.

The effect of this was to reinforce the idea that women's involvement in art was a recreational activity, not a 'serious', or formal, professional role. The art work in which women engaged was properly of an amateur status. For middle-class women, art was a suitably frivolous, recreational pastime, whereas for the male artist, art was legitimately and more frequently a serious activity, his life-work. For women to practice art full-time, in a professional capacity, constituted a challenge to conventional notions of the appropriate work for women. Elias (1984:5) states:

"A fundamental part of looking at the history of women's participation in the 'fine arts' has to be assessing male attitudes to women as creative, intellectual beings. The relegation of women's contribution to the arts can be seen as the manifestation of a prejudice that only men attain greatness in art."

The work of many women artists provided a critical contrast to the traditional definition of art. It consciously sought to give artistic expression to women's experiences (for example, rape, pregnancy, menstruation) which had been neglected or silenced, subjects which were often considered taboo in art and in other media. It embodied new themes (for example, the reality of domestic conflict in the face of the 'happy family' image, and the question of ideal beauty) and new symbols (for example, shells and spirals), and it challenged the under-valuing of women's art. There has been a new emphasis on the personal and the autobiographical. The women's movement, which asserts that the personal is political, has promoted the intimate and the domestic aspects of daily life as worthy subjects of art - themes which were generally regarded as trivial or mundane by art critics, art historians, art dealers and art gallery curators. Feminist theorists and historians have begun to reclaim the work of women which was not even considered to be 'real art' because it dealt with such themes.

The Women's Art Movement in New Zealand

Juliet Batten (1982) describes the emergence of the women's art movement in New Zealand. She speaks of several "cultural grandmothers", Rita Angus, Olivia Spencer Bower, Edith Collier, and Frances Hodgkins¹, who "consciously or unconsciously began to reveal themselves as females in their work". Batten finds however that these early New Zealand women artists offer no

substantial content or consistent quality to a female art tradition that compares with the achievement of women artists beyond the shores of this country; women like Georgia O'Keeffe and Mary Cassat.² Batten concludes (1982:24),

"When the women's art movement began to appear in New Zealand in the '70s, it was a movement nourished by sources other than our own artistic past."

Oliver (1981:440) confirms this observation about the contribution of New Zealand's women artists. Of such women as Rita Angus, Doris Lusk, Evelyn Page, Olivia Spencer Bower, May Smith, and Louise Henderson, he writes,

"They were all (like Frances Hodgkins) beneficiaries of that colonial genteel tradition that made it acceptable, even estimable for middle-class girls to occupy themselves with paint, preferably watercolour. All transcended these limitations and sometimes incurred the wrath of family and society in doing so. But the ability to transcend fell short of the capacity to break new ground."

This confirms the earlier claim that art-work by middle-class women was not considered by representatives of the male-dominated art establishment (and also by many of their peers) to be serious. Often, recognition of their work came first of all from overseas. The women themselves, however, did not accept such views about the lack of seriousness of their artistic endeavours, although Oliver notes that their desire to extend their interest in art to a full-time, serious activity meant that they often had

to accept an extra-ordinary, sometimes lonely way of life. In the previous chapter, the impact of Victorian ideologies of femininity and domesticity were shown to furnish a new ideal for women, in whom a certain degree of artistic skill was valued as a feminine accomplishment. Dalziel (1977) has described the powerful ideology in nineteenth century New Zealand which upheld women as the moral guardians of society, whose purity, virtues, and piety were to be used for the conversion of their boorish, rough, colonial male counterparts. Women's pursuit of artistic skills was seen as entirely consonant with their identity as representatives of "refinement and culture".

The surge of a new wave of feminism in the late 1960s provided the radical thought that was carried into art work. It is Batten's contention that the radical content of that feminist thought, the new unconventional themes in the work of the increasing number of women artists, generated new hostility which has been displayed towards women's art. Furthermore, in the process of reclaiming the right to define and produce art, more women artists become visible, in contrast with the previous paucity of women artists.

The 'women's art movement' in New Zealand (that is, the conscious and critical involvement of women in art work) dates from about the mid-1970s. Elizabeth Eastmond (1982:42-43) describes the women's art movement as primarily a "content-oriented movement". While there is a pluralism of styles, the content is constant:

"... its concerns are with the experience of women and the perspective of women, whether the themes have been/are being centred around the physical, sexual, social, psychological or spiritual aspects of female experience; around the critique of our male-dominated society; around the creative renewal, reassessment and reinvolvement in traditional women's arts; around forays into alternative approaches to art-making; around community interaction."

Batten records that in 1975, International Women's Year, the first public exhibition of work by women influenced by feminist consciousness took place at the Robert McDougall Art Gallery in Christchurch. Batten (1982:26) described it as "a radical exhibition for its time." A second major event in the history of the New Zealand women's art movement occurred two years later. A women's art environment at the Christchurch Society of Arts Gallery was set up to run in conjunction with the United Women's Convention being held in the city at the same time.

According to Batten (1982:26), those who were involved with the planning of it sought

"... to reveal the nature of women's work and experiences from a feminist perspective: where we could make parodies on public images of women, make references to our vulnerability, our powerlessness and our powerfulness, show women's self-images (countering the heavily popularised images of woman by man), work communally, make tributes to women's collaborative abilities. The ideas for the environment came individually and collectively as both a painful and revealing process of recognising exterior oppression. We wanted to break taboos that were and are so strong

few of us realised they existed."

Another historical event for the women's art movement in New Zealand was the opening of the Women's Gallery in Wellington in January, 1980. This was significant because, in Juliet Batten's words (1982:28), "the women's art movement had come out from underground". The stated aims of the Gallery were to promote and support women artists. This involved a concern to transform and extend the perceived function of an art gallery, to remove barriers between artists and non-artists, between 'art' and women's wider day-to-day realities.

The Gallery was constantly challenged from many quarters: women who did not support the concept of a separatist institution; separatists who did not believe it should be open to men; and men - especially those in the art world who reacted negatively to the Gallery's rejection of the art establishment's attempt to construct objective artistic standards. Instead of such standards, the Women's Gallery encouraged serious recognition of women's art work, sharing of skills and information, and exploration of new ways of recording the significance of women's realities. Four years later the Women's Gallery in Wellington was closed but the women's art movement proceeded to consolidate the ground that had earlier been won. In 1984, the Kaleidoscope series (a weekly television programme on the arts in New Zealand) featured six programmes on women visual artists. A touring exhibition, 'New Women Artists', was launched in New Plymouth earlier in 1984 and visited a number of centres.

Discrimination Against Women in the Arts

In seeking to draw attention to the discrimination by 'gatekeepers' (such as gallery curators, art publications), Elizabeth Eastmond, Cheryll Sotheran and Priscilla Pitts have surveyed the first thirty-four issues of Art New Zealand.³ Their findings revealed that women's art was grossly under-represented in what is the major art magazine of this country. For example, there were 117 articles and reviews on women artists and 376 on male artists. There were 121 articles and reviews by women writers and 471 by male writers. There were 92 colour reproductions of works by women artists and 310 of works by male artists. The covers of the magazine also proved to be significant. Seven and one-seventh of them were of women artists or works by women artists, compared with twenty-one and six sevenths of male artists or their works. (The one-seventh is one woman in a group of artists; the six-sevenths are the other six male artists in the group portrait.) It is interesting to note that the covers included Frances Hodgkins (a woman who is now dead, and who was exceptionally famous), Lois White (who is elderly and no longer paints), Claire Fergusson (who appears nude⁴), Deryn Cooper, and Rita Angus (now dead, also an exceptional person). Except for Claire Fergusson and Deryn Cooper, there were no cover images in the first twenty-four issues of a currently active woman artist or her work.

Eastmond and Sotheran concluded that for a woman artist to receive recognition, she should preferably be dead, or at least

elderly. It should be noted that Rita Angus was not accorded recognition as an artist until she had reached a late stage in her life, and, indeed, the greater part of the recognition given her has been much more recent - that is, since her death in 1970. It was only in 1983, with a major touring (retrospective) exhibition, that a significant interest by, and popularity with, the public emerged.

Before proceeding further, I should point out that while it might be considered necessary to refer to the actual numbers of men and women working as artists in order to evaluate the relative degree of representation of women artists, it is nevertheless not possible to obtain useful figures. The five-yearly censuses provide some data in their figures on occupational distribution.⁵ However, the method of classification is problematic: those who place themselves in the category 'Sculptors, Painters (Artists), Photographers' are included in the one total.

To discover a smaller percentage of female artists than male, does not become justification for a similarly smaller degree of support and recognition going to those women. Such a quota system entrenches the disadvantaged position of women. It is an example of tautological reasoning to claim that because women are under-represented they are not artists. Again, the problem of definition of 'artist', which was raised in the previous chapter, emerges to challenge conventional perceptions. The important conclusion to be reached from evidence of lesser participation by women in the arts is that strategies of affirmative action are necessary.

Art New Zealand's receptivity to women artists and to feminist artists in particular is perhaps changing from its earlier unwillingness to acknowledge the women's art movement. An article on New Zealand women visual artists in Broadsheet (June 1983) claimed that it had been unusual to find coverage of feminist art in Art New Zealand. Furthermore, Batten (1983:21) claimed that the editor of Art New Zealand had deleted a paragraph from an interview with Alexis Hunter which read as follows:

"Feminism is not a word with which many New Zealand art critics or historians feel comfortable. In so far as the purpose of feminism is to criticise, unsettle, even topple the patriarchal system which oppresses women, this is not surprising. The art world here has managed until now to evade the issue of feminist art practice, and generally hostile or patronising responses to feminist art have ensured the rarity of work which has political content, and which attacks or satirises the patriarchy both in the art world, and in society."

This would seem to indicate a reluctance to accept the presence of feminist art and its charges against the art establishment. Recently, there has been an issue devoted (though not exclusively) to the theme of women artists.⁶ This may be seen as token gesture, although it nevertheless breaks the silence.

Janet Paul (1980:203) states that of the Auckland City Art Gallery's total of 739 donations and purchases in the 1970s fewer than one in seven are works by women. Other evidence of discrimination against women is provided by Daly (1977) who, in the thesis referred to in Chapter One, looks at the acquisitions

and spending in five art galleries over a five year period (1972-76), and reveals that only eighteen of a total of 131 New Zealand paintings purchased in that period of time were works by women.

The Arts Council, too, in its distribution of funds reflects the unequal position of women artists. Janet Paul (1980) carried out an analysis of grants made by the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council in 1978. In that year, the total sum for spending on the visual arts was \$147,000. Of this, approximately \$87,000 was used to fund art-gallery picture-purchasing and exhibitions, and approximately \$60,000 was allocated to individuals. There were twenty-four applications from women and fifty-six from men. An equitable distribution of funds would have been in the region of three to seven (females and males respectively) but in fact total grants to women amounted to \$8,000, with males receiving \$61,498. Paul concludes (1980:206),

"... I think we have to assume that the Arts Council has given grants on the basis of merit - that is, quality plus commitment. Also, women are frequently diffident and may not have presented their cases well. Still, an unescapable conclusion is that women's work is different from men's and, as such, is less "good" or less interesting to the official art establishment."

A similar pattern is revealed in the Arts Council's grants over the period 1963-78, when Commissions were awarded to three men and four women; exhibition assistance to thirty-four men and five women; awards to sixty-six men and seventeen women. Grants in Maori and Polynesian (sic) traditional arts went to five men and two women; project grants (including tours and training)

went to forty-five men and eight women; equipment grants went to two men and two women; and fellowships went to eleven men and five women (Paul, 1980).

Paul's classification of commissions and other awards/assistance is not accompanied by precise definitions of each category. However, the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council makes grants under a number of headings. Commissions are those grants to groups or individuals in order to finance specific works or productions. The award of a fellowship is described (Annual Report, 31/3/78) as

"... the highest distinction the Arts Council can bestow on any individual. It is a means of acknowledging outstanding contribution to the arts in New Zealand."

In 1976, the Exhibiting Artists Subsidy Scheme was introduced to provide financial assistance for exhibitions. It is likely that in Paul's survey the funds for "exhibition assistance" come from this source. There is a wide choice of awards designed to develop individual human resource through advanced study/training or creative work; and to assist special projects (for example, short-term travel/study awards; establishment and equipment grants). The Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council's Funding Guide 1984-85 listed a number of schemes through which visual artists may seek assistance: (i) Annual Grants Scheme (which has two categories of application: major creative projects and major study projects); (ii) Short-Term Grants Scheme (also for both creative and study projects); (iii) New Artists Promotion Scheme; (iv) Studio Space (twelve months' rent-free tenancy of

studio space); (v) Print Workshop Subsidy Scheme; (vi) Exhibition Subsidy Scheme; (vii) Group Projects; and (viii) Gallery Purchase Subsidy Scheme.

Further data on the allocation of funding through the 'Annual Grants to Individuals Scheme' since 1980 are carried below.

Annual Grants to Individuals

YEAR	no. of applications	no. of grants made	success rate
1980/81			
TOTAL	30	20	67%
MEN	22	15	68%
WOMEN	8	5	62%
1981/82			
TOTAL	48	22	46%
MEN	34	15	44%
WOMEN	14	7	50%
1982/83			
TOTAL	72	22	30%
MEN	45	15	33%
WOMEN	27	7	26%

Annual Grants to Individuals

(cont'd)

YEAR	no. of applications	no. of grants made	success rate
1983/84			
TOTAL	85	28	33%
MEN	54.5	17.5	32%
WOMEN	30.5	10.5	34%
1984/85			
TOTAL	70	31	44%
MEN	41	16	39%
WOMEN	29	15	52%

There is a slight discrepancy in the success rate of men and women, with that of women slightly below that of men. However, much more significant is the far fewer numbers of women who apply for grants.⁷ The consequence of the smaller number of applications from women means that in real terms a very much reduced proportion of total funding goes to women's art.

Data from minutes of meetings of the Visual Arts Adjudication Panel of the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council reveal this significantly lesser degree of assistance for female artists. Through the 'Annual Grants to Individuals Scheme', male

artists received a total of \$89,000, and female artists received \$21,000, in 1980-81. The following year, 1981-82, men received \$80,200, and women \$26,500. In 1982-83, men received \$96,000, and women \$57,000. In 1983-84, men received \$98,1000, and women \$61,900.

In New Zealand, there has been a limited amount of research into the nature of and extent of discrimination against women working in the arts. The recent study of craftspeople by Scotts and Mounsey (1983) exposed some features of the situation of female craftworkers which are relevant to the present investigation. The survey of craftspeople revealed that whereas it had been thought that women would be more numerous than men in the total population of craftspeople, among the six hundred incoming-earning craftspeople covered by the survey they formed a slight minority (45 per cent). Although a slightly smaller percentage of women are engaged in craftwork, according to the survey, this fact does not contradict the commonly-held expectation that women engage more frequently and significantly in craftwork.

The findings of this research indicated that men were more likely than women to be securing a significant income from craftwork. The survey had established a \$2,000 income per annum qualification as a criterion for defining the term 'craftsperson' and this was deemed to be the likely explanation of differences in the numbers of male and female craftspeople. Even within the survey population, women received lower incomes, and this would seem to reinforce the expectation that women participate in greater numbers than men in craft activities in the general

population of craftworkers (not limited to those above a certain income-level). It should be noted that the 329 male and 271 female craftworkers of the survey population were considered to represent a large sample of the (then existing) total New Zealand population of those earning \$2,000 or more per year from sales of their craft items.

The research identified systematic differences between the sexes within craft occupations. There was a difference between the Maori and Pakeha populations, with a rigid differentiation present in the former: women traditionally have been involved only in the fibre crafts. Pakeha female craftworkers also predominate in fabric and fibre crafts, but there are similar numbers of women and men involved in pottery. Moreover, the fibre crafts are very low income-earners, since their practitioners are unable to receive payment that is appropriate to the labour involved in production.

Women, therefore, earn less than men, who predominate in other craft forms. Seventy per cent of women, compared with forty-seven per cent of men, earned less than \$6,000 in the year prior to the survey (which was carried out between October 1982 and January 1983). Women tend to engage in their craft work fewer hours per week than men, but the national survey revealed that even when the number of hours worked by men and women in equalised, women earn less. The conclusion reached was that women involved in craftwork experience similar disadvantages to those that exist in other occupations. These disadvantages are reflected in lower incomes and greater constraints on their labour. What might appear as an advantage in their ability to

carry out work in the home in fact turned out to be more a constraint for women than men in the same work environment. The domestic responsibilities traditionally assigned to women interfered with the development of their craftwork.

It is important to recognise that there are two kinds of discrimination: direct and indirect. Direct discrimination is that which occurs when a specific policy or action treats one group less favourably than another. Indirect discrimination occurs when an apparently neutral policy or practice results by its operation in the disadvantage of one group in relation to another. Much of the disadvantage or inequality experienced by women artists is indirect discrimination.

We have, in New Zealand, several pieces of legislation supporting the concept of equality for women. In particular, the Human Rights Commission Act of 1977 has made it unlawful to discriminate on the grounds of sex in the areas of employment, education, accommodation and the market-place. Late in 1984, the Government ratified the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women indicating a concern to eliminate discrimination against women which denies women fundamental freedoms. It seeks also to promote acceptance of the principle of equality for women and men.

Data relating to the success or failure of women in applying for Arts Council grants cannot be used simplistically, without reference to other processes that influence the position of women in the arts. The dynamic by which women's access to arts funding

is disadvantaged operates to exclude women long before the point at which they approach the Arts Council for funds.

There appears to be a very real need to investigate women artists' perceptions of institutional and other forms of inequity in the arts. It is quite clear that the experience of inequitable conditions or professional disadvantages and the recognition of them are two separate things. Part of the strategy to remove discrimination requires, first of all, that women's awareness of the direct and indirect effects of institutional inequities be increased. As the Research Advisory Group's report states (1984:15),

"It is neither fair nor realistic to assume that, if many women fail to recognise inequitable career constraints, those constraints may be ignored. To do so would be to ignore the requirements of natural justice and the indirect costs to the community of women's career frustration."

Not only female, but male artists also have sometimes been reluctant to accept state patronage of the arts, for it was seen to be encouraging bureaucratic intervention in their traditionally free, detached profession, with the implication of censorship. Fairburn (1956:206,211) has strongly expressed such reservations about state patronage:

"... any artist who gives positive encouragement to State expenditure on the arts - especially to certain forms of it - is asking for a collar and chain sooner or later, however much disguised it may be... The

careerists and parasites who clamour for 'recognition' (meaning, not the sort of understanding the genuine artist values more than any other thing, but does not expect to be able to command at will - but money) should be ignored."

But women artists, to a much greater degree than men, have reason to be reluctant about seeking state support, because of their own, and others' attitudes to their involvement in art as professionals. It may be that women artists have been dissuaded from turning to the state apparatus for support for their work because of such attitudes. The pervasive notions about the seriousness of women's art (which have implied questions about the quality of women's art) have created the same perception of inadequacy which characterises women's experience in other areas. This exclusion from state support and recognition has undoubtedly dissuaded women from applying for grants in the first place. Likewise, craft-workers, whose work does not constitute one of the forms of 'high art', have been similarly unlikely to seek state support.

It is only recently that such non-traditional arts are gaining recognition and value, although it is interesting that in New Zealand we have a Crafts Council which is an autonomous body from the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council. These efforts to make visible the female tradition of domestic craft-based and textile-based production have had two outcomes. They have either been the basis for work that challenges traditional notions of art through addressing a non-art world in non-gallery situations, or become a new commodity of the art world, thereby moving into

gallery contexts the "private, female, artisanal work which high, male and public culture defines itself against" (Tickner, 1984:16).

It becomes obvious that there is a profound tension between, on the one hand, the achievement of recognition by, and acceptance of the rewards of, the art establishment for feminist art with its particular political convictions intact, and, on the other, the accommodation by the art establishment of critical work so that its oppositional character in fact becomes defused. The tendency has been for the women's art movement to become a new avant-garde movement.

The oppression of women through arts funding policy and practices was the subject of two major studies carried out in Australia recently. The Research Advisory Group of the Women and Arts Project, New South Wales, with financial assistance from the Australia Council (the Australian equivalent of the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council), conducted a study in 1982-83 of the obstacles which women artists and art-workers encounter in various fields and which limit their opportunities as practitioners and administrators. During the same period, the Council sponsored a large-scale enquiry into the career circumstances of Australian artists in general. Because of its very wide terms of reference, this enquiry did not specifically address the situation of women in the arts, but the inquiry's survey data did allow analysis to be made which further highlights the career difficulties faced by women artists. This research indicated that evidence of discriminatory practice appears in working patterns, incomes, training, domestic

responsibilities and other career aspects.

Overall, women were a minority in arts occupations: 37 per cent of all artists were women. And in some art forms there were especially marked imbalances in the number of male and female artists. Women were found to cluster in those occupations which were lower in status; for example, 61 per cent of craft workers were women. (In New Zealand, however, as was mentioned above, the extent of women's participation in craftwork differed somewhat.)

The Australian research revealed further differences in the experience of women and men in the arts. As in New Zealand, women comprised a significantly smaller proportion of the total number of individual applicants to the Australia Council - thirty-seven per cent. The research report noted that the percentage had remained fairly constant over the previous few years. Women applied for smaller amounts on average than men: \$7,000 and \$7,800 respectively in 1981-82. (Together, women applied for \$5 million and men \$9.5 million.)⁸ A study of the sex composition of the governing bodies of arts and cultural institutions in New South Wales revealed smaller numbers of women than men - which is probably characteristic of the situation in other states, and which means that there is a lack of influence by women in directing the policies and practices of those institutions.

As a consequence of the Women in the Arts study, the Australia Council announced in 1984 several proposals which, it was hoped, would be steps toward improving the adverse

circumstances of many women artists.⁹ These proposals included the development of equal-opportunity programmes relating to employment, acquisition of works and repertoire selections, among the criteria for assessment of all arts-organisation applications; the inclusion in the annual reports of all major council-funded arts organisations their progress toward equal opportunity for women; a review by all major arts organisations of the representation of women on their governing bodies, and an effort toward equal opportunity. In light of the research findings that 75 per cent of women art workers and artists felt restricted by their child care responsibilities, the Council also agreed that it would look at the possibility of funding subsidised child-care facilities to help women in the arts. Finally, the Council acknowledged the need to investigate the reasons why so many women drop out after completing arts training.

The report of the Research Advisory Group (1984:15) identifies entrenched attitudes in the community as a major factor contributing to women's disadvantage, among which are included "internalised psychological barriers to success within many women artists themselves, a result of long-term conditioning". Even where many earlier barriers have been removed (such as enrolment at art schools), other obstacles still remain. Batten (1980:71) regards the "psychic obstacle that is created by being female in a culture that is male-dominated" as constituting the major barrier to women's equality in the arts. The material and psychic obstacles that women artists experience are described by Eva Hesse, a modern American artist in a letter to her friend Ethelyn Honig (cited by Batten, 1980:72):

"A singleness of purpose no obstructions allowed seem a man's prerogative. His domain. A woman is side-tracked by all her feminine roles from menstrual periods to cleaning house to remaining pretty and 'young' and having babies. If she refuses to stop there she yet must cope with them. She is at a disadvantage from the beginning... She also lacks conviction that she has the 'right' to achievement. She also lacks the belief that her achievements are worthy. Therefore she has not the steadfastness necessary to carry ideas to the full development. There are handfuls that succeeded, but less when one separates the women from the women that assumed the masculine role..."

While it is true that acknowledgement of these psychological barriers is important in invalidating biological traits as the explanation of women's disadvantage in the arts, that approach is not sufficiently illuminating. Batten rightly concludes that the solution to the difficulties women encounter is more than merely a matter of assertiveness or development of self-confidence. Instead, the structures of oppression must be explored. These structural aspects serve to make redundant questions related to women's inherent artistic ability as compared with that of men, and they shift the focus from women's social experiences to societal power relations which ensure women's exclusion from certain spheres. Later on, I shall refer to the theory of gatekeeping as a tool for understanding women's oppression in this form of exclusion.

Women artists are involved in a considerable struggle to achieve recognition and even more fundamentally to achieve the same opportunity as men to study and practice art. Rosier (1983:42) quotes the New Zealand painter Robin White, who, in the context of a discussion about Rita Angus confirmed the obstacles faced by women artists:

"I'm conscious of the extra effort that's involved in being female and trying to do something like paint. You're up against problems which men don't have to face, you have to confront inbuilt prejudices and preconceived ideas on what your role is to be."

Many women artists who have married male artists have abandoned their own artistic activity and taken up responsibility for domestic work in order that their husbands might continue to pursue their art work. Certainly, when women choose to have children, they typically face disruption to their career and for women artists the situation is no different. Where women do engage in artistic activity, they are considered to be less serious than men.

Jacqueline Fahey, a New Zealand woman painter, in an interview with Pat Rosier (1984:33), perceives herself as different from other (earlier) women artists, in that she had children, although she notes that a number of young women painters are now both artists and mothers. Traditionally, where women have had a profession, as well as children and other domestic responsibilities, the latter have been considered to be their primary concern, and their professional role has been

secondary and often suspended. For women artists, the result has been that their commitment to art has been regarded as less serious than that of men, and less important.

At this stage, it is relevant to refer to some of the findings of the recent (1982-83) national survey of craftspeople mentioned earlier in this chapter. In describing the systematic differences in the incomes of female and male craftworkers, Scotts asserted that female craftspeople faced additional obstacles. He finds that these obstacles derive particularly from their domestic role. He claims that it would be

"... relatively easy to label many women as hobbyists - as being not seriously involved in craftwork as a vocation. Not only do they tend to work fewer hours per week on craftwork (at least, among those surveyed), but they are also much more likely than men to live in a household in which the bulk of income is provided by a spouse. But to label them hobbyists would be facile indeed. Their family commitments are almost always likely to be greater than those of men (an important factor when most craft work is home-based and there is little possibility of physical escape from those responsibilities), and their access to resources less." (Scotts and Mounsey, 1983:20)

Many of Fahey's female predecessors were exceptional women. The biographical details of Olivia Spencer Bower are evidence of extra-ordinary circumstances. Her mother was a painter and it was during her childhood that Olivia developed an interest in painting. In her early twenties, she spent time studying in Britain and Europe. She did not marry and had no children. Her

life was therefore able to be work-orientated, although it appears that she had a private income (hence, marriage was not an economic necessity), and did not rely solely on painting for her livelihood. She is quoted by Rosier (1983a:42) as saying: "I was practically a freak because I was interested in painting."

Issues relating to women's perceived status and their domestic responsibilities reveal a situation where women artists are especially vulnerable to the normal competition for recognition and support. A concentration of males in positions of influence and their own subsequent choices may increase women's vulnerability; in particular, their earning capacity may be diminished. The combination of these factors tends to reduce women's confidence in their abilities and may lead to lower expectations in regard to the financial assistance they deserve.

The experiences of women artists in New Zealand and Australia are similar to their Canadian counterparts. It is estimated that seventy to eighty per cent of gallery directors in Canada are men. In 1977, a Statistics Canada survey indicated that the income of full-time female artists was 56 per cent that of males. Despite large numbers of women graduates from art-schools, very few women are represented in the higher classification of full-time tenured positions in those institutions. Other research showed that from 1972 to 1975, thirty per cent of applicants for Canada Council (the equivalent of the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council) grants were from women, and 21 per cent of the recipients of grants were women. There are claims of gross under-representation of women on the Council's juries, selection committees and advisory panels. The

jurors, those who would decide grant recipients, were rarely women: 12.5 per cent from 1970 to 1978. (This Canadian research was cited in an article, by Hope Kamin, 'Stereotyping. An Issue in the Arts' in the Winnipeg Free Press, 6/10/81.)

The New Zealand equivalent of these jurors are the members of the adjudication panels established by the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council to evaluate funding applications. It is worth noting that the minutes of the meetings of the Visual Arts Adjudication Panel, which considered applications under the 'Annual Grants to Individuals Scheme', revealed that each year the membership of the panel comprised three men and one woman for the years 1980-84.

However, the issue of the membership of advisory and adjudication panels is not a straightforward matter. The mere presence of women on these bodies, or a chairwoman of an Arts Council, does not guarantee understanding and acceptance of women's art. However, some claim that the participation of women is decisive. Michele Landsberg, writing in the Toronto Star, 28/5/83, stated,

"The appallingly low number of women in powerful arts jobs casts a chilly pall on job hopes for other women. The number of roles goes up when there's a women director; the number of grants given by the Canada Council [to women] is in direct proportion to the number of women on the jury. Only women, it seems, give fair chances to other women."

Perhaps the most that can be said is that the presence of women on advisory and adjudication panels is a necessary but not

sufficient condition for the promotion of women artists.

While my intention in this thesis is not to focus solely on the extent of the disadvantages women artists experience in pursuing a career and in receiving state support, it has nevertheless been important to examine, albeit somewhat cursorily, these aspects of the struggle of women artists because they both reflect and reinforce perceptions about women's participation. Women are seen to be removed from the public sphere of professional art which men are privileged to occupy since their art-work is not secondary to domestic responsibilities. Instead, men's art is 'serious' and this, in turn, influences higher expectations about their access to financial support - as revealed in the much greater numbers of men applying for Arts Council grants. In this thesis, I am wanting to look at women's relation to art practice - not just to the institutions of art. The studies referred to above highlight several issues that are of central concern to a feminist critique of the arts. These issues include the need for feminist art and criticism to be promoted through favourable levels of funding of such work; the importance of the visibility and recognition of women artists as role models for other women; the desire to allow women freedom to work in the arts in a full-time capacity; and the concern to represent feminist critics on arts adjudication panels.

Art Critics as Gatekeepers

Earlier discussion in this chapter focussed on the discriminatory practices of major state funding institutions (in New Zealand, the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council). These may be seen as 'gatekeepers' - agents which control the accessibility of individuals or groups to different resources and rewards in society. In this section, I wish to examine the operation of discrimination against women artists through the attitudes of art critics.

Powerful interests do indeed act to discredit women's ideas, as Dale Spender has shown. It is the nature of patriarchal ideology to conceal the particularity of the dominant world-view - an androcentric world-view, but one that has not been (and still often is not) recognised as such. Smith (1978) has described how a discourse emerges as part of the way of organising society. The specific discourse that has emerged in Western Europe over the past 400-500 years has been "an integral aspect of the development of the capitalist mode of production" (Smith, 1978:281). Women have largely been denied influence in shaping this ideological sphere of social reality:

"Women have been deprived of the means to participate in creating forms of thought relevant or adequate to express their own experience or to define and raise social consciousness about their situation and concerns. They have never controlled the material or social means to the making of a tradition among themselves or to acting as equals in the on-going discourse of intellectuals. They have had no economic status independent of men. They have not had, until very recently, access to the educational skills necessary to develop, sustain, and participate in the making of a common culture..." (Smith, 1978:281-282)

At the most fundamental level of cultural production, women have been excluded from encoding meanings. Our entire language, according to Spender (1981), has been generated and legitimated by men. Women's meanings if they have differed or dissented from those of men, have been rejected and/or lost. A constant theme in Rich's book On Lies, Secrets and Silences is that because we speak, write and think in 'man-made language' there are whole areas of women's experience that are not only unspoken, but unspeakable. For women, then, says Rich (1980:245), there is a need to be

"... listening and watching in art and literature, in the social sciences, in all the descriptions we are given of the world for the silences, the absences, the nameless, the unspoken, the encoded - for there we will find the true knowledge of women."

There is a close inter-relationship between the control of power and the control of language and knowledge in society. By challenging the dominant definitions of social reality, the mainstream knowledge of society, the power of the dominant group(s) is threatened. With regard to art criticism, it becomes clear that women's participation in critical practice and their potential to challenge dominant judgments is disallowed through the mechanism of gatekeeping. Gatekeepers may be seen as those who have power to formulate discourse, that is, the language with which the reality of a social group or society is articulated, and through which knowledge is defined.

The idea of 'discourse' refers to the way in which a particular aspect of social reality is defined according to a certain set of terms, within a certain framework. Other aspects of reality which fall outside that framework cannot be perceived. Women's experience cannot be fully addressed or included by a discourse that is male-defined. The effort to separate art and politics, to define certain art as political, and thus to discredit such work, reflects the patriarchal bias in the process of naming reality. When feminists are critical of male power, this becomes defined as a 'political' statement. When artistic statements about reality do not question the subordination of women these are not considered 'political', even though in effect they are legitimating the existing power relations. Feminist artists, then, critique patriarchal social structures and relations. They specifically oppose the view that art transcends politics. Even the more recent liberal acceptance of a certain amount of political content in art nevertheless has reservations about the content when it constitutes a feminist political analysis, which is regarded as narrow and political and is dismissed as propaganda.

Lynne Spender's theory of gatekeeping (1983:6) contributes to an understanding of the activities of art critics. According to this theory,

"... the people who hold decision-making positions in our society actually select the information and ideas that will be allowed to pass through the 'gates' and be incorporated into our culture...our patriarchal society is purposefully arranged so that men fill the decision-making positions and become the keepers of the gates. On the basis of their experience and their

understandings, men can allow entry to the information and ideas that they find unsuitable or unimportant. Gatekeeping thus provides men with a mechanism to promote their own needs and interests at the expense of all others. In doing so, it effectively ensures the continuation of a male supremacist culture."

Spender goes on to talk about the "arranged exclusion" of women from influencing all kinds of cultural practices. This exclusion may be formal, structural and explicit, or it may be informal, in the ways that only men are encouraged to fill influential roles.

This is not a mere 'conspiracy theory' on the part of males, or a case of unfounded paranoia on Spender's part. She argues, in fact, that thoroughly logical, rational processes bring about the perpetuation of male dominance. It is not necessary for males to recognise and consciously collude in this means of oppression of women. Men need only act normally, 'naturally'; that is, in the way that they have been socialised to act in order that discrimination against women to may take place. Men exclude women and women's experience from the category of persons and events that influence our culture. Instead, men and their experience are the reference point from which patterns of social organisation have emerged. The social reality that then exists is one that attributes authority and status to men's concerns and perceptions. Those things which are of significance to women's lives are regarded as secondary, even by women themselves in many instances (Spender, 1983:6).

One frequent method by which the women's art movement has been undermined has been through accusations of sexism. Where

women have sought to implement affirmative action strategies, these have been perceived to be reverse discrimination by women against men. Ironically, women who attempt to challenge the established male 'norm' are quickly dismissed as similarly oppressive of the male half of the population.

At the time of the opening of the Women's Gallery in Wellington early in 1980, a common criticism (for example, Rowe, Evening Post, 2/2/80; Davies, Nelson Evening Mail, 17/1/80) was that the Gallery itself was sexist. Davies asserted that the basis on which artists are selected for exhibitions is always aesthetic, not sexual. He likened women artists to disabled artists (that is, those who paint with a brush held between their toes or teeth) who have established their own art societies, and concluded,

"If these women as a group feel themselves so disabled as to be unable to participate on equal terms in an open market, I'm sure that they have everyone's sympathy. Perhaps, however, they should come out into the open and call their gallery the 'Art Gallery for the aesthetically disabled female'."

Rowe believed that even though inequality between the sexes existed in certain spheres (such as the economy and labour force), in the area of the arts there was no such discrimination. Like so many who misrepresent the strategy of affirmative action, Rowe considered the Women's Gallery to be discriminatory and divisive in its exclusiveness.

Thus, it is clear that another type of gatekeeper, a type who has a very immediate impact on the status of feminist art are those art critics who may either condemn or respect the aspirations of the artists. Feminist art is easily misunderstood, even resented, by male critics; a common ploy is to reject it as propaganda. Frequently, the work of feminist artists is pejoratively referred to as polemical. Feminist art very consciously conveys a political message and often explicit, persuasive, and uncompromising style of their statements in art is seen as inimical to the aesthetic process.

One such recent example is the title given to Roberts' (1985) review of Claudia Pond Eyley's work: 'Painted Polemic'. Roberts is not necessarily unappreciative of the content of Pond Eyley's paintings, but he is ambivalent about the polemical style. He refers to the example of Picasso's Guernica - relevant because it too seeks to inspire a political conviction. Roberts implies that Guernica has come to be regarded as one of the great paintings of this century for reasons other than its polemical quality:

"War, we all agree with sufficient banality is hell. But Picasso's imaginative power is so great, his imagery so singular, that we are carried beyond the truism to a new perception of the true horror. Our innocence is restored."

Similarly, Neil Rowe (1980) wrote of the newly-opened Women's Gallery in Wellington,

"While any new gallery is a welcome addition on the Wellington scene, one that is so dogmatically based on an ideology that is determined to show art that serves its own polemical ends has less to do with art than it has with politics and a form of therapy for disgruntled ladies..."

It seems, then, that innocence/imagination and polemic are incompatible, even mutually exclusive. Warwick Brown, writing about the polemical method of some contemporary feminist artists, concluded very concisely (1985:12),

"Soapbox stridency isn't art. Personal conviction complexly conveyed is."

These critics, then, presume that they may determine the acceptable degree of political involvement, and for Brown, this would appear to be a very limited degree:

"Apart from posters and the potent art of caricature, politics seems another area where art can only get involved indirectly."

Such attitudes regarding the relationship between art and politics are problematic for feminist artists. Those attitudes require a separation of two spheres which feminists regard as inseparable. For socialist-feminists, in particular, there is no possibility of an 'other-worldly' artistic detachment from the 'worldly' phenomenon of politics. Politics is understood here in the widest sense of the word: that is, the manifestations of power relations and power structures. Feminists have

consistently upheld that the personal is political. By this is meant that the experiences of the 'private sphere' (that is, domestic labour, family, reproduction and sexuality) are similarly structured by power relations as is the 'public sphere' (which includes such activities as state and local government, economic production, paid work, law, media, formal education). They are not to be seen as 'natural' features of female experience, but as important arena for politicisation and change. Therefore, all aspects of human activity are characterised by societal power structures. Gender is seen, by socialist-feminists, as one of the basic categories according to which members of society are ordered and rewarded.

The attempt to separate art and politics raises questions about the definition of politics. If all human social activity is political, then apparently apolitical activity is in fact promoting (either tacitly or more actively) the existing power structure. Often the term 'political', when it is used of artistic production, is indicating oppositional practice: work which challenges the existing power structure.

Male monopoly of the naming process enables men to establish definitions of art which embody the exclusion of explicit references to power structures. Thus, art of any merit, in the judgment of contemporary mainstream critics, becomes defined as that which is indirect, subtle. Warwick Brown (1985:12) uses the example of the failure of the Futurists, the Dadaists and the Suprematists who were influenced by the early modernist belief that through art the perceptions and values of people could be significantly changed to justify this rejection of overtly

political content in art. Because of the evident fruitfulness (for example, art about the horror of war has not prevented war), of such uses of art, Brown is led to ask, "What point is there, what merit is there, in polemical art in New Zealand in the 1980s?"

Feminist artists are often justifiably suspicious of the 'hidden agenda' of their (usually male) critics. Throughout history, there are numerous examples of the chauvinism of critics who respond favourably to work that is appropriately 'feminine'. King (1984) describes the misrepresentation of the painting of Margaret Stoddart, who was among the first generation of New Zealand-born artists. She was one of the first women in Canterbury to seek professional involvement in water-colour painting. Her contribution to landscape painting has been obscured by the attention given to her flower painting, which was considered by at least one critic, writing in the Lyttleton Times (p5) on 17 November, 1890 (quoted by King, 1984:46), to be particularly appropriate for a woman artist:

"Flowers are nowadays the especial property of our lady artists... Miss Stoddart was our first 'floral artist', and still remains facile princeps..."

The critics are similarly negative in their judgments of women's work that offends the stereotype of women as gentle, submissive, delicate, and so on. Brown's own evaluation of contemporary feminist artists reflects the paternalism so frequently present in art criticism:

"For a message to be conveyed convincingly through art, it must be subtly woven into the fabric, so subtly that the viewer doesn't notice it as the *raison d'être* of the work. It is the artists who have consciously focused on their femininity and let it guide their hands who have been most successful. Carole Shephard has chosen to work with handmade paper, using stitching and weaving and small collected objects. Her collages and paintings are unmistakably feminine; pretty yet tough, uncompromising yet very accessible. Juliet Batten's most recent water colour and xerox works portray personal rituals which, whatever their genesis, come across as beautifully mysterious."

It is clear that art critics such as Brown are able to define the status of feminist art by the very language that they employ. Adjectives such as "small", "feminine", and "pretty", are all used to connote a positive judgment, and words such as "tough" and "uncompromising" are deliberately qualified. They may not stand alone to describe women's art - because they are considered to be more frequently and properly qualities of men's activity. Indeed, the language Brown uses elsewhere in his review seems anti-feminist also. He writes,

"Notwithstanding the significant and well-recognised contribution to art here by numerous women, from Frances Hodgkins through Rita Angus to Gretchen Albrecht, in the 1970s some women artists felt it necessary to produce feminist art..." (my emphasis)

For Brown, the work of these women was not only "well-recognised"; it was obviously appropriately or acceptably feminine. Moreover, in writing in this way, he appears to be

skeptical about the project of feminist artists.

It should be pointed out that, as mentioned earlier, Frances Hodgkins shifted from New Zealand as did so many of her contemporaries who struggled to practise their art in colonial New Zealand. Hodgkins won a belated recognition. Although she was known in the 1930s as a representative of the English avant-garde, it was only after the outbreak of war that she enjoyed critical acclaim. Rita Angus found herself working in a less-than-supportive environment; to say that her contribution to art was "well-recognised" is in fact inaccurate. In the preface to the catalogue that accompanied the recent retrospective exhibition, Rita Angus, Luit Bieringa writes (1983:7),

"Rita Angus often sold her work only reluctantly and for most of her life her paintings did not find a ready market with either private buyers or public galleries. The result of this has been that the range and breadth of her work has previously only been hinted at. The artist herself was well aware of and disliked this restricted view of her work. She was very mistrustful of the patchwork promotion of a small number of paintings which seemed to her to present an edited and overly simplified view of her individual achievements as an artist."

Pat Rosier (1983) points out that the critics' distortions of the range and subject matter of Rita Angus continue even to the present day. She argues that two critics in particular, Ronald Brownson and Anthony Mackle (who write in the catalogue along with Bieringa) introduce patriarchal stereotypes which

demean the artist's work. In other words, they assert a feminine sensibility, which imposes a certain set of criteria for evaluating women's work: criteria which conform to traditional oppressive beliefs about suitable concerns and styles for women.

Spender's observations (1980:99) about the means through which males establish supremacy seem particularly valid here. Men seek to disallow any opportunity for themselves to be judged 'wrong'; they themselves define the 'right' answers. They do this through setting up a single reality. In this particular case, the one reality is that art and direct statements about political conviction are mutually exclusive, and thus they prevent the claims made by feminist thinkers about a reality where art and indeed all activity are thoroughly political. The dismissal of feminist art by critics is part of the attempt to deny women a means of expression; men establish their experience as normal (Rowbotham, 1973:35). The accompanying text for the album Ain't I a Woman (1974), produced by a group of North American feminist musicians called New Harmony Sisterhood Band, confirms this:

"... all culture expresses certain points of view and their accompanying values. When cultural expressions reflect the standard norms of society, they are comfortably accepted as art. When culture puts forth views that contradict our social norms, we have been taught to think that this is propaganda rather than expressing a new point of view."

FOOTNOTES

(1) Elias (1984) seems somewhat ambivalent about claiming Frances Hodgkins and Rita Angus as evidence of success by women in pursuit of serious artistic activity. In fact, she scarcely considers Hodgkins to be a New Zealand artist: Hodgkins spent the first part of her life here but soon left New Zealand in search of a more artistically supportive environment. Furthermore, Olivia Spencer Bower (in an interview with Adams, 1983:21) says of Hodgkins that "... she had to sign herself Francis with a c i s so that no-one would know what sex she was in order to get on as well as she did."

(2) Cassatt, for example, although also an expatriate from her native America, seeking a more favourable working environment in Europe, turned her energies to a radical examination of women's lives that was not to be found in the work of these New Zealand women artists. Moreover, not only the content but also the form of her work embodied a strongly subversive critique of dominant ideologies about women's traditional activity (Parker and Pollock, 1981:38, 41).

(3) A summary of the survey of the first twenty-four issues conducted by Eastmond and Sotheran was presented at the seminar, 'Sexism in the Arts', jointly convened by the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council and the New Zealand Students Arts Council, held at the University of Auckland in September, 1983. The August-September 1976 issue of Art New Zealand was the first appearance of the new magazine. The survey was updated by Eastmond and Pitts (1985).

(4) Eastmond, Sotheran, and Pitts indicated a degree of mistrust of the motives of the magazine's editor in the use of this particular photograph of Claire Fergusson on the cover of Art New Zealand 21. Instead of according serious recognition for her art-work, she becomes transformed into an object of the male voyeur's gaze: Fergusson resembles a "cover girl". She is reduced to her sexual meaning for a male spectator. Cooper similarly is portrayed in a low-cut top playing the role of a masseuse.

(5) The Census data on the numbers of 'Sculptors, Painters (Artists), and Photographers' is as follows:

CENSUS	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
1971	2714	926	3640
1976	3026	1205	4231
1981	3285	1674	4959

(New Zealand Official Yearbook, 1982)

(6) Here again, the cover of Art New Zealand 26 (the issue devoted to women artists) is of critical interest. Evelyn Page, then in her eighties, is pictured on the cover as a sweet and gentle elderly woman, benign and not at all threatening, with flowers positioned near her further reinforcing the image of a

conventional type of female of that age. The article about Page in that issue is very specific, and not a piece of more general biographical writing. For this reason, it would have been most appropriate to portray her on the cover with examples of her work and/or tools (as does the representation of Richard Killeen on the cover of Art New Zealand 20, or of Boyd Webb on the cover of Art New Zealand 24). The issue on women artists in fact demonstrated that writing about the work of women was commercially viable in that it sold out very rapidly. It was however compiled by male editors and made only passing mention of the women's art movement.

(7) John McCormack (Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council Visual Arts Advisory Officer) hastens to point out that these data are to be used cautiously. They were prepared for the purposes of seeking more funds for grants to visual artists. He himself suggests that in the light of the apparent absence of discriminatory mechanisms within the Arts Council's operations, one must look to perceptions and structures limiting women's interest in applying for funds.

(8) These figures are drawn from the Individual Artists Enquiry and presented in the report, Women in the Arts. A Strategy for Action, 1984, Australia Council.

(9) These proposals were reported in the Brisbane Courier Mail, 17/7/84, p19 by Sally Loane.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Role of the Cultural Infrastructure in the Maintenance of Hegemony

The emergence of a significant cultural infrastructure in New Zealand indicates some more or less coherent belief about, and commitment to, the place of artistic production in this society. In this chapter, I shall document the development of that cultural infrastructure. I shall then examine the relationship of this cultural infrastructure to bourgeois hegemony, through reference to a theory of the state. It is evident that the task of interpreting the meaning of art for this society, and of developing a cultural policy involves this reference to a theory of the state, since the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council is a body which is established by parliamentary statute, comprised of members who are appointed by the Minister for the Arts, and charged with the distribution of funds obtained by the Minister from Treasury and from other financial sources that are managed by his Ministry.

State patronage, not only of the visual arts, but of a whole range of art forms would appear to be a major factor in their survival. One is led to examine the nature of the arts in society, their significance in the whole mosaic of human activity and production, for in the allocation of resources it is obvious that the state must prioritise. It is also evident that policy-makers, politicians and participants in artistic production have divergent interests on many occasions.

A large part of the following study of the state's support of the arts will be taken up with an examination of the structure of the Arts Council, which appears to have a dominant influence on the condition of the various art forms, at least those which depend heavily on state subsidy through the Council.

The year 1940 is perhaps an obvious place to begin a chronology of the State's support of the arts, for it was not until that time that there was any real contribution from the Government to cultural activities. Nineteen-forty was the year of New Zealand's Centennial celebrations of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, and in conjunction with these celebrations there were a number of 'high' cultural events as well as a new general self-awareness among the people of the country, a type of emergent nationalism, and, in particular, a recognition of local achievements in the field of the arts. In 1940, Peter Fraser succeeded Michael Joseph Savage as leader of the Labour government, and through the personal support of Fraser and his administration there was a favourable climate in which the arts flourished. In conjunction with the Centennial celebrations were held a National Exhibition of New Zealand art, a National Music

Competition and the establishment of a National Symphony Orchestra. The Orchestra did not continue after the Centenary but was reassembled several years later as one of a number of measures that were introduced as part of a new, large-scale public patronage of the arts instituted by Joseph Heenan, Under-Secretary of the Internal Affairs Department.

Whereas the financial contribution of the State during the Centennial was not part of a continuing commitment to the arts, the intention at the end of the 1940s was to create permanent cultural institutions. As well as the launching of a National Orchestra in 1947, there was the establishment of a State Literary Fund which received funds to be distributed to publishers of New Zealand literature, history and Maori writing; to New Zealand authors; and also for the encouragement of the reading and study of New Zealand literature through assistance with the publication of New Zealand critical essays. Through this fund, New Zealand writers have been able to continue full-time writing, and to travel overseas, and the New Zealand publishing industry has been able to grow. In particular, literary magazines have been published.

In 1945, the National Library Service was established; and in 1941 the National Film Unit was set up, thus permitting the development of indigenous film. Through the New Zealand Broadcasting Service the State has fostered activity in the fields of music and drama, and through the publication of the New Zealand Listener local writing, both fiction and non-fiction, has been published. The contemporary Music Federation had its origins in the Federation of Chamber Music Societies which was

formed in 1950. The Department of Education was another instrument of state patronage of the arts, notably through the School Publications Branch.

In 1949, the Labour Government was removed from the administrative seat and the new National Government exhibited a different attitude to the arts. According to one historian (Oliver, 1981:450),

"... though little was dismantled, the 1950s were the years of private not state initiative in the arts. The state settled down to the role of pay-master, rewarding enterprises that had already demonstrated a measure of success."

In that decade, the degree of patronage by the private sector (both individual and corporate support) was increased. The State Literary Fund remained as the major source of the government's financial commitment to the arts, but through the Department of Internal Affairs individual projects obtained substantial assistance. In 1953, the New Zealand Ballet Company was formed; and in 1954 the New Zealand Opera Company began productions and toured extensively in conjunction with the Community Arts and Adult Education Services. The two companies that had been formed by individuals soon had to seek support from the State due to the high financial costs of their operations.

A different fate was the lot of professional theatre at that time. When the Labour Government was removed, so was the prospect of a national theatre which had been anticipated under Fraser. There was a professional company, the New Zealand

Players, directed by Edith and Richard Campion, which toured the country, but the costs of travelling forced them to discontinue their productions in 1960. It is evident that New Zealand's geographical conditions have a marked effect on the availability of cultural 'goods'. In many instances, the difficulties and the expense involved in travelling the length of the country have discouraged artistes from visiting many centres.

The year 1960 was of great importance in the history of the arts in New Zealand, for it was then that there was a significant increase in the level of arts funding by the government, and the Arts Advisory Council was set up. This was superseded by the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council in 1963. The following statement by Oliver (1981:452) sums up the changes in the cultural infrastructure:

"The time of the do-it-yourself individualist had passed; both pioneer and proletarian virtue were at a discount. The era of the cultural bureaucrat, the patronised producer, and the subsidised consumer had arrived."

During the 1950s, the suggestion that a body similar to the Arts Council of Great Britain should be established in this country had been made several times. It was envisaged that such a body, if it came into existence, would function to advise the government on matters relating to the arts, would distribute state funds to artistic ventures, and would promote the practice and appreciation of the arts.

In the 1960 Budget, the first move towards setting up such an organisation was made, with the allocation of 60,000 pounds to be distributed by a group of people working in conjunction with the Department of Internal Affairs.

Before proceeding to a closer analysis of the Arts Advisory Council and the philosophy behind its establishment, there is one further channel of state funding of the arts which is rather different from the kind of support that has been provided from the government vote to the State Literary Fund and from government bodies such as the Education Department and the Broadcasting Service. This other channel still remains and is of much significance. It was simply known as the Cultural Fund when it was set up in 1947 but it is known today as the Cultural Facilities Fund. Originally, it had a slightly different purpose but it operated in much the same way then as now. In its beginnings, the Fund was available for more general arts activities, rather than as a provider of capital for cultural amenities as it is now. The fund was intended to assist the arts other than literature, and the money for it came from lottery profits. During the Depression years, 'art unions' had been established for charitable purposes and relief of distress, but, with the recovery from the Depression and the war, there had been an accumulation of profits from the art unions.

Grants from the Cultural Fund were made by the Department of Internal Affairs and the Prime Minister and, later, with the approval of just the Department. At first, these grants were not publicised; they were made quietly to assist talented young people practising in the arts to seek overseas the advanced

training and experience not available to them in New Zealand, and to a few national organisations in the arts. However, it was not long before the administration of the fund was reorganised and formalised. The availability of grants was publicised, applications for grants had to be properly filed, and the Minister of Internal Affairs set up professional selection committees.

When the Arts Advisory Council came into being at the end of 1960, it was given the general directive to recommend to the Minister of Internal Affairs grants that would foster and encourage the arts. The members of the Arts Advisory Council were appointed by the Minister, who was an ex officio chairman. There were three other ex officio members, the Director of Education, the Director of Broadcasting, and the Secretary of Internal Affairs. Five other members were appointed on the basis of their experience and/or interest in the arts. The 60,000 pounds given to the Council in its first year was made up equally from government vote (that is, from the Consolidated Fund) and from lottery profits. For 1962 and 1963, the level of the Arts Advisory Council grant remained at 60,000 pounds. The establishment of the Council signified the introduction of an important principle: by allocating funds earned from taxation, the state accepted direct responsibility for fostering the arts, outside of existing support through education and broadcasting (Turnovsky, 1969:38).

From the Arts Advisory Council emerged the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council in 1963. The enabling legislation anticipated a structure and set of functions similar to those of the Arts

Council of Great Britain. Arts Councils throughout the world are in fact a new phenomenon, and the one in Great Britain was the first. It was established in 1946 in recognition of the important role the arts played in maintaining morale in the Second World War. Lord Keynes who designed the structure of that first Arts Council saw the event as a recognition by the Government of the "encouragement of the civilising arts of life as part of their duty" (cited by Joan Kerr, in an address to the thirtieth Annual General Meeting of the Music Federation).

From the 1963 Act, the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council derived four main functions, and four main budget categories:

(1) the development of professionalism, by establishing professional standards through support of professional performing institutions (subsidies for galleries, theatre, etc.) and by establishing an infrastructure in which artists may find employment;

(2) the development of the practice and the appreciation of the arts;

(3) accessibility of the arts and regional development, especially through development of regional arts, and through such things as tours of static exhibitions and visiting artists); and

(4) public education, promotion and research.

These four functions define the principle means by which the Arts Council was to carry out its primary task: the integration of the arts fully into community life.

At the end of 1972, a Labour government came into power and, as part of its election manifesto, it almost doubled the Arts Council's 1973-4 grant. In 1974, the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council Act was passed. (See Appendix A.) It came into force on April 1, 1975, giving the Arts Council its present form (although there have been several subsequent amendments to this Act, in 1977, 1978, and 1980).

By the Act, New Zealand was to be divided into three regions: Northern, Central and Southern, each of which would have a Regional Arts Council. (For the composition and functions of these Councils, see Appendix B.) The Act also provided for the establishment of Community Arts Councils. (See Appendix C.)

The Arts Council thus has a regional structure that is community-based and involves the encouragement and development of the arts at a community level. Considerable local authority involvement in the arts was sought by the Act. This was through local authorities providing administrative services to community arts councils in their area.

Impetus for these developments came from the Labour Government's commitment to regional development and from that Government's response to a significant number of claims by regional amateur arts groups, as well as individuals, that they had not received grants because of the Arts Council's emphasis on professionalism and a national base for the arts. The Government itself had a wider view of the arts than the Arts Council's funding policies indicated. (This was reflected in the Government's creation of a Ministry of Recreation and Sport.)

In the first three years after the Act was passed, fifty community arts councils began operating. The number now has grown to over sixty. The development of community arts councils depended on the motivation of groups and individuals at the local level, rather than imposed organisation. The Regional Arts Councils established themselves as a sort of distributive funding committee, but were also very involved with activating and stimulating community arts. They play a supportive role by providing services, ideas, communication links, to facilitate the development of community arts.

In 1978, an amendment was made to the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council Act to establish a Council for Maori and South Pacific Arts which would become part of the Arts Council's structure at the same level as a regional arts council. In 1977, the Crafts Council of New Zealand was established as a non-governmental organisation but with government assistance; in 1978, the New Zealand Film Commission was established to offer financial, organisational and marketing assistance to the

burgeoning film industry.

The Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council is adamant that it is more than purely a funding body, and is constantly seeking to be seen more as an agency that develops and fosters the arts, with funding being only a small part of its role. As Hamish Keith stated when he was the chairperson of the Arts Council (quoted in Action 6, September-October, 1978:14),

"The Arts Council must be concerned with developing an environment in which the arts can flourish. An environment where support from all sources is readily available for arts activities and artists; where there is a climate of acceptance for the arts; where the arts are used by everybody; and where artists can see themselves as having a professional career, as living in a stimulating, innovative environment to which they contribute and in which that contribution is recognised and valued. The responsibility for fostering that environment extends across an enormously wide range of activities, and includes advising the government on legislation that might affect the arts or the interests of artists."

In 1983, a new budget category was introduced - that of the preservation of our cultural heritage, and, in particular, assistance to the Maori and South Pacific Arts Council and its clients.

Arts Council Funding

The Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council's funds come from government vote, from the Lottery Board, and from other sources such as rents and donations. In December every year, the Arts Council presents a submission to the Department of Internal Affairs with an estimate of the finance needed to maintain its current activities and to introduce new activities. By February, the Department is ready to send its own budget to Treasury with submissions from all the institutions and activities that the Department of Internal Affairs administers, ranked in order according to the Department's new policy proposal. Treasury then comes up with its allocation based on the former policy (which means a maintenance of the existing activities) and incorporating something of the newly-generated policy. The main task is that of persuading Treasury to accept the new policy proposals. For this reason, it would appear that the respect and the favourable consideration that the Minister for the Arts can earn for himself through his powers of articulation and persuasion are crucial in influencing Caucus and Treasury to approve of a satisfactory level of funds for the Arts Council. The Arts Council is presently, and has been for several years, experiencing difficulties in maintaining its current programme of activities. Even without expanding its programme, the Council requires an increase of about twenty percent in its basic grant.

The Arts Council has been alarmed at the Government's lack of commitment to arts funding, for since the late 1970s there has been a downward trend in the proportion of government vote money in comparison with the grant from the Lottery Board. In 1978-79, the government vote constituted 77.8 per cent of the Arts Council's grant; in 1979-80, the government vote constituted

74.2 per cent; in 1980-81, it constituted 66.7 per cent; and in 1981-82, it constituted 62.8 per cent.¹ The grant is made annually to the Arts Council, and is linked to the increases in the Consumer Price Index. Herein are two sources of dissatisfaction. People involved in the arts have pressed for a triennial grant - and in fact the 1978 election policy of the National Party was in support of triennial funding. Also, the Arts Council prefers a scheme of funding that is linked to the Gross National Product, so that Arts Council funding would be linked to the inflation rate.

Having briefly set out the circumstances surrounding the grant to the Arts Council, I will now turn to examine what happens with the funds under the Arts Council's control. Towards the end of the 1970s, it was recognised by the Council that there was some degree of imbalance in the amount of funding distributed to the Arts Council's institutional clients compared with the level of support the Council had been able to give individual artists. In the 1979-80 allocation of funds, it was intended to redress that imbalance.

The Arts Council splits its money three ways. By far the greatest portion of the funds is retained for the Council's own five major budget areas (as there existed before 1983) which were described earlier. A small amount of money goes to the Regional Arts Councils, and an even smaller amount went to the Maori and South Pacific Arts Council. (See Appendix D for a table of the distribution of funds by the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council for the years 1977-82.)

The funds that the Arts Council itself allocates are divided between six different areas, namely:

- (1) development of professionalism, maintenance of arts institutions;
- (2) development of the practice and appreciation of the arts;
- (3) projects in the arts;
- (4) grants to individuals;
- (5) accessibility of the arts and regional development programmes (outside of Regional Arts Councils); and
- (6) the Council's public education, promotion and research programmes.

(See Appendix E for a table of the distribution of funds to each of these six areas.)

The increasing shortfall between the Arts Council's requested grant from the Minister for the Arts (a level that reflects the Council's commitment to its current clients, and also its role in the development of the arts) and the actual grant, prompted the Arts Council to make a major assessment of its funding priorities in 1980.² The Council was not only experiencing a falling level of government financial support, but it was simultaneously receiving increasing numbers of demands on its funds, a result of the growing number of individuals involved

in the arts, and of public pressure for an expansion of the range and purpose of the Council's functions. The Council can only meet these new responsibilities by curtailing the flow of funds to existing programmes. The Council, of course, has strongly expressed its views to the Government that the present level and the method of arts funding is undesirable. It is only the generosity of the Lottery Board that has prevented the Council funding from falling much further below the current inadequate level. As the Arts Council report stated (quoted in Action 15, June/July 1980:20),

"The Board now provides 33 1/3 per cent of the Council's total grant compared with only 19 per cent in 1977/78. The Board has advised the Council, however, that it cannot expect this rate of increase to be maintained in the future."

In particular, it is unlikely that the Council will be able to continue to provide the same level of institutional funding - institutions being such things as professional theatre companies.

The Arts Council believes that it should not be the only funding agency, and currently there is, at the national, regional and local levels, a move by individuals and groups involved in the arts to exploit sources of revenue in the private sector - that is, from non-governmental organisations. The success of sporting bodies in obtaining sponsorship for their activities is a lesson to be learned by those involved in cultural or artistic activities. Furthermore, there is a strong belief that municipal bodies should play a more effective role in the support of the arts.

Since 1963, then, amending legislation has made considerable changes to the original structure and functions of the Arts Council. In addition, the state of the economy and government policy have intervened in the operation of the Council, more or less indirectly. Here, I wish to explore further some important features of state involvement in the arts in New Zealand.

In contrast to arts patrons of the past, the Arts Council is a public body spending public funds, for public purposes. The legislation which sets out the public purposes which the Council is expected to fulfil determines the sphere of the Council's operations. Likewise, the administrative procedures that have been developed in the public sector determine the way in which the Council will carry out its policies.

Another feature of the Arts Council that has been maintained since its inception is its quasi-autonomous non-governmental character. Before and after the establishment of the Arts Council there were fears that state patronage of the arts would involve political interference. Also, among a number of writers and artists, there was skepticism, even hostility, expressed about the establishment of an Arts Council, on the grounds that it would become a bureaucratic monolith. Fairburn (1956:206) was one such critic:

"... any artist who gives positive encouragement to State expenditure on the arts - especially to certain forms of it - is asking for a collar and chain. For State subsidies mean some measure of State control sooner or later, however much disguised it may be... The arts, above all other activities except religion and love, should be carried on by individuals acting in

free association."

There are a number of assumptions about the nature of the arts and their relationship to society contained in this statement, which will be addressed later in this chapter. However, for the moment, Fairburn expresses eloquently the fear of censorship which, initially, at least, caused much ambivalence and suspicion about state patronage of the arts. The phrase, 'arms length principle', was formulated to describe the nature of the Arts Council's position: at a distance from governmental control.³ Yet, the Arts Council's position is riddled with ambiguity.

The Arts Council is perceived as a buffer between government and artists: a means of keeping artists at 'arms length' from the Minister's door. The Arts Council is only nominally independent and perhaps should be regarded as a government agency established to give effect to government purposes, subject to annual government funding and to the variations in emphasis apparent in the cultural 'policies' of successive governments. It might seem that Arts Councils are expected to serve irreconcilable ends: on the one hand there are the limits on spending and the rational, efficient (in the economic sense) use of available funds which the government demands; and, on the other, the insatiable demands for support from increasing numbers of artists.

The way that members of the Arts Council are appointed further reveals that the Arts Council is monitored by the government. The 1974 Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council Act specifies the membership of the Arts Council as:

- (1) a person appointed by the Minister as chairperson;
- (2) three persons, chairpersons of the Regional Arts Councils (who are similarly appointed by the Minister);
- (3) five others, appointed by the Minister;
- (4) one representative from the Department of Education;
- (5) one representative from the Broadcasting Council; and
- (6) the Secretary of Internal Affairs.

It is obvious the membership of the Arts Council rests heavily on ministerial favour. The Council serves the Government by attending to the need of artists for income maintenance, and setting up a legitimate channel for communication, one that defuses a certain amount of artists' grievances.

Although originally modelled on the Arts Council of Great Britain, the New Zealand structure has evolved a rather unique pattern of internal organisation, unique in the way that it is significantly decentralised and democratised. This feature has been achieved with the creation of regional arts councils and community arts councils, as well as the Maori and South Pacific Arts Council. The members of these are some appointed, some elected. Community Arts Councils can be established simply by calling a meeting which then adopts an approved constitution and

obtains the consent of the local authority to administer the Council. Having become legally constituted in this way, they may then advise the national body of the Arts Council, and apply for funds.

In another way, the New Zealand modification of the British Arts Council is an improvement on the original Arts Council structure, although New Zealand's innovation has only been brought about more recently. For the first ten years of its operations, the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council retained the British structure. In the Arts Council of Great Britain, policy formulation was carried out along the lines of the traditional fields within the arts, for example: music, theatre, visual arts, craft, dance. For each of these specialist areas, there was an advisory panel, of which the members were drawn, generally, from the artistic professions. What this meant was that the Council's advisors were frequently its own clients, and that it tended not to serve the cultural needs of all the people within the country. The advisory panels became vehicles for lobbying according to the vested interests of their members. Furthermore, the goal of excellence came to be very narrowly defined in terms of the traditional art forms, and excellence within non-traditional artistic activities, especially the arts of cultural minorities tended to be ignored. The way the Arts Council operated served to reinforce the division between 'high' art and newer or non-established art forms.

However the 1974 Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council Act sought to avoid this situation by abandoning the system of advisory panels. Instead, policy formation is guided by a variety of

specialist groups and individuals. The staff of the Arts Council are responsible for translating the opinions of the artists into policy. The Arts Council is not divided into committees along the lines of the traditional disciplines within the arts, as the Arts Council of Great Britain is. Instead, it establishes four (recently modified) committees based on structural elements within the arts arena - namely, Arts Employment Committee; Arts Development Committee; Support Services Committee; and Community Services Committee. In this way, each committee must consider proposals in a 'multi disciplinary' context, with professional advice being channelled through the staff.

This evolution of the Arts Council (through a series of amendments to the original structure) during the 1970s was perhaps the major undertaking of the Government in the sphere of the arts. However, other measures also reflect the enormous growth of interest internationally in the support of cultural activities. In New Zealand in 1969 a report by the Social and Cultural Committee of the National Development Conference outlined a democratic concept of culture that has remained part of later policies and actions:

"Culture is neither an indulgence of an elite nor the preserve of those with special gifts or attainments... It offers all people a greater enjoyment of life and a means by which they can overcome the feeling of alienation and aimlessness in a world of increasing technology and rapidity of change. By cultural experience people can be made aware of the greater possibilities living latent in them; it is therefore important to the well-being of any community that the means to this experience be available. Concerted and constructive action from within the community is

necessary to ensure its cultural progress."

This initial statement has been reiterated in words of similar effect by a number of planning groups, especially the Arts Conference of 1970 and the Task Force Committee of 1976, and by the policy statements of the major political parties on cultural development. There are a number of common themes:

- (1) that New Zealand artists should be supported;
- (2) that 'cultural experience' should be available to all;
- (3) that 'cultural experience' enhances the 'quality of life';
- (4) that the fostering of multi-culturalism is fundamental; and
- (5) that development of the arts is valuable to economic and general social development.

In December 1975, the first ministerial portfolio with responsibility for the arts was appointed. In that year also, government grants to cultural organisations were increased significantly, from \$2,179,500 to \$2.5 million. Unfortunately, in subsequent years, due to efforts to recover from government overspending the increase in arts funding did not continue. (See Appendix F for a table of the source of government funding of the arts through most of the 1970s.)

Perhaps the most basic starting-point, when investigating state patronage of the arts, is the policies of the political parties which are given in election manifestoes - bearing in mind, however, that the reality may be quite different from stated intentions. It is probably necessary to mention only the two major parties, Labour and National, although other parties (Social Credit, Values, and the New Zealand Party) have also formulated policy with regard to the arts and culture. It should be noted that apart from Labour's terms in office, for a brief period from 1972 to 1975, and since July 1984, the National Party has been in office throughout the last two decades in which the cultural infrastructure in New Zealand has become established. Nevertheless, as the Labour Party's manifesto records (cited in Action 6, September-October, 1978),

"Most of the positive achievements in the field of the arts occurred under a Labour Government. Among these were the restructuring of the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council, the setting up of the regional councils and many community arts councils throughout the country, and the expansion of financial assistance to \$1.5 million in 1974... Labour believes that the arts play an important role in the moulding of a balanced society. Just as with other forms of recreation, all New Zealanders should have the same opportunities to take part in cultural activities. Encouragement of all forms of the arts must increase if they are to survive as economically viable structures. New Zealand artists should be able to make a living wage from their professions in the same way as other workers."

One of Labour's stated intentions was to establish Arts Council funding on a triennial basis in order to give more stability of employment to those working in the arts:

"Labour believes that the present system of funding for the arts, recreation and sport is unsatisfactory. It is based on a 'catch as catch can' principle, depending on the vagaries of a Government decision which is moulded by its own approach towards the importance of the arts. The funding of the arts, recreation and sport should be on a firm basis that will remove it from the present uncertainty of a government handout. It is proposed to work towards the funding being one-quarter of one per cent of the Gross National Product."

In its manifesto for the 1978 election, National made the same claim (cited in Action 6 September - October, 1978:12):

"Having established the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council as the body to foster and encourage the Arts, National will continue to provide adequate funds to ensure that the Council is able to fulfil that function. National will move as soon as possible to a system of triennial funding to enable the Council to plan ahead with confidence."

National also made explicit its encouragement of private sponsorship in the area of the arts and suggested that this could be increased through tax concessions on donations.

In its 1981 manifesto, Labour's policy remained much the same, but it had not been responsible for administering the arts in the three preceding years of growing recession in the economy.

And the National Party, despite deepening concern and increasing dissatisfaction among artists and arts administrators about the level of funding, in its election manifesto denied any cause for lack of confidence. It took credit for the achievements in the arts during its time in office, and naively declared that (quoted by Hamish Keith in Action 21, November-December, 1981:1)

"[its] Growth Strategy will give... the economic base from which to promote the practice and enjoyment of the arts throughout the country."

With this kind of apparent support from the Government, why should those involved in the arts find any reason for alarm? To understand their reason I take up again the chronological development of state patronage.

Michael Volkerling, in an address to the Northern Regional Arts Council in October, 1982, recounted the fate of the arts since the mid-1970s. He made the following points:

(1) since 1975, financial pressure had brought about the closure of twelve arts organisations (and this did not include the crisis experienced by Centrepont theatre, the Impulse Dance Company, layoffs of dancers within the New Zealand Ballet Company, the National Opera, which was in recess, and the financial difficulties of Fortune theatre and other companies)

(2) as well as cuts in its programmes of institutional support, many other Arts Council programmes had been eliminated in the previous five years, including the support of publications,

regional touring, cultural inter-change and recordings;

(3) major grants for individual artists were only worth 40 per cent of their value in 1975;

(4) only static funding was available for the regional and community arts system; and

(5) in relation to the obvious needs, the funding for the Maori and South Pacific Arts Council was quite inadequate.

The Annual Reports of the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council since 1976 note the difficulties caused by inflation and general retrenchment in the arts. Where there has been almost static levels of funding, it is obvious that the real level of Arts Council support has dropped markedly. The Annual Report for the year ended 31/3/77 claimed that the Arts Council, the major source of encouragement for the arts, had received an unfair share of the cutbacks in government spending:

"In 1975-76, while public spending as a whole rose by 28 1/2 percent, public funding to the Arts Council rose by only one-and-a-half per cent. In 1976-77, public funding to the Arts Council rose by only three-and-a-half per cent, while public expenditure increased by eight-and-a-half per cent. Over the last two years public moneys flowing to the Arts Council have reduced from the equivalent of 4.2 cents for every \$100 of public spending, in 1974-75, to only 3.2 cents in 1976-77."

The Report of the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council for the year ended 31/3/78 states that these financial restrictions contributed to the flight of approximately three hundred artists and writers, during the 1976-77 year, to more sympathetic environments beyond this country. The Arts Council report describes the way that the effects of retrenchment are particularly harmful in the area of the arts:

"Arts institutions are ... caught in a self-defeating cycle. Diminished resources lead to a decline in the standard of their productions; poor productions lead to decreasing audiences; the consequent loss of income makes these institutions yet more dependent on subsidy. In an attempt to attract greater audiences, operating costs are reduced to free finance to improve presentation. Efficiency suffers as a result, and the institution becomes yet more vulnerable."

Despite an increase in cultural funding for the 1977-78 financial year, the Arts Council reiterated its concern about the existing system of funding. The Council believed that public arts funding should be linked to the level of economic activity, whereas in the two previous years it had obviously been given a greater burden in reduction of its vote from government. The Council claimed that there was, in the reduction in levels of funding, an implication that the arts were not an essential part of people's activities and could therefore be readily restricted. The report for the financial year ended 31/3/80 pointed out that not only was the value of the funds available for Arts Council activities declining, but also the base level for arts funding in

New Zealand was significantly lower than that in other comparable countries. For the 1977-78 year, in New Zealand the Arts Council had available only \$14.32 for every \$100,000 of Gross Domestic Product, compared with \$34.67 in Canada, \$40.71 in Australia, and \$42.46 in Great Britain.

Finally, the Arts Council has sought triennial funding of the arts so that there may be a more rational development of the arts, continuity of policy, provision against the effects of inflation and planning for real growth. The Government has accepted this in principle, but has not enabled practical steps towards such a situation to be made.

The Political and Ideological Aspects of State Patronage

In the foregoing discussion of the development of the cultural infrastructure and cultural policy, the emphasis has tended to be placed on the 'economics' of culture', due to the direct influence that changes in the level of material support exert on the practice of the arts. This has been helpful in illuminating the extent of state support of the arts and indicating artists' and administrators' expectations and perceptions of the funding process. However, it is also necessary to focus on what might be called a 'politics of culture'. By this is meant the maintenance or change of power relations through cultural products and practices. Hutchinson

(1982:13) argues that

"... the arts are value-saturated, and to the extent that it controls resources which create, transform and interpret society's values and norms, the Arts Council is an intensely political organisation... The profoundest source of the Arts Council's power lies in its official capacity to conceptualise and to identify the arts and the artistic."

It is therefore this "capacity to conceptualise" with which I shall be concerned in the following section. The Arts Council has considerable capacity to control the agenda of 'issues'. Controlling the agenda involves powers of decision-making and also of non-decision-making (Lukes, 1974). Non-decision-making is the suppression of an issue that threatens the present power structure. Lukes asserts that some issues are organised into politics while others are organised out. As Hutchinson (1982:105) says,

"The State is a political activity. The exercise of State power is a political process. The intervention of the State in art is political. The exercise of State power in support of the visual arts (or, rather, in support of particular understandings of the visual arts) has to be understood in political terms."

The recent and continuing difficulties and dilemmas faced by the Arts Council, which have been presented in the previous section, have highlighted the urgent need for a coherent, comprehensive cultural policy. The public importance of the arts

as promoters of tourism, as earners of export income, as providers of employment opportunities, and as perceived sources of enhanced social life justifies, in the Arts Council's view, a continuing and consistent programme of state funding of the arts. For the arts administrators, the ingredient that is integral to a favorable level of funding is a change in society's attitude toward the arts.

One of the major features of the conditions in which the arts are practised in New Zealand is the absence of any such well-formulated cultural policy. Indeed, very recently this fact was adverted to by the Prime Minister⁴ who referred to New Zealand's deficiency in the area of cultural policy and expressed his desire for the present government to produce one that formulated a set of priorities and a statement of the entire financial commitment of the state to the arts. For this reason, the Arts Council is eager to see the development of a co-ordinated cultural policy. Statements by the Arts Council director, chairperson, and other representatives, and the provisions of legislation, are the nearest things we have to declarations of cultural policy.

It is certainly valid to question the spending of public money on the arts when the alleged benefits of art for society do not extend to certain groups, and when certain groups find their oppression reinforced by that spending. It is clear that the government is committed to spending substantial sums of money on the arts - and it is equally evident that such spending has wider effects through the usually implicit assumptions about the place of the arts in society.

When there are doubts cast about the legitimacy of state funding of the arts, and especially when there are charges that the way the state becomes involved in the arts serves to reproduce undesirable divisions, the state's response is not one of a radical questioning about the intrinsic meaning of its role. Instead, the focus is placed on extrinsic factors - especially the place of educational processes in determining the differential responses to cultural activities among various groups, and the impact of marketing in the creation of certain audiences. Thus, where groups in society appear to accrue little or no benefit from state (that is, publically) funded arts activities, the onus is on the provision of education to generate a response from such marginalised groups, and also on the expansion of opportunities for those groups to experience the officially-recognised arts activities.

In documenting some of the historical changes in the nature of state patronage, and drawing attention to the criticisms and struggles surrounding arts funding, I have wanted to expose the ideological elements of the beliefs and values of the art establishment. My intention is not to validate certain claims by artists and arts administrators, but it is to look beneath those claims. It becomes clear, however, that to understand, and ultimately to intervene, in the official construction of art is precisely an intervention in the ideological terrain of struggle. This term, 'the ideological terrain', is defined as "those images, concepts and premises which provide the frameworks through which we represent, interpret, and understand and 'make sense' of some aspect of social existence" (Hall, 1981:31). In this next section, I shall examine more closely the discourse in

which discussion about the place of the arts in this society is couched, and I shall attempt to expose the ideological underpinnings of that discussion.

Observations made by Codd et. al. (1985:10) about the discursive nature and hegemonic processes that are characteristic of the education system in New Zealand may be applied to the state's involvement in art. The popular myths and the liberal rhetoric that constitute traditional discourse about the arts in New Zealand are to be seen as having an ideological role in concealing the contradictions and political interests and in detracting from a critical enquiry into the role of state patronage of the arts. Such discourse operates as inherently political, by contributing to social and cultural reproduction through hegemonic strategies. The dominant discourse achieves its domination through winning consent through its shaping of meaning and commonsense understandings of the world (the myths and rhetoric referred to above).

Official Discourse

During the time since the establishment of the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council, the official perceptions of art (that is, those articulated by arts administrators and politicians) have changed substantially, and of course will remain subject to alteration, especially in the face of feminist and Marxist critiques. In some ways, the different conceptualisations of art

represent different periods of history, but it is also evident that the different attitudes may co-exist, or re-appear at later periods in history. The point I am making here, then, is that these different attitudes do not necessarily represent a chronological development.

For a long time before the Arts Council was set up, a pervasive belief was that the arts constituted a special form of superior knowledge. Fairburn (1956:199-200) expresses this particular belief:

"An understanding of the fine arts is part of the mental equipment of the civilised man (sic). It is in painting, sculpture, music and poetry that the greatest concentration of aesthetic meaning, and refinement of taste occur.

In Wane's (1975:67) analysis, this emphasis on high art forms dominated the practice of the Arts Council; indeed, the Arts Council was premised on such a notion:

"Throughout its early years... the Arts Council maintained an artistic conception of culture. In fact, the word "culture" did not even appear in the original enabling legislation... very few artistic activities other than the "fine arts" were included in the Council's scope of activities as it saw them."

He claims that despite its being accorded wider powers, the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council followed very closely the pattern established by the Arts Council of Great Britain, by which the

fine arts and professionalism were fostered, to the near exclusion of other forms and types of practice. This particular concept of art is one that is not a historical relic; a concept that has been eclipsed by a more 'accurate' definition - as was evident in its usage by Cater (1982), who, much more recently claimed that New Zealanders were "a cultured people" on the basis that

"... annual admissions to New Zealand's museums and art galleries probably exceed 4.5 million people... New Zealanders buy more books per head than any other country in the world... We buy more recorded music than any country but Sweden. Not long ago, a definitive issue of the Beethoven Symphonies recorded by the Berlin Philharmonic... sold twice as many per capita as in any other country..."

According to Wane (1975:33), it was the third Labour Government (1972-75) which promoted a sociological conception of culture - a far wider conception than the 'artistic' one. This was reflected in the establishment of a Cultural Division within the Department of Internal Affairs. At the same time, the Labour Government's recognition of the arts suggested some elements of a certain ideologically-based concern: in Wane's view (1975:98), it "was clearly a genuine aspect of the social and humanitarian approach the Labour Party endeavoured to portray during the 1972 election campaign and in Government." (my emphasis) As such, the idea of culture promoting a higher quality of life was still retained. It is to be found in more recent statements by Arts Council representatives - as, for example, in the Director's address to the Northern Regional Arts Council's 1982 conference:

"Most importantly, the arts also confer vital intrinsic benefits. A developed artistic life, as well as providing entertainment and recreation, has the power to help both individuals and the community reshape their situation. Art lends experience coherence and assists the community to accommodate to new realities and to discover new directions. The arts are crucial to maintaining the quality and character of community life. They enshrine and celebrate basic social values which are important to all New Zealanders. The task of all those involved in the Arts Council system now is to ensure that in these confused times, these basic values continue to be acknowledged and protected." (Volkerling, 1982)

A second distinctive, but in many ways related to the first, conceptualisation of art mentioned above (that is, as a special form of superior knowledge) consisted of its being regarded as a "public good". As Wane (1975:17) says,

"Arts Councils and artists have tended to justify aid to the arts as an investment in the well-being of the whole society. The arts are seen as representing much of the finest achievements of the human spirit in all ages and as such providing a better place in which to live, heightening man's (sic) perception and sensitivity, acting as a source of national pride preserving past traditions and forging new ones, and enriching the life of all. Justification for patronage, therefore, becomes one not of economic or artistic necessity but of social and national values."

Accordingly, people's exposure to artistic practices and products stimulates "community advancement". Community advancement implies elements of amorphous quality and well-being, as well as economic benefits⁵.

"Through cultural activities, an innovative and imaginative workforce can be developed. Moreover, today products such as film, wines, recorded music, inventions and activities such as tourism provide a firm cultural base for an export drive capable of harnessing New Zealand's talent rather than repressing it..."

This was reflected in the recruitment of a Social and Cultural Committee to work with the National Development Council (which had been established in the late 1960s to oversee economic planning) and was considered to be "an important step towards recognition of the importance of planning, in such a way as to ensure that national and economic advancement is accompanied by cultural enrichment" (Smyth, 1973:77). Thus, the arts were considered to be both a moral and a material good.

Part of the official discourse surrounding the arts takes up the issue of the state's relationship to the arts. This is articulated, for example, by Cater (1982):

"... people, not governments, create culture. To my knowledge, no government has composed a symphony, written a poem or won an Olympic medal. What throughout the world most governments in their various ways seek to do is to create conditions within which people are enabled to participate in cultural life."

A crucial element in this perceived importance of fostering the arts has been the assertion of the need of the individual to practise in freedom, as Hight (1982) testifies,

"We value the freedom of the artist. We have never regarded his (sic) role as being subservient to the State. Indeed, the reverse is true. The responsibility of the State is, in our view, to support the artist's freedom to develop freely along his own lines."

The hegemonic quality of the state's power is established through its very declaration of support for the artist's freedom. By such discourse, the state obtains the consent of artists who perceive their freedom to be protected and respected by the state. In the way that they give assent to such a role, as it is defined by the discursive practice of the state, artists conform to the authority of the state's discourse.

Christopher Lasch (cited in The Great Divide, 1977:22) has described how the state intervenes in the ideological structures of society through this concept of the independent, free artist:

"The modern state, among other things, is an engine of propaganda, alternately manufacturing crises and claiming to be the only instrument which can effectively deal with them. This propaganda in order to be successful, demands the co-operation of writers, teachers and artists, not as paid propagandists or as state-censored time-servers, but as free intellectuals. This new version of 'free intellectual' is self-censoring in his or her so-called professional detachment from the economic realities of society. That isn't implying that they don't hold political

views. Instead, they may hold strong left political views, but so long as they remain based within the 'intellectual environment' they are displaced from political or economic impact. In fact, the more 'dissident' such a person is, the more useful they are as propaganda, as symbols of 'freedom of expression' within an 'open and free society'. By presupposing an abstract or academic relation to the political dimension of what they do, artists and intellectuals alike become and eloquent expression of the harmlessness of such 'freedom' and finally its social meaninglessness."

The subsequent effect is that political action within the art establishment is simply a token gesture, a liberal front, which the ruling-class can afford, at least for a while, to allow to exist. It is the lack of questioning or analysis of the mystification of the arts or of the race/class/gender-divided social reality that permits a lot of work to feature in galleries, collections and exhibitions.

The nature of official discourse is such that not only does it possess the ability to conceal ideology in the form of appeals to commonsense beliefs and values, as in Highet's statement above, and as Lasch observes in his reference to the state as an "engine of propaganda", but it also has an intriguing power to acknowledge explicitly the particular interests it serves, and yet not threaten the exclusiveness of those interests. After making claims about the nonhierarchical, decentralising features of the system of Community Arts Councils in New Zealand, Volkerling (1981a) states, in a footnote,

"It is only fair to admit that the motivations of New Zealand's policymakers were not necessarily as pure as this description [of the Community Arts Councils as being non-hierarchical] may make them appear. As in Australia at the same time, this reformed structure was not the product of idealism alone or deep understanding."

And, to reinforce his point, he goes on to quote Terry Smith (1975:127) who wrote critically of similar moves to democratise the Art Council in Australia,

"The push for change seems to be coming from politicians who want to be able to show to their constituents some clear evidence of some piece of the millions for the arts being spent locally. This means a new lease of life for the local arts club, sculpture society, watercolour group, dramatic ensemble..."

Earlier, the 'arms length' principle was mentioned - as a specific feature of the relationship between the Arts Council and the state. The intention of this particular formulation is to convey an impression of distance, so that the state's control is not directly traceable. Pearson (1982:104) sees this as part of the

"... systematic development of overt politics from the exercise of State power and authority. Overt politics is displaced by a cultural consensualism which, while being in fact political, is experienced ambiguously but powerfully as a kind of informal consensual benevolence."

Examination of expressions of official views about the arts is a method of enquiry that provides useful insight into the relationship between the state, the arts, and ideological hegemony. Indeed, for Burton and Carlen (1979:48), official discourse - defined as "the systematisation of modes of argument that proclaim the state's legal and administrative rationality" - is a "necessary requirement for political and ideological hegemony." (my emphasis) As I have shown in the Chapter One, theorists of discursive practices argue that the state generates a particular discourse in order to effect its administrative, legal, and ideological intentions. A certain discourse constructs a particular social and political reality out of which consent may be achieved. Frequently, the discourse of the state is employed to conceal the existence of conflicting interests and unequal power relations, and to achieve acquiescence to strategies that are declared to be 'in the public interest'. Policy-making is in fact a matter of accommodating the claims of various groups in such a way that the interests of the dominant groups are protected and enhanced. According to Codd (1985:23),

"Policies produced by and for the state are obvious instances in which discourse plays an important tactical and political role, constructing particular meanings and signs that work to mask social conflict and foster commitment to the notion of a universal public interest."

Theorising the Role of the State

In this section I want to consider theories of the state, especially the welfare state, in which culture is seen as a public good, and essential to the general welfare of society and its members. Volkerling (1981a) is accurate when he points out that

"... fundamentally, Arts Councils are established to fulfil a specialised function within the broader field of welfare economics. Crudely stated, the philosophy informing welfare economics insists, rightly that state intervention in any sector of public life can be justified only if its effect is to increase the public good. In particular, the policy-maker needs to be satisfied that benefits which flow from government support to the arts are sufficient to outweigh the loss of welfare that can be assumed to result from associated reductions in private income and spending."

Volkerling also states that there is a problem in that economic theories (for example, Throsby and Withers, 1979), which analyse the arts in terms of inputs of labour and capital, and the productivity of these, cannot specify the value of public benefits which derive from specific works of art or specific performances. Unfortunately, he does not consider the nature of the welfare state in a capitalist society such as New Zealand. There is a ready acknowledgement that the state and its agents (including the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council) should be acting in the public interest, but there is no penetrating or competent theoretical account of the effects of intervention by the welfare

state in cultural practices.

It is evident that the economic and administrative theories typically employed by Arts Councils are essentially inadequate for analysing or directing their activities if Arts Councils are to be concerned about their public legitimacy. An example of administrative theory is the goal-model approach, Programming Planning and Budgeting System (PPBS) which involves setting goals, their evaluation of outcomes of objectives, the consideration of costs, and assessment of alternative policies. Another such approach is that of 'incrementalism', whereby existing policies are merely continued and built upon, with little or no consideration of their legitimacy.

One critic of the 'administrative policy' approach to the arts is Smith (1983), who, in his analysis of the practices and procedures of the Canada Council, argues that the idea of artist as genius is an ideological process which "draws an administrative boundary around the notion of cultural production." He says (1982:331),

"The procedures involved require abstracting cultural production out of the actual social organisation of intellectual and artistic life and relocating it in the social organisation of a government bureaucracy... The result is that it is then possible to take up this notion and think about it quite narrowly in terms of the administration of government policies and programmes."

The establishment of a semi-autonomous arts council is thus based on the creative genius notion of culture which demands an 'arms length' approach on the part of government, so that art is seen to be removed from politics. The idea that the government must not be in a position of being able to inhibit or direct the expression of a genius is used to legitimate and provide the organisation for the depoliticisation of art. What I would argue is that theories about state patronage and administration of the arts must involve examination of theories of art/culture and society.

The official discourse about the Arts Council reiterates the idea of the responsibility of the Council to serve "public priorities". The discourse, not surprisingly, is permeated by bourgeois ideological constructions of the relationship between the Council, the state, and the public:

"The system effectively represents a form of contract between the public, whose will is expressed through the legislation, and the Council..." (Volkerling, 1981a)

This implies a faith in the ability of bourgeois democracies to represent in legislation the will of the public. The Arts Council is described as a 'quango' (that is, a quasi-autonomous non-governmental organisation) but, in an admission by Volkerling (1981a), one is able to perceive a significant degree of continuity between the will of government and the activities of the Arts Council:

"Since the Council also has an advisory function to government, a feedback loop - a kind of safety valve - is available if it becomes clear that the functions of the Arts Council, and therefore the government's objectives, are diverging too markedly from artistic reality or public priorities."

This statement casts doubt on the idea of quangos as having any real degree of autonomy or non-governmental status.

In contrast to the economic and administrative theoretical approaches, I wish to examine neo-Marxist theories which reject traditional assumptions about the state's promotion of the public's interest. For these claims about the state's accountability to be an accurate account of the nature of the state, it would have to be demonstrated that legislation is a legitimate and valid expression of "public will" or "public priorities". (For Volkerling, in fact, it is. He says: "The will of Parliament is accepted as a statement of objectives desired by the public.")

Gold, Lo and Wright (1975) identify three major traditions in Marxist theories of the state - instrumentalist, structuralist, and Hegelian-Marxist - although they assert that very few theoretical endeavours constitute a pure form of any one of these three traditions.⁶ The same authors mention several major deficiencies - especially the tendency towards voluntarism - of the instrumentalist approach, which, they claim (1975:34), "make it unsuitable as a general theory of the capitalist state". Structuralist theory develops the concept of the hegemonic state which represents the interests of the dominant class, and at the

same time makes obvious concessions to the dominated classes, for the purposes of obtaining their consent. The state appears neutral, or even benevolent, to the extent the it 'protects' the interests of all citizens (who are seen as equal). The state, according to Poulantzas (1978:44), has a conflict-managing function - it is a factor of social cohesion. Structuralist theories are criticised, particularly by neo-Gramscian theorists, for their lack of emphasis on consciousness and their functionalist tendencies.

As a complement to the structuralist perspective, the Hegelian-Marxist perspective addresses more directly the nature of the state, and the way in which it manages to disguise the antagonism inherent in capitalist social relations. Again, Gramsci's concept of hegemony is extremely pertinent to an analysis of the dynamic of the state and to an understanding of organs of the state, both state apparatuses (such as government departments) and institutions (such as the education system), and also 'quangos' (such as the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council).

Through neo-Gramscian Cultural Studies and socialist-feminist theoretical and empirical studies, material has been generated to illuminate the connections between cultural practices and bourgeois and male power. It is through such work that the "benefits" of works of art come to be seen in terms of their part in the creation of ideological, political and economic hegemony.

In New Zealand, the establishment of the Arts Council represents a significant advance of the state into the sphere of the ideological. I have pointed out how feminist theorists, in particular, have recognised the importance of the ideological sphere in the process of gaining and maintaining political and economic power. Similarly, the state's role in administration and patronage of the arts indicates that it is concerned that the arts constitute an important area through which to secure hegemony, that there is a need to protect areas of bourgeois and patriarchal ideology by ensuring its generation and articulation, especially through cultural production (that is, through cultural forms of signification). It recognises that such forms of signification (including the nature and content of art) may be effectively influenced through patronage. potential for influencing the nature of art through patronage. For example, bourgeois hegemony, according to neo-Gramscian approaches, means creating a field of political and ideological unity organised in the bourgeois interest. The state, as the only force capable of imposing authority and leadership, is required to underpin hegemony and, through its appearance as representative and neutral, and as upholding the public interest (Poulantzas, 1978:133), it is able to contain forces which would challenge the power of the dominant group(s).

In contrast to the idea that the Arts Council merely represents the public interest, and acts in response to pre-given values, I would argue that the Arts Council, as a somewhat less-than-autonomous governmental body, intervenes actively in its support of certain definitions and contexts in which art is recognised. For example, it funds particular kinds of art, it

introduces new categories such as film, photography, and mixed media, in addition to those traditionally regarded as art-work. There is sometimes a tendency to regard the Arts Council as a passive institution that reacts to pre-given evaluations and developments in the practice of artists. Pearson, insisting on the active role of Arts Councils, writes (1982:98),

"Just as the collecting and exhibiting policies of the Tate Gallery shape understandings of what constitutes current art (and set the conditions for arguments over what constitutes significant art) so the decisions of arts councils and regional arts associations [the British equivalent of New Zealand's regional arts councils] shape and define aspects of what shall constitute the culture of art."

The Arts Council is thus seen as part of the state's ideological apparatuses. For a more democratic form of administration and development of the arts, it is necessary for arts councils to recognise that they do constitute an ideological state apparatus. It is by seeing themselves as (at least once) removed from the organ of government that idealist conception of art and artists, and the accompanying elitist practices of such conceptions, are able to flourish.

In the preceding description and discussion of the state's role, the state has been conceived as the more or less direct agent of government. It is this definition of the state which approximates Gramsci's notion of 'political society'. The Gramscian use of the term 'state' is riddled with snares. One very quickly finds that Gramsci has more than one usage of the term. Anderson (1976-77:12-13) argues that in Gramsci's Prison

Notebooks there are three positions of the state: (i) the State is contrasted with Civil Society; (ii) the State encompasses Civil Society; and (iii) the State is identical with Civil Society. The degree of confusion that sometimes might emerge upon encounter with these diverse definitions, however, is transcended by the more comprehensive understanding made possible with Gramsci's concept of the 'integral state'. As Buci-Glucksman (1980:93) points out,

"... the integral state requires a rich and articulated development of the superstructures which excludes their reduction simply to government and force, even if this is complemented ideologically."

The separation of political and civil society in opposition to the expanded definition of the state, reflects liberal parliamentarism. The integral state, in contrast to the liberal state, is a whole state, dictatorship and hegemony (Buci-Glucksman, 1980:93-100; Gramsci, SPN, 239). For Gramsci,

"The state is the entire complex of practical and theoretical activities with which the ruling class not only justifies and maintains its dominance but manages to win the active consent of those over whom it rules." (SPN:244)

Here, then, the distinction between civil and political society is abolished. The way consent is won in the course of a hegemonic project is particularly insidious, as Anderson (1976-77:30) acknowledges,

"The novelty of this consent is that it takes the fundamental form of a belief by the masses that they exercise an ultimate self-determination within the existing social order. It is thus not acceptance of the superiority of an acknowledged ruling class (feudal ideology), but credence in the democratic equality of all citizens in the government of the nation - in other words, disbelief in the existence of any ruling class." (emphasis in original)

Thus, Gramsci broadens the concept of the state to include hegemonic apparatuses.

At a more subtle level, the state exercises its hegemony through a particular bourgeois and patriarchal ideological definition of what is artistic/aesthetic merit. It is Janet Wolff's contention (1981:55) that "art is clearly an ideological activity and and ideological product", but arts administrators generally ignore this fact (or, at best are uncritical of the ideological component of art). The social construction of aesthetic and literary criticism is not often acknowledged, let alone satisfactorily theorised, so arts administrators base their practices on assumptions about what is of artistic quality. Notions of 'quality' tend to be vague and problematic, and, especially among those who formulate (both explicit and implicit) policy for the arts, there is an uncritical faith in the fact that standards can be established. Yet, Janet Wolff (1983:51) argues,

"the defence of 'objective standards' by those whose job it is to maintain them provides little reassurance that they can either be defined or be shown to be objective."

In his thesis on the funding of arts in New Zealand, Wane is correct in that it is the conceptualisation of art and its forms, not solely administrative matters, that must be addressed. He says (1975:42) that there are two fundamental problems in specifying the scope and nature of the development of the arts, which transcend administrative dilemmas. The government that chooses to support the arts, according to Wane, must decide on one of these two approaches. He contrasts the two by comparison of certain major criteria:

(i) excellence - dominant value system; artistic conception of culture; professionalism; national identity; "theatre" performing arts; and

(ii) participation - new value system; ideological conception of culture; amateurism; regionalism; individual creative arts.

However, the issue is not simply as Wane (1975:42) suggests, the choice of either one of two basic categories for supporting the arts - 'excellence' versus 'participation'. Instead, the theorist, policy-maker, researcher must seek to locate ideas about art and about state support for the arts - that is, the ideological context - in particular economic and political structures. Wane acknowledges the way the "dominant value system" and its perception of the arts influences funding - but he does not develop his analysis to the point of describing the origins of the "dominant value system" and its relation to other forms of dominance. The "dominant value system", associated with

'Government', is crudely identified as those beliefs and practices of the contemporary "technological, scientific, economic, and managerial" sectors, diametrically opposed to to the emerging "artistic, humanistic, social, creative value system" of 'Artists' (Wane, 1975:116).

A materialist theory of art requires that such ideas about art be identified as arising from particular economic and political relations in society that are empirically verifiable. These 'ideas about art' serve to construct and reproduce hegemony. While discourse theory is a powerful explanatory tool with recognition of the necessary specificity and effectivity of discursive practices, it is also important to avoid the conflation of the social structure of reality with its signification in discursive formations. Language or discourse may have a determining effect on society, but this must not be extended to the point of stating that society is nothing but languages or discursive formations.

In this chapter, the pattern of state patronage has been mapped out, and the discourse within which the state support for the arts has been defended has been critiqued. In this way, I have sought to point out the ideological component of the activity of arts administrators and of the political effects of state support for the arts. This analysis of the Arts Council as a specific instance of the operation of discourse returns us to the feminist critique of the arts. The concept of 'gatekeepers', which has been described in the previous chapter, signifies not only those who will determine what will become public knowledge through their control of mechanisms such as the publishing

industry, but also those who formulate the discourse which defines particular situations.

FOOTNOTES

(1) These figures were given by Mr Andrew Sharp in a public lecture at Massey University, 17/6/83.

(2) See Action 15, June-July, 1980, p1.

(3) The term 'the arms length principle' was adopted by Lord Redcliffe Maud (1976:24), in reference to the Arts Council of Great Britain, to indicate the way in which those in government - including the Minister for the Arts - are able to apparently deny their responsibility for the distribution of grants to the arts.

(4) In an interview with the American newspaper Variety, quoted by Mike Nicolaidi, 'Funding Priorities Needed', in the New Zealand Times, 5/5/85:10. Strangely, though, Highet, former National Government Minister for the Arts, in an address to the World Conference on Cultural Policies (26 July - 6 August, 1982), claimed in reference to the initiatives taken in the area of the arts since 1970, that what had been achieved could be seen as representing "a very comprehensive and widely embracing evolution of positive cultural policies." This statement, which is

inconsistent with others on the state of the development of cultural policy in New Zealand, might be accounted for by acknowledging its context (the World Conference) as one that encourages ministerial platitudes. Certainly, the Minister's perception of the situation may be categorised as a piece of discourse with its source (a Cabinet Minister) ensuring that it is a significant force in establishing a particular (distorted) view of reality and therefore structuring both the terms in which that aspect of reality is understood, and the nature of the response to it.

(5) This is expressed in Arts Conference '80, a discussion paper for working parties involved in the organisation of a proposed national arts conference, October, 1980.

(6) For a fuller account of these three theoretical traditions, see the two articles in Monthly Review by Gold et. al. (1975).

CHAPTER FIVE

The Contemporary and Future Development of
the Women's Art Movement

In this chapter, I wish, by way of conclusion, to draw together some of the threads of the foregoing discussion. In the previous two chapters, I have examined the cultural infrastructure (primarily the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council) in New Zealand, and presented some of the ideological elements of discourse about the arts in New Zealand as it is articulated by certain public representatives of the cultural infrastructure and by art critics. I have presented a number of feminist objections to the existing pattern of cultural production - arts funding, administration, criticism - mindful, too, that there are different feminist approaches. Here, I want to outline what I consider to be the necessary direction for the women's art movement, or at least for those who seek a socialist-feminist approach to cultural practice.

The socialist-feminist critique of cultural products and practices may be seen as an important development in the sociology of art. It requires that one questions what really constitutes the social meaning and value of art, rather than simply seek to validate women's contribution within the existing art establishment.

The Present Debate

It should be clear that the contribution of socialist-feminism to the understanding and practice of art is to be seen not in forms or styles or even contents, but in structures reflecting a different discourse. Art may no longer signify a bourgeois elitist cultural practice and consumer product. As Lippard (1980:363) says,

"Only new structures bear the possibility of changing the vehicle itself, the meaning of art in society."

There has been, in some circles, a temptation to classify feminist art as a new movement within the avant-garde. In addition, it has generated a new form of art criticism - 'feminist criticism'. Kolodny (1981), although more strictly speaking about literary criticism, is representative of those who advocate this new variety of criticism.

Kolodny (1981:28) argues that male readers (and therefore male critics) are unable to evaluate women's work because they are unfamiliar with women writers' use of language. She accepts that language-use is influenced by gender so that

"... male readers who find themselves outside of and unfamiliar with the symbolic systems that constitute female experience in women's writings, will necessarily dismiss those systems as undecipherable, meaningless, or trivial."

The male reader, says Kolodny (1981:34), shows an

"... incapacity... to properly interpret and appreciate women's texts - due, in large part, to a lack of prior acquaintance."

These observations about literary criticism are nevertheless equally valid for artistic criticism. In the same way that male literary critics have devalued and misunderstood women's writing, so, too, have male critics misrepresented women's art-work. Kolodny's fundamental thesis is accurate:

"Since the grounds upon which we assign aesthetic value to texts are never infallible, unchangeable, or universal, we must re-examine not only our aesthetics but, as well, the inherent biases and assumptions informing the critical methods which (in part) shape our aesthetic responses." (1981:35)

Kolodny then applies this to a critical methodology in order to encourage

"... nothing less than a playful pluralism, responsive to the possibilities of multiple critical schools and methods, but captive of none..."

She thus applauds a pluralist approach to art criticism as a major characteristic and strength of a feminist critical theory. Gardiner (1982:634), however, points out that the particular commitment of radical-feminists and socialist-feminists to a certain type of change in society precludes such a pluralism. For her, the type of pluralism that Kolodny prescribes is politically and ideologically flawed because

"... the liberal myth of pluralism is closely allied to those of bourgeois individualism and of artistic universality. All ideologically reinforce the status quo. Those liberals who approve the basic structure of things as they are may choose from a supermarket of approaches that they consider equally valid."

The feminist critique of male-defined art criticism is directed precisely at the assumption that there is an identifiable, universally-applicable set of criteria by which aesthetic quality may be established. For socialist-feminists, however, to advocate a "playful pluralism" is politically naive and ineffectual. Critics of Kolodny's approach argue that the feminist criticism she advocates merely establishes a feminist canon. According to Bulkin (in Gardiner, et. al., 1982:636), the attack must be far more deep-seated:

"... one can talk about "the historical, social, and ethical consequences of women's participation in, or exclusion from " [citing Kolodny] literature or criticism, without exploring the very social and ethical issue of which women get published by whom and why - of what even gets recognised as "feminist literary criticism".

A genuine socialist-feminist criticism must expose and oppose not only what Kolodny (1981:38) calls the "sexist omissions and ignorances of earlier critical schools" (my emphasis) but also racist, heterosexist and classist biases. As Bulkin (in Gardiner, et. al., 1982:636) points out,

"... feminists can object to the the "canonisation" by white male academic critics of certain works, but then go on to canonise some white heterosexual academic female critics whose work reveals racism, hetersexism and classism."

A socialist-feminist approach argues that the elements of the 'superstructure' - that is, social phenomena other than the directly economic are utilised for the establishment of hegemony without being exclusively a reflection of substructural relations. In the same way that the so-called 'private' sphere of people's lives (sexuality, family, domesticity, and so on) has been politicised, through feminists' insistence that the personal is political, so, too, have cultural practices and products (including art which is often regarded as a private, individual

activity) been politicised. As Kuhn (1982:4) says,

"... everything that might come under the heading of the ideological - a society's representations of itself within and for itself and the ways in which people both live out and produce those representations - may be seen as a vital, pervasive and active element in the constitution of social structures and formations."

Cultural practices are a necessary focus of theoretical work, and more importantly, culture is itself a site of struggle. Indeed, the evidence of the discrimination and disadvantage experienced by women artists confirms that the cultural practice of art is a significant arena for constructing bourgeois and patriarchal ideologies through which hegemony is created and maintained.

The implication that the sexism of the literary (and art) establishment can be eliminated through a greater understanding of women's symbolic worlds reflects a grave neglect of the political and economic interests which construct male dominance in cultural practices and formations. It is the political and economic implications of sexist criticism with which feminists must be engaged. It is for these broader purposes that male critics attempt to define women's art as 'political' and to dismiss it as 'polemical'. And the same purposes have enabled critics to claim that 'art has no sex' thereby ignoring the difference of women's and men's experience of the sexual divisions within society and the historical differences that gender division has generated for the art produced by women and men. Indeed, the gender of the 'artist' has been of crucial relevance to the construction of a hierarchy of artistic practice

- especially the ranking of art and craft.

The theory of gatekeeping, which I have described in Chapter Three, is particularly appropriate, for it may be applied to all types of discrimination against women, including the way feminist art is rejected by art gallery curators, its under-representation in, or exclusion from, exhibitions, the dismissal of feminist art as 'political' by conventional critics, the disproportionately limited numbers of females in the higher levels of education in and in teaching positions in art schools, and so on. 'Gatekeeping' implies a monopoly of control over the things that may enter into mainstream perceptions and definitions. It is compatible with Gramsci's concept of hegemony in that it works by achieving the consent of those who are dominated. Women themselves generally do not perceive that the way things are ordered is a product of male authority. The theory, by identifying the way in which certain males have established the discourse in which art is defined, provides critical links for those theorising women's oppression in this area.

Parker and Pollock's thesis (1981:13-14) is that women's art has not been entirely neglected by art historians and art critics but that they have had a

"particular relation to official structures and male-dominated modes of art production. For women artists have not acted outside cultural history, as many commentators seem to believe, but rather have been compelled to act within it from a place other than that occupied by men."

The task, then, is not so much to reclaim women's lost history as it is to understand the reasons for women's particular location. A socialist-feminist critique examines the very definition of art in terms of its historically-varied role in bourgeois and patriarchal hegemony. The major unresolved dilemma for such a critique is the question of aesthetic value.

In response to mainstream literary and art critics, who invoke some universal, intrinsic set of elements specific to artistic work, feminist critics have rejected the independent nature of aesthetic evaluation and emphasise the political aspects of such judgments, pointing out that they are culturally-based and therefore irrelevant to, or at best not cognisant of, the experiences of other cultural groupings. More specifically, the kinds of product that are deemed to be 'art' have a particular relation to the dominant power; it is that which confirms the political position of males, according to feminist critics. They would try to establish new criteria, devoid of political influences, for judging art-work.

Barrett (1982) and Wolff (1983) reject the more extreme relativist position according to which there are no objective criteria. As Barrett (1982:50) says, the tendency towards "complete relativism"

"... leaves us with total inability to distinguish between a random scrawl and a finely-wrought painting that has moved generations of people."

Barrett (1982:51) argues that it is possible to establish some standards for assessing aesthetic value by taking account of two

aspects: imagination and skill. It is true, she acknowledges, that the definition of skill is the outcome of struggle, but at the same time there is an objective element to this. Art-work, too, requires skilful execution because imaginative ideas must be expressed in some way. Moreover,

"... an emphasis on aesthetic skills is in fact democratising rather than elitist - for skills may be acquired, whereas the notion of an artistic 'genius' forbids the aspirations of anyone outside the small and specialised group"(Barrett, 1982:52).

The 'imagination' component of art-work has tended to be devalued, and sometimes condemned as reactionary, and Barrett believes that it is possible to consider the imaginative process in art-work, without resorting to "the individualistic romanticism of traditional bourgeois theories of art" (Barrett, 1982:52).

Perhaps even more useful, is Barrett's assertion about the inseparability of production and consumption; if one is able to recognise the way in which works of art are constructed, then one can more fully perceive the meaning of them. Foster (1983:xv) has invoked the term 'anti-aesthetic' to signify not

"... a modern nihilism - which so often transgressed the law only to confirm it - but rather... a critique which destructures the order of representations in order to reinscribe them."

In some respects, this seems to be the same as Beatson's (1982:7-8) concept of "aesthetic exegesis... the ideological

decoding of art." According to this view, the denaturalisation of aesthetic ideology is an important step in a materialist approach to artistic production.

However, Foster's fundamental assumption is that one is never outside the politics of representation. Whereas, for Beatson, art still retains a radical or subversive potential, Foster^(1983:xv-xvi) dismisses the idea of an aesthetic realm which can exist apart from history:

"The adventures of the aesthetic make up one of the great narratives of modernity: from the time of its autonomy through art-for-art's sake to its status as a necessary negative category, a critique of the world as it is. It is this last moment (figured brilliantly in the writings of Theodor Adorno) that is hard to relinquish: the notion of the aesthetic as subversive, a critical interstice in an otherwise instrumental world. Now, however, we have to consider that this aesthetic space too is eclipsed - or rather, that its criticality is now largely illusory (and so instrumental). In such an event, the strategy of Adorno, of "negative commitment" might have to be revised or rejected, and a new strategy of interference (associated with Gramsci) devised."

Socialist-feminist criticism of the arts thus seeks to examine the process of representation which is conceived as itself mediated.

Also, of necessary investigation is the construction of pleasure and its impact on the reception of artistic production. As Mercer (1983:98) says,

"Analysis of regimes of representation and the ideological formation of subjectivity is important because it lays the ground for a critique of the connection between pleasure and subjectivity."

This is not, however, adequately offered in psychoanalytic accounts which locate the origins of such pleasure in an individual's basic sexual desire, but are, at least partly, the product of collective social experience. Similarly, Lovell (1980:95) argues that a sociology of art must be concerned with the analysis of social pleasures:

"... Aesthetic sensibilities are class- and sex-linked, and the politics of aesthetic pleasure will depend on the particular ways in which that sensibility has been appropriated and developed along lines of sex and class."

It is this analysis of the bases of aesthetic experience which will provide a fully sociological understanding of practices and values associated with the arts.

The Future Direction of the Women's Art Movement

In identifying the developments of feminist art criticism, it has become clear that within the women's art movement, from the time of the "second wave" of feminism (i.e. since about 1970), the focus of theoretical and practical emphasis has changed. Lisa Tickner (1984:14-15) has provided an overview of

the historical development of the movement:

"The question of a feminist cultural practice seemed at first a simple matter... The tasks on the agenda here ...came under the headings of excavation and expression. What had to be excavated was i) a female history and ii) a female content. What was needed to express them was a female form."

Batten (1982) describes the differences in women's art in New Zealand, from the conservatism of Auckland, to the radicalism of Christchurch. In particular, she is critical of those who constitute "yet another ego boost by women to men" (1982:27), and recognises that women's art is not necessarily feminist art:

"... there is always a danger that women use the new art movement as a place for shelter rather than challenge, as a place to confirm the stereotypes rather than explode them."

Kuhn (1982:9) similarly acknowledges that the promotion of women artists, film-makers, writers, and so on, does not constitute a fully-developed feminist intervention in cultural production. She says,

"... it is perhaps important to reiterate that I am not suggesting that feminist efforts aimed at increasing the numbers of women 'cultural producers' are unimportant or irrelevant: on the contrary, it can certainly be argued that transformation in dominant modes of representation will not be brought about unless this happens. However, such transformations are neither a necessary nor an automatic outcome of such a strategy."

Kuhn proceeds to discuss the important issues about authorship and gender, and feminism and textual organisation. She points out that texts are not reducible to the author's particular intentions (as the 'intentionalist fallacy' would hold) but that meaning is produced in the moment of reception. This raises the possibility, then, that a non-feminist may produce a feminist text (film, painting, poem, etc.), and also that a consciously feminist artist may produce a non-feminist art-work - and, of course, the fact of possessing a female body does not ensure that an artist is a feminist artist. For Kuhn, more important than defining a feminist text is to describe what is a feminist cultural intervention:

"... if it is accepted that meaning does not reside purely in the text itself, that^{it}_^ is not something locked within the text waiting for a reader in order to be liberated, but is itself to some degree an independent product or outcome of reading, then it becomes impossible to consider feminism in terms of fixed textual attributes, whether they be of 'form' or of 'content', let alone in terms of whether or not producers intended to put them there." (Kuhn, 1982:16)

Thus, the encouragement of a feminist art criticism results in feminist 'readings' of texts to alert people to the patriarchal and bourgeois ideological mechanisms of texts. Kuhn concludes (1982:18), "Feminism, considered in relation to cultural practice is perhaps even more complex and many-sided than might at first be imagined."

Feminist art, then, is a politics of art, not simply a female aesthetic. Indeed, as Elias (1985:5) says, "The goal of

feminism is to change the face of art." Many exhibitions of women's art are, however, merely attempting to fit women's art into the mainstream, to showcase women's art. As I have argued in the previous chapter, socialist-feminism provides for an analysis of the profoundly significant role of ideological factors (including art and art criticism) in perpetuating existing power relations. The struggle to transform the oppressive features of the status quo must be directed not only at the economic aspects of women's subordination. For this reason, the women's art movement is an important moment in the development of revolutionary strategies.

The claim that women artists have been relegated to obscurity, that there is a significant body of women artists who have simply been overlooked by conventional art historians, should not be the goal of feminist artists and historians, but the point of departure. Although it has been a worthwhile project to assert the status of women's work, the task is not to apply to women's art the same criteria by which men's art has been elevated, but to challenge the fundamental assumptions about what constitutes art. This is to proceed beyond the 'women and ...' syndrome that has been described by Stanley and Wise (1983:31). This corrective emphasis of filling the gap where women have been excluded (for example research into 'women and work', 'women and the arts') enables the development of women's studies to be appropriated by existing male-dominated social science, to be incorporated into its subject matter without changing the established procedures of social science which originally silenced and omitted women.

The central intention of a socialist-feminist criticism of art is to generate a new practice that legitimates and values the contribution of traditionally powerless members of society, and which recognises and undermines the hegemonic purposes to which art and art criticism have been directed by the powerful in society. For Patterson (in Gardiner, et. al., 1982:660),

"Criticism can be an instrument of social change by challenging practices which omit or distort or discourage the expression of certain voices."

The two-fold nature of socialist-feminist criticism is vitally important in order to avoid the methodological conservatism, on the one hand, or, on the other, the utopianism that so often accompany proposals for social change.

The crucial difference between those less radical proposals and the object of socialist-feminism is the former's denial at the epistemological and methodological level of the possibility of change. It is not sufficient simply to gather facts about women's past or present conditions because those methodological approaches which require only the factual recording of existing or past realities do not allow for attention to alternatives to those realities. As Westkott (1979:428) confirms,

"Women's devaluation and the consequences of this devaluation are reinforced by a social science which records these conditions while systematically ignoring alternative possibilities. A depressing pall hangs over this litany of past and present subjugation of women, precisely because its methodological principles allow for no future that is not an extension of present

facts."

Morgan (in Roberts, 1981:83-113) also discusses the consequences of taking gender seriously, which involves more than merely an acceptance of the claims made by feminists of androcentric bias in conventional sociology. It requires a new approach and will generate profoundly different bases for knowledge and action. Such attempts simply reinforce existing myths about art being the work of a genius, except that they establish not only 'great masters' but also 'great mistresses'.

While it is founded on such elitist notions, which derive from the things which predominantly male artists have produced, art remains the preserve of an elite in its production and in its consumption. Consequently, the strategy of socialist-feminists is far more radical than some of the so-called 'socialist' prescription for art-practice and arts administration. The conditions of a socialist practice are conventionally described as those requiring public welfare rather than private gratification to be the measure employed in making policy for the arts; eliminating the pejorative, class-based and class-bound distinctions of the category of the fine arts; rejecting the notion of artist as genius, involving the public, instead of an elite, in decisions about aesthetic quality.

Socialist policies for the arts are similar to policies for health, education, and so on. The task of the state is to intervene to redress imbalances in opportunity, wealth, and power through fostering a more open and democratic use of and participation in art. Typically, this is interpreted to mean the

decentralisation of administration and finance of the arts, increasing the diversity of, and access to, the arts, improving the wages, conditions of employment, and security of all people professionally engaged in the arts. However, this does not challenge basic questions about the arts and the moralistic approach of the state to its patronage of the arts. As we have seen, there is need for more than a mere recognition of the value of 'community arts', for a properly socialist form of arts administration. According to Pearson (1982:109),

"A more open (and politically aware) use of state power would recognise the diversity of interests, experiences and lifestyles of a socially and culturally mixed society. It would do that, moreover, without consigning the experiences and cultures of various minorities to the cultural dustbins of the 'amateur' and the 'community' arts. Community arts, in itself, can be a positive thing. Its patronage by arts councils, however, has too often been used as a defensive gesture to justify their lack of serious support of and response to the lives and experiences of the majority of the population."

Yet, for feminists, this approach has to be challenged. The task is more than merely tacking women on to art history. Likewise, in the process of eradicating the notion of a 'feminine sensibility' and other male ideas about women's art, there is a temptation to replace the former with a new distinctive female or feminist sensibility, and thus to set up a new stereotype, still biologically-based, which does not challenge or overcome the patriarchal misuses of sexual differentiation.

Several strategies have been suggested by feminist artists in New Zealand in seeking to intervene in cultural production in this society. These include affirmative action in funding allocation, to promote the work of feminist artists: and the monitoring of art criticism: in particular, the recognition and encouragement of feminist criticism. Thus, funding agencies like the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council, which receive public funds, would be required to carry out research on the participation of women in the arts, their levels of employment, their levels of income, and so on. Any group or individual seeking government assistance for projects would be expected to promote the equal participation of women so that women would no longer be ignored and excluded at the public expense.

While feminists are excluded from specifying the categories of art criticism they do not have the opportunity to challenge the dominant discourse; that is, "the production of the languages of art, the meanings, ideologies and views of the world and social relations of the dominant culture" (Parker and Pollock, 1981:135). It is true that women artists and critics have challenged the dominant discourse but

"... such interventions as have been made could be dismissed, ignored, re-defined and eventually obliterated because the power to determine what is 'high', 'great' or 'historically significant' art remained in the hands of male-dominated institutions." (Parker and Pollock, 1981:135-36)

There is a tension between the desire of women artists to gain acceptance for their work (which often challenges existing notions about the appropriate form and content of art) and the tendency to establish new prescriptions. This tension between challenging conventional structures, and recognising artistic skill is acknowledged by Taylor (1978:58):

"This attack on art, or this attempt to expose its mystifying face, is not intended to stop putting paint on two-dimensional surfaces or making music, or dancing, or using language to create fictions. It is the organisational forms surrounding these activities which are being subject to critical examination, and what is being said is that art, as one of these organisational forms is socially pernicious."

Women's domestic labour and other aspects of women's lives have traditionally been denied to be worthy of representation. For this reason it is important to oppose the trivialisation and invalidation in art of these legitimate features of women's past and present reality. However, there must be caution exercised in emphasising and celebrating these, so that they do not constitute a new prescription for women's art. In a review of the Kaleidoscope series on New Zealand women visual artists (on Television One in 1984), Camille Guy wrote (1984:39),

"... we need to ask ourselves some searching questions about our feminist art; to subject it to as much critical scrutiny as celebration."

Alexa Johnston, in an interview with artist Alexis Hunter asked (1982:46): "How do you see women in the art world contributing to feminist awareness among people who are not involved in the arts?" Hunter's reply came as follows:

"I find that many women in the art world are anti-feminist, because they are token women and very insecure in their jobs. The feminist women I know working in the art scene are mostly what I would call 'closet feminists'. They do their best, but hide their feminist ideas."

This may seem a harsh criticism on Hunter's part, but it highlights the struggle in which women working in the arts (whether as critics, curators, administrators, or artists) must engage. To be committed to feminist values and strategies is profoundly incompatible with the intentions of many who have achieved positions of status and influence in the art establishment (including art historians, critics, and administrators, as well as the producers of art).

Feminism is, of course, precisely that which resists appropriation. As Annette Kolodny (1981:30) acknowledges, those feminists who are involved in the arts need to take full responsibility for the "truly radicalising premises that lie at the core of all that we have so far accomplished." The challenge for socialist-feminist theorists - especially those critics of cultural production - and cultural producers, is to be alert to co-optive tendencies, so as not to compromise the value of a thorough-going feminist and sociological critique of art with the

romantic notion of an autonomous and independent artistic production.

It is important to recognise the contingent nature of progressive or radical political elements in art practice, as Burgin (1980:80) asserts,

"Without necessarily abandoning those forms which exist, 'new forms of politicisation' within the institutions of art... must begin with the recognition that meaning is perpetually displaced from the image to the discursive formations which cross and contain it; that there can be no question of either 'progressive' contents or forms in themselves, nor any ideally 'effective' synthesis of the two; that there can be no genre of 'political' art... given in advance of the specific historical/institutional/discursive conjuncture; that there can be neither 'art for all' nor 'art for all time'. These and other unrequited spectres of the left art imaginary are to be exorcised; the problem here is not to answer the old questions, it is to identify the new ones."

Similarly, Taylor (1978:58) says that there is "no recommendation for an organised policy of revolt", but that the necessary equipment for overcoming absorption into the mainstream art-world is to be drawn from analyses of the way art is organised. Through exploring the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council, and the discourse of its representatives and of art critics, I have sought to provide such an analysis.

Feminists who are involved in the arts must be constantly displacing themselves, that is, continually re-assessing and refining their critique of art. They must shift away from any

recognition or reward that does not stimulate more egalitarian forms of participation, both in the creation and enjoyment of art-work, and must seek to critique the artistic status of any work that reinforces negative perceptions of the role of women. Formerly subversive activities, indeed, may lose their oppositional impact. Likewise, the idea of art as retaining universal significance, across time and distance, is ideological. For socialist-feminists, art is not something that necessarily has an inherent, timeless meaning; rather, quality and meaning are derived from the socio-historical conditions in particular conjunctures. The radical nature of socialist-feminist theorising and working requires on-going self-evaluation and re-direction: life-long vigilance.

APPENDIX A

The powers of the Arts Council are all those "reasonably necessary or expedient" to enable it to fulfill its functions under the 1974 Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council Act. In particular, it may:

(a) formulate and carry out policies to further and assist the arts generally;

(b) make grants, on such conditions as it thinks fit, to any persons to assist them to undertake studies, assignments, or commissions, or to make investigations, or to gain further experience, in respect of matters approved by the Council, whether within or beyond New Zealand;

(c) make grants or pay subsidies, on such conditions as it thinks fit, to Regional and Community Arts Councils, to local authorities, and to organisations engaged in the execution, creation, publication, or presentation of any of the arts or in the preservation and display of articles and things relating to the arts;

(d) make awards to persons for outstanding accomplishments in the arts, whether in or beyond New Zealand;

(e) commission the creation or execution of any artistic works;

(g) arrange for or undertake any artistic exhibition or performance;

(h) advise and assist any bodies or organisations that are engaged in artistic activities;

(i) arrange for the maintenance and management of any land, buildings, or other real or personal property for the purposes of the Act;

(k) dispose of any of its property, by whatever means;

(l) charge fees for admission to land and buildings it controls;

(m) collect, examine, disseminate or publish any information relating to the arts or to any particular form of art; and

(n) generally do whatever it considers necessary in order to stimulate artistic activity.

According to the 1974 Act, the membership of the Council was to be made up of the following:

(1) a person, appointed by the Minister, as chairperson;

(2) three persons, the chairpersons of the Regional Arts Councils;

(3) five others, appointed by the Minister;

- (4) one representative from the Department of Education;
- (5) one representative from the Broadcasting Council; and
- (6) the Secretary of Internal Affairs.

The functions of the Arts Council were described as:

- (a) to encourage, promote and support the development of professional standards in the arts in New Zealand;
- (b) to encourage, promote and support the practice and appreciation of the arts in New Zealand, including Maori and Pacific Island arts;
- (c) to make accessible to every person in New Zealand, as far as may be practicable, all forms of artistic activity;
- (d) to encourage, promote and support public interest in the arts;
- (e) to encourage, promote and support artistic links with other countries by way of cultural exchanges, and to foster appreciation of the arts as practised in other countries;
- (f) to co-operate with broadcasting organisations and services in any activities that may facilitate the carrying out of the functions of the Council.

(g) to co-operate with educational bodies so as to develop the practice and appreciation of the arts as integral aspects of education in New Zealand;

(h) to give advice to the Minister on any matter relating to or affecting the functions of the Council; and

(i) to establish and maintain regional offices so as to facilitate the activities of the Regional Arts Councils.

APPENDIX B

By the 1974 Act, the Regional Arts Councils are to have the following members:

- (a) a chairperson, appointed by the Minister;
- (b) four persons, appointed by the Minister; and
- (c) four persons elected by the representatives at the regional conference.

The functions of the Regional Arts Councils are:

- (a) to advise the QEII Council of the ways in which the QEII Council's functions can best be carried out in respect of the region;
- (b) to keep the QEII Council fully informed of all activities and developments relating to the arts in its region, and of the needs of the region in respect of such matters;
- (c) to undertake activities in the region as the QEII Council directs;
- (d) to co-operate with and assist the QEII Council in the carrying out of the QEII Council's functions in the region;

(e) to encourage and promote the establishment and development of Community Arts Councils in the region;

(f) to provide assistance and guidance to the Community Arts Councils in the region in their activities;

(g) to receive from the annual regional conference, and from any Community Arts Councils in the region, any recommendations as to the distribution of funds by the Minister to any local arts groups in the region and, after consultation with the QEII Arts Council, to advise the Minister;

(h) to give advice to the QEII Council on the financial needs of any Community Arts Councils and of any professional arts organisations in the region ;and

(i) to co-operate with educational bodies and broadcastasting agencies and services in the encouragement, promotion and development of the practice and appreciation of the arts in the region.

APPENDIX C

Community Arts Councils, by the 1974 Act, have the following functions:

(a) to keep the Regional Arts Council fully informed of all activities and developments relating to both amateur and professional arts in the area that the Community Arts Council serves, and of the needs of the area in respect of such matters;

(b) to give advice and make recommendations to the Regional Arts Council as to the ways in which the functions of the QEII Arts Council and the Regional Arts Council can best be carried out in the area in which the Community Arts Council carries out its activities;

(c) to co-operate with and assist the QEII Arts Council in the carrying out of their functions in respect of the region and the area which the Community Arts Council serves;

(d) to make recommendations to the Regional Arts Council as to the priorities for the distribution of funds by the Minister to any local arts groups in the region;

(e) to co-operate with educational bodies and broadcasting organisations and services in the area in which the Community Arts Council carries on its activities; and

(f) to arrange or undertake, as it thinks fit, in accordance with the policies of the QEII Arts Council, such artistic exhibitions, performances and activities by any persons or organisations in the area that the Community Arts Council serves.

APPENDIX D

Distribution of total Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council grant.

YEAR	TOTAL GRANT RECEIVED	QUEEN ELIZABETH II ARTS COUNCIL ACTIVITIES	REGIONAL ARTS COUNCILS	MAORI AND SOUTH PACIFIC ARTS COUNCIL ACTIVITIES
1977-78	\$2 100 000	\$1 959 000	\$141 000	\$50 000
1978-79	\$2 705 000	\$2 457 000	\$198 000	\$50 000
1979-80	\$3 100 000	\$2 787 000	\$253 000	\$60 000
1980-81	\$3 600 000	\$3 140 000	\$290 000	\$120 000
1981-82	\$4 100 000	\$3 605 000	\$320 000	\$175 000

APPENDIX E

Distribution of funds over the six main areas of
Arts Council activities.

The six main areas are as follows:

1. Development of professionalism; maintenance of arts institutions.
2. Development of the practice and appreciation of the arts.
3. Projects in the arts.
4. Grants to individuals.
5. Accessibility of the arts and regional development programmes (outside of Regional Arts Councils), and
6. The Council's public education, promotion and research programmes.

AREA OF ARTS COUNCIL FUNDING

(see above)

YEAR	1	2	3
1978-79	\$1 512 000	\$391 000	\$90 000
1979-80	\$1 633 000	\$544 000	\$165 000
1980-81	\$1 744 000	\$673 500	\$200 000
1981-82	\$1 788 000	\$988 000	\$207 000
YEAR	4	5	6
1978-79	\$131 000	\$202 000	\$102 000
1979-80	\$202 000	\$216 500	\$122 500
1980-81	\$257 300	\$220 400	\$131 400
1981-82	\$352 000	\$287 000	\$141 000

APPENDIX F

Proportion of Arts Council funds coming from
Government Vote and Lottery Board

YEAR	GOVERNMENT VOTE \$	LOTTERY BOARD \$
1972-73	689 000	305 000
1973-74	1 628 000	593 000
1974-74	2 179 000	576 200
1975-76	2 535 000	679 200
1976-77	2 324 000	809 200
1977-78	2 669 000	1 193 846
1978-79	3 007 000	1 891 200

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, G., 1983, 'Afternoon Tea with Olivia Spencer Bower' in Art New Zealand 26:20-21.
- Alexander, S. and Taylor, B., 'In defence of patriarchy' in Evans, M. (ed), 1983, The Woman Question, pp80-83, Fontana:Great Britain.
- Althusser, L., 1971, Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays, New Left Books:London.
- Anderson, P., 1976-77, 'The Antinomies of Antonio Gramsci' in New Left Review, 100:5-78.
- Arnold, M., 1961, (edited by J. Dover Wilson), Culture and Anarchy, Cambridge University Press:Cambridge.
- Barnett, P., 1982, 'Domestic Hiss' in Crafts, January/February issue, pp18-21
- Barrett, M., Corrigan, P., Kuhn, A., and Wolff, J. (eds), 1979, Ideology and Cultural Production, Croom Helm:London.
- Barrett, M., 1980, Women's Oppression Today, Verso:London.
- Barrett, M., 1981, 'Materialist Aesthetics' in New Left Review 126:86-93.
- Barrett, M., 'Feminism and the Definition of Cultural Politics' in Brunt, R. and Rowan, C., (eds), 1982, Feminism, Culture and Politics, pp36-58, Lawrence and Wishart:London.

- Barrie, L., 1984, Annotated Index for Women's Art Archive 1984 Interview Project, undertaken with the support of the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council. Unpublished. Held at Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council Resource Centre, Wellington.
- Barry, J. and Flitterman, S., 1980, 'Textual Strategies - The Politics of Art-Making' in Screen 21,2:35-48.
- Batten, J., 1980, 'Women Artists: Is there a female aesthetic?' in Women's Studies Conference Papers '80, pp69-74, Women's Studies Association, Auckland.
- Batten, J., 1982, 'Emerging from Underground: The Women's Art Movement in New Zealand' in Spiral 5:24-28.
- Batten, J., 1983, 'What is a feminist artist?' in Broadsheet, June:20-32.
- Beatson, P., 1982, 'Rival Siblings' in New Zealand Cultural Studies Working Group Journal 5:10-19.
- Beatson, P., and Cox, S., 1982, 'The Arts in New Zealand' in New Zealand Sociological Perspectives, Spoonley, P., Pearson, D., and Shirley, I. (eds), Longman: Auckland:353-375.
- Beechey, V., 1979, 'On Patriarchy' in Feminist Review 3:66-82.
- Beiringa, L., 1982, 'Preface' to catalogue for Rita Angus exhibition, pp7-8, National Art Gallery:Wellington.
- Bennett, T., 1979, Formalism and Marxism, Methuen and Co.:Great Britain.
- Bennett, T., 1981a, Popular Culture. Themes and Issues 1, Open University Press:Milton Keynes.

- Bennett, T., 1981b, Popular Culture. Themes and Issues 2, Open University Press:Milton Keynes.
- Bennett, T., Martin, G., Mercer, C., and Woollacott, J. (eds), 1981, Culture, Ideology, and Social Process, Open Unveristy Press:Milton Keynes.
- Berger, J., 1972, Ways of Seeing, British Broadcasting Corporation:London.
- Biggs, D., 1970, Expenditure on the Arts in New Zealand, Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council of New Zealand: Wellington.
- Bourdieu, P., 1977, Outline of a Theory of Practice, Cambridge University Press:Cambridge.
- Bovenschen, S., 1977, 'Is there a feminist aesthetic?' in New German Critique, 10:111-137.
- Bowen, J., 1977, 'Women artists: objets d'art?' in Hecate, 3,2:81-84.
- Braden, S., 1978, Artists and People, RKP:London.
- Brittan, A. and Maynard, M., 1984, Sexism, Racism and Oppression, Basil Blackwell:Oxford.
- Brown, G.H., 1981, New Zealand Painting 1940-1960. Conformity and Dissension, Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council:Wellington.
- Brownson, R., 1982, 'Symbolism and the Generation of Meaning in Rita Angus's Painting', pp79-88, in catalogue for Rita Angus exhibition, National Art Gallery:Wellington.
- Brunt, R. and Rowan, C. (eds), 1982, Feminism, Culture, and Politics, Lawrence and Wishart:London.

- Buci-Glucksman, C., 1980, Gramsci and the State, Lawrence and Wishart:London.
- Burgin, V., 1980, 'Photography, Fantasy and Fiction' in Screen 21,1:43-80.
- Burton, F. and Carlen, P., 1979, Official Discourse, RKP:London.
- Busch, G., 1984, Working Men, National Art Gallery:Wellington, New Zealand.
- Calhoun, A., 1984, 'Aspects of New Zealand Art 1890-1940' in Art New Zealand 32:32-33.
- Cater, R., 1982, 'Government and Culture in New Zealand', keynote address for New Zealand Sociological Association Conference, Massey University, 20 August 1982.
- Chambers, I., Clarke, J., Connell, I., and Curtis, W., Hall, S. and Jefferson, T., 1979, 'Marxism and Culture' in Screen 18,4:109-119.
- Chapman, R., 1973, 'Fiction and the Social Pattern' in Essays on New Zealand Literature, Curnow, W. (ed), Heinemann:Auckland:71-98.
- Codd, J., Harker, R., and Nash, R., 1985, Political Issues in New Zealand Education, Dunmore:Palmerston North.
- Codd, J., 1985, 'State Schooling and Cultural Reproduction' in Codd, J. et. al., Political Issues in New Zealand Education, pp23-41, Dunmore:Palmerston North.
- Connell, R.W., 1983a, Which Way is Up?, George Allen and Unwin:Auckland.
- Connell, R.W., 1983b, 'Democratising Culture' in Meanjin 42,3:295-307.

- Cornwell, S., 1979, 'The Social and Working Conditions of Artists' in International Labour Review 118,5:537-556.
- Coward, R., 1977, 'Class, 'Culture' and the Social Formation' in Screen 18:75-105.
- Crean, S., 1984, 'The Thirty Per Cent Solution. Sexism as a Fine Art' in This January:10-14.
- Curnow, A. (ed), 1945, A Book of New Zealand Verse 1923-45, Caxton:Christchurch.
- Curnow, A. (ed), 1960, The Penguin Book of New Zealand Verse, Penguin:Great Britain.
- Curnow, W. (ed), 1973, Essays on New Zealand Literature, Heinemann:Auckland.
- Cvitanovich, L., 1984, Breaking the Silence, unpublished thesis for degree of Master of Arts, Department of Sociology, Massey University, Palmerston North.
- Daly, P., 1977, Sculpture, and the "Artworld" in New Zealand, unpublished thesis for Diploma in Fine Arts, University of Canterbury, Christchurch.
- Dalziel, R., 1977, 'The Colonial Helpmeet: Women's Role and the Vote in Nineteenth Century Nw Zealand' in New Zealand Journal of History, 11,2:112-123.
- de Beauvoir, S., 1983, The Second Sex (translated and edited by Parshley, H.M.), Penguin:Harmondsworth.
- Department of Internal Affairs, 1976, 'Cultural Planning in New Zealand', a paper prepared for the UNESCO seminar on Cultural Planning in Asia, Teheran, 23-27 February, 1976.

- de Silva, L., 1978, Culture and Government, Dept. of Internal Affairs: Wellington.
- Dickie, G., 1969, 'Defining Art' in American Philosophical Quarterly 6,3:253-56.
- Diffey, T.J., 1984, 'The Sociological Challenge to Aesthetics' in British Journal of Aesthetics, 24,2:168-171.
- Eagleton, T., 1976, Criticism and Ideology, New Left Books, London.
- Eagleton, T., 1983, Literary Theory, Basil Blackwell:Oxford.
- Eastmond, E., 1982, 'A Morning at the Mothers' in Broadsheet January-February:42-45.
- Eastmond, E., and Sotheran, C., 1983, 'In the Red. Or, it helps if you are nude - or dead.' Unpublished paper given at 'Sexism and the Arts' seminar, Auckland.
- Eastmond, E. and Pitts, P., 1985, 'An Analysis by Gender of Articles/Reviews and Artists' Works discussed in Art New Zealand, Issues 25-34. (Update of 1983 survey by Eastmond and Sotheran.) Unpublished paper given at 'Issues in Feminist Art' seminar, Auckland.
- Elias, A., 1984, 'Discrimination and the Artist', transcript of a Broadcast on the Concert Programme, 1/3/84.
- Ewington, J., 1982, 'Fragmentation and Feminism: the Critical Discourses of Post-Modernism' in Art and Text 7:61-73.
- Fairburn, A.R.D., 1956, 'The Culture Industry' in Landfall, 10,3:198-211.
- Fairburn, A.R.D., 1967, The Woman Problem and Other Essays, Blackwood and Janet Paul:Auckland.

- Fee, E., 1981, 'Is feminism a threat to scientific objectivity?'
in International Journal of Women's
Studies 4:378-392.
- Firestone, S., 1971, The Dialectic of Sex, Cape:London.
- Foster, H. (ed), 1983, The Anti-Aesthetic. Essays on
Post-modern Culture, Bay Press:Port Townsend,
Washington.
- Fox, J., 1967, State Aid to the Arts in New Zealand, unpublished
thesis for the degree of Master of Arts (Political
Science), Victoria University:Wellington.
- Gardiner, J.K., Bulkin, E., Patterson, R.G. and
Kolodny, A., 1982, 'An Interchange on Feminist
Criticism: On "Dancing Through the Minefield" in
Feminist Studies, 8,3:629-675.
- Garnham, N. and Williams, R., 1980, 'Pierre Bourdieu and the
Sociology of Culture:An Introduction' in Media,
Culture, and Society 2:209-223.
- Gold, D., Lo, C., and Wright, E.O., 1975, 'Recent Developments in
Marxist Theories of the Capitalist State' in
Monthly Review 27,5:29-43, and 27,6:36-51.
- Grace, H., 1982, 'From the Margins: A Feminist Essay on Women's
Art' in Lip 6:13-18.
- Gramsci, A., 1971, Selections from Prison Notebooks, Hoare, Q.
and Nowell-Smith, G. (eds), Lawrence and
Wishart:London.
- Greene, G., 1981, 'Feminist and Marxist Criticism: An argument
for alliances' in Women's Studies 9:29-45.
- Greer, G., 1979, The Obstacle Race, Secker and Warburg:London.

- Guy, C., 1984, 'Breakdown of Distinctions in New Zealand Listener, October 27:39.
- Hadjinicolaou, N., 1978, Art History and Class Struggle, Pluto Press:London.
- Hall, S. and Jefferson, T., 1976, Resistance Through Rituals, Hutchinson:London.
- Hall, S., Hobson, D., Lowe, A., and Willis, P. (eds), 1980, Culture, Media, and Language, Hutchinson:London.
- Hall, S., 1981, 'The Whites of their Eyes' in Bridges, G. and Brunt, R. (eds), Silver Linings, pp28-52, Lawrence and Wishart:London.
- Hartsock, N., 1983, 'The Feminist Standpoint:Developing the ground for a specifically feminist historical materialism', in Harding, S. and Hintikka, M. (eds), Discovering Reality, pp283-310, D. Reidel:Dordrecht.
- Harris, A.S. and Nochlin, L., 1976, Women Artists 1550-1950, Los Angeles County Museum of Art:U.S.A.
- Hess, T.B. and Baker, E.C. (eds), 1973, Art and Sexual Politics. Why have there been no great women artists?, Collier:New York.
- Hill, A., 1983, In the Public Good, unpublished thesis for the degree of Master of Arts, Department of Sociology, Massey University, Palmerston North.
- Hincks, T., 1984, 'Aesthetics and the Sociology of Art: A Critical Commentary on the Writings of Janet Wolff' in British Journal of Aesthetics, 24,4:341-354.
- Horrocks, R., 1984, 'No Theory Permitted on these Premises' in And, 2:119-137.

- Hull, A., 1983, 'Community Arts. A Perspective' in Meanjin 42,3:315-324.
- Hutchinson, R., 1982, The Politics of the Arts Council, Sinclair Browne:London.
- Jaggar, A., 1983, Feminist Politics and Human Nature, Harvester:Sussex.
- Jameson, F. et. al., 1983, Formations of Pleasure, RKP:London.
- Jauss, H., 1982, Towards an Aesthetic of Reception, Harvester:Brighton.
- Jessop, R., 1982, The Capitalist State, Martin Robertson:Oxford.
- Jenkins, D., 1985, 'If it feels good, it's art' in New Zealand Listener, April 6:91-92.
- Johnson, P., 1984, Marxist Aesthetics, RKP:London.
- Johnston, A., 1982, 'Alexis Hunter' in Art New Zealand 16:46-47.
- Johnston, C., 1980, 'The Subject of Feminist film theory/practice' in Screen 21:27-34.
- Kelly, M., 1982, 'Reviewing Modernist Criticism' in Screen 22,3:41-62.
- King, J., 1984, 'Margaret Stoddart' in Art New Zealand 31:46-49.
- Kolodny, A., 'Dancing Through the Minefield: Some Observations on the Theory, Practice, and Politics of a Feminist Literary Criticism' in Spender, D. (ed), 1981, Men's Studies Modified, pp23-42, Pergamon Press:Oxford.
- Kuhn, A., 1982, Women's Pictures, RKP:London.

- Laclau, E., 1979, Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory, Verso:London.
- Laclau, E., 1980, 'Populist Rupture and Discourse' in Screen Education 34:87-93.
- Laclau, E. and Mouffe, C., 1981, 'Socialist Strategy. Where Next?' in Marxism Today 25:17-22.
- Laing, D., 1978, The Marxist Theory of Art, Harvester:Great Britain.
- Langer, S., 1982, 'Against the Grain: A Working Gynergenic Art Criticism' in International Journal of Women's Studies, 5,3:246-264.
- Lauter, P., 1983, 'Race and Gender in the Shaping of the American Literary Canon: A Case Study from the Twenties' in Feminist Studies, 9,3:435-463.
- Leavis, F., 1960 (fourth edition), The Great Tradition, Chatto and Windus:London.
- Lippard, L., 1980, 'Sweeping Exchanges: the contribution of feminism to the art of the 70s' in Art Journal, Fall/Winter:362-365.
- Lonie, B., 1981, 'Diaries' in Art New Zealand 18:14.
- Lovell, T., 1980, Formations of Pleasure, British Film Institute:London.
- Lukes, S., 1974, Power. A Radical View, Macmillan:London.
- Macherey, P., 1978, A Theory of Literary Production, RKP:London.
- Mackle, A., 1982, 'Rita Angus Portraiture' in catalogue for Rita Angus exhibition, pp89-94, National Art Gallery:Wellington.

- Maharey, S., 1982, 'Cultural Studies:Mapping the Field' in New Zealand Cultural Studies Working Group Journal 3:13-15.
- Maharey, S., 1985 (forthcoming), 'Filling the Hole: An Approach to Cultural Studies Research' in Sites 10.
- McCormick, E.H., 1940, Letters and Art in New Zealand, Department of Internal Affairs:Wellington.
- McCormick, E.H., 1980, 'Frances Hodgkins. The Path to Impressionism. 1890-1912' in Art New Zealand 16:28-35, 66.
- McCormick, E.H., 1981, Portrait of Frances Hodgkins, Auckland University Press:Auckland.
- McGrath, J., 1981, A Good Night Out, Eyre Methuen:Great Britain.
- Mercer, C., 1983, 'A Poverty of Desire: Pleasure and Popular Politics' in Jameson, F. et. al., Formations of Pleasure, pp84-100, British Film Institute:London.
- Merewether, C. and Stephen, A. (eds), 1977, The Great Divide, The Great Divide:Melbourne.
- Miliband, R. and Saville J. (eds), 1983, Socialist Register, Merlin Press:London.
- Miller, L. and Swenson, S., 1981, Lives and Works. Talks with women artists, Scarecrow Press:Metuchen, New Jersey.
- Morgan, D., 1981, 'Men, masculinity and the process of sociological enquiry' in Roberts, H. (ed), Doing Feminist Research, pp83-113, RKP:London.
- Mouffe, C., 1981, 'Hegemony and the Integral State in Gramsci' in Bridges, G. and Brunt, R. (eds), Silver Linings, pp167-187, Lawrence and Wishart:London.

- Mouffe, C., 1981b, 'Hegemony and Ideology in Gramsci' in
Bennett, T. et. al. (eds), Culture, Ideology, and
Social Process, pp 219-234, Open University
Press:Milton Keynes.
- Mulhern, F., 1980, 'Notes on Culture and Cultural Struggle' in
Screen Education 34:31-36.
- Mulvey, L., 1975, 'Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema' in
Screen 16,3:6-18.
- Oliver, W.H., 1981, Oxford History of New Zealand, Oxford
University Press:Wellington.
- Open University Art and Environment Course Team, 1976, The Great
Divide, Open University Press:Milton Keynes.
- Open University Art and Environment Course Team, 1976, Social
Relationships in Art, Open University Press:Milton
Keynes.
- Open University Popular Culture Course Team, 1981, Form and
Meaning 1, Open University Press:Milton Keynes.
- Open University Popular Culture Course Team, 1982a, The State and
Popular Culture 1, Open University Press:Milton
Keynes.
- Open University Popular Culture Course Team, 1982b, Science,
Technology and Popular Culture 1, Open University
Press:Milton Keynes.
- Owens, C., 1983, 'The Discourse of Others: Feminists and
Post-Modernism' in Foster, H. (ed), The
Anti-Aesthetic, pp57-82, Bay Press:Port Townsend,
Washington.
- Parker, R. and Pollock, G., 1981, Old Mistresses: Women, Art
and Ideology, RKP:London.

- Paul, J., 1980, 'Women Artists', in Bunkle, P. and Hughes, B.(eds), Women in New Zealand Society, pp184-216, Allen and Unwin:Australia.
- Pearson, N., 1982, The State and the Visual Arts, Open University Press:
- Pearson, W., 1974, Fretful Sleepers and Other Essays, Heinemann:Auckland. Milton Keynes.
- Poulantzas, N., 1978, Political Power and Social Classes, Verso:London.
- Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council, 1975, Cultural Planning and Development in New Zealand. Unpublished paper.
- Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council, Annual Report, for the years 1975-83, Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council:Wellington.
- Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council, 1978, Policy Discussion Paper, Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council:Wellington.
- Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council, 1984, Funding Guide, Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council:Wellington.
- Redcliffe-Maud, J., 1976, Support for the Arts in England and Wales, Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation:London.
- Research Advisory Group, 1984, Women in the Arts. A Strategy for Action, Australia Council:Australia.
- Rich, A., 1980, On Lies, Secrets and Silences, Virago:London.
- Riley, B., 1983, 'Pakeha Taniwha' in New Zealand Listener, November 24:56.
- Roberts, B., 1983, 'Community Writing' in Meanjin, 42,3:283-293.

Roberts, H. (ed), 1981, Doing Feminist Research, RKP:London.

Roberts, J.L., 1985, 'Painted Polemic' in New Zealand Listener, April 6:34-35.

Rose, D., 1981, Institutional Funding Policy, unpublished report, Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council:Wellington.

Rose, M.A., 1984, Marx's Lost Aesthetic. Karl Marx and the Visual Arts, Cambridge University Press:Cambridge.

Rosier, P., 1983a, 'Olivia Spencer Bower' in Broadsheet January/February:42-43.

Rosier, P., 1983b, 'Rita Angus. The Woman in the Landscape' in Broadsheet April:18-21.

Rosier, P., 1984c, 'Robin White: New Zealand Painter' in Broadsheet November:42.

Rowbotham, S., 1973, Hidden From History, Pluto Press:London.

Rowbotham, S., 1983, 'The Trouble with 'Patriarchy'', pp73-79, in Evans, M. (ed), The Woman Question, Fontana:Great Britain.

Scotts, N. and Mounsey, P., 1983, craft newzealand. A study of the craft industry, craftspeople and their training needs., Vocational Training Council:Wellington.

Showalter, E., 'Towards a feminist poetics' in Jacobus, M. (ed), 1979, Women Writing and Writing about Women, pp22-41, Croom Helm:London.

Sinclair, K., 1978, 'New Zealand Literary History' in New Zealand Journal of History, 12,1:69-74.

Slivka, R., 1985, 'Women at Work' in Craft International, January-March, pp7, 12, 14.

- Smith, D.E., 1978, 'A Peculiar Eclipsing: Women's Exclusion from Men's Culture' Women's Studies International Quarterly, 1,4:281-295.
- Smith, G., 1983, 'Culture Accounting Practices' in Fuse March/April:330-333.
- Smith, T., 1975, 'Official Culture and the Visual Arts Board' in Meanjin, 34,2:121-28.
- Smyth, B., 1973, The role of culture and leisure-time in New Zealand, UNESCO:Paris.
- Sotheran, C., 1983, 'Replacing Women in Art History' in Art New Zealand 26:15-16.
- Sparks, C., 1977, 'The Evolution of Cultural Studies' in Screen Education 22:16-30.
- Spender, D., 1980, Manmade Language, RKP:London.
- Spender, D., 1981, 'The gatekeepers: a feminist critique of academic publishing' in Roberts, H. (ed), Doing Feminist Research, pp186-202, RKP:London.
- Spender, D., 1983, Feminist Theorists, The Women's Press:London.
- Spender, L., 1983, Intruders on the Rights of Men, Pandora Press:London.
- Stanley, L. and Wise, S., 1983, Breaking Out. Feminist Consciousness and Feminist Research, RKP:London.
- Swingewood, A., 1979, The Myth of Mass Culture, Macmillan:London.
- Taylor, P., 1981, 'Lip-Reading' in Meanjin 40,4:529-533.
- Taylor, R., 1978, Art, An Enemy of the People, Harvester:Sussex.

- Taylor, R., 1981, Beyond Art, Harvester:Sussex.
- Throsby, G. and Withers, G., 1979, The Economics of the Performing Arts, Edward Arnold:Melbourne.
- Tickner, L., 1984, 'Notes on Feminism, Femininity, and Women's Art' in Lip, 8:14-18.
- Turnovsky, F., 1969, 'Government and the Arts: the next ten years and beyond', in Ascent 3:34-42.
- Urry, J., 1981, The Anatomy of Capitalist Societies: The Economy, Civil Society and the State, Macmillan: London.
- Vasquez, A.S., 1973, Art and Society. Essays in Marxist Aesthetics, Merlin Press:London.
- Volkerling, M., 1981a, 'Reforming the Arts Council: The New Zealand Experience', a paper prepared for the second conference of Commonwealth Arts Councils, Montreal, April, 1981.
- Volkerling, M., 1981b, 'The Arts and Society - their future in New Zealand', a paper prepared for the Winter Lecture Series, University of Auckland, 5/8/81.
- Wane, G.M., 1975, The King and the Nightingale, unpublished thesis for degree of Master of Arts, Department of Political Science, University of Canterbury, Christchurch.
- Weir, A. and Wilson, E., 1984, 'The British Women's Movement' in New Left Review 148:74-103.
- Westkott, M., 1979, 'Feminist Criticism of the Social Sciences' in Harvard Educational Review 49,4:422-430.

- Whittick, A., 1984, 'Towards Precise Definitions of Art and Craft' in British Journal of Aesthetics, 24,1:17-52.
- Whitty, G. (ed), 1981, The Politics of Cultural Production, Open University Press:Milton Keynes.
- Williams, R., 1961, The Long Revolution, Chatto and Windus:London.
- Williams, R., 1973, 'Base and Superstructure in Marxist Theory' in New Left Review, 82:31-49.
- Williams, R., 1977, Marxism and Literature, Oxford University Press:Oxford.
- Williams, R., 1981, Culture, Fontana:Great Britain.
- Wolff, J., 1981, The Social Production of Art, Macmillan:London.
- Wolff, J., 1983, Aesthetics and the Sociology of Art, Allen and Unwin:London.
- Willis, P., 1983, 'Cultural Production and Theories of Reproduction', in Race, Class, and Education, Barton, L. and Walker, S. (eds), Croom Helm:London.
- Women and Labour Publications Collective (eds), 1984, All Her Labours Vol. 2., Embroidering the Framework, Hale and Iremonger:Sydney.

Newspaper articles

Brown, W., 'Success through subtlety in polemical art' in New Zealand Times, 3 March 1985.

Davies, A., (letter to the editor) in Nelson Evening Mail, 17 January 1980.

Kamin, H., 'Stereotyping: An issue in the arts' in Winnipeg Free Press, 6 October 1981.

Landsberg, M., in Toronto Star, 28 May 1983.

Loane, S., 'Women, arts and equality' in Courier Mail (Brisbane), 17 July 1984.

Nicolaidi, M., 'Funding Priorities Needed' in New Zealand Times 5 May, 1985.

Rowe, N., in Evening Post (Wellington), 2 February 1981.

Addresses by Arts Council members

Gascoigne, D., 1979, address given to Wellington Rotary Club, 20 August.

Highet, A., 1982, address given to the World Conference on Cultural Policies, 26 July - 6 August.

Kerr, J., 1981, address given to Annual General Meeting of Music Federation, 11 April.

Kerr, J., 1982, address given at opening of the first exhibition of Southland Savings Bank Art Foundation, 7 August.

Kerr, J., 1982, address given to Southern Regional Arts Council,
11 September.

Kerr, J., 1982, address given to Northern Regional Arts Council
Conference, 17 October.

Volkerling, M., 1982, address given to New Zealand Students Arts
Council Activities Conference, 13 May.

Volkerling, M., 1981, address given to Central Regional Arts
Council Conference, 17 May.

Volkerling, M., 1982, address given to Central Regional Arts
Council Conference, 7 June.

Volkerling, M., 1982, address given to Northern Regional Arts
Council conference, Titirangi, 16 October.

Volkerling, M., 1983, address given to Annual General Meeting of
Music Federation, 16 April.

Other sources

Action, issues 1-24, magazine of the Queen Elizabeth II Arts
Council. Replaced in July 1983 by Update.

Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council of New Zealand Act 1974.