COOK STUDIES: WHITHER NOW?

by Michael E. Hoare

At the end of April 1978, exactly two hundred years after Captain James Cook left Nootka Sound, Vancouver Island, British Columbia, to make northwards towards Alaska and Bering Strait, over 450 scholars from the complete spectrum of disciplines; editors, secretaries of societies, museum people, Cook devotees, historians, natural historians, medical men, cartographers, geographers, anthropologists, and others from the southern and northern hemispheres foregathered at Simon Fraser University in greater Vancouver on the lower mainland of British Columbia to consider "Captain Cook's Life and Times" in four days of conference, exchanges, excursions, celebrations and feasting such as would rival any Polynesian festivity in the Pacific. They had come to celebrate the bicentenary of that Nootka landfall, to focus on Cook's third voyage (1776-1780) but also, in the words of the conference preprogram, "as people from throughout the world who are interested in all three voyages and the scientific discoveries they produced." More was indeed foretold:

> It [the Conference] will offer a unique opportunity for scholars from a number of disciplines to discuss new research and reconsider earlier assessments and perspectives.

And further:

> The scientific and artistic impact of Cook's voyages have a universal significance. The remarkable contributions to human knowledge resulting from Cook's voyages have affected many fields of science including navigation, botany, history, geography, medicine etc. and continue to be significant to the present day.[1]

It was an ambitious, a significant conference: for Pacific studies it was also a seminal series of symposia, both in intent and results. Hitherto only the expected spate of more popular journalistic reports, some good, most bad, has appeared to review the work and achievements of this conference. Most of this reporting has not, however, overlooked the

[1]Simon Fraser University, *Captain James Cook and His Times: International and Interdisciplinary Conference* (Vancouver, B.C.), pp. 1-2. I am grateful to all colleagues at this conference for the free exchange and discussion which made this paper, a very personal view, possible.

fact that this was a gathering of review: the reviewing of Cook and his work.[2] It was also, too, more than anything else a critical re-examination of the massive scholarship of the one man, the late Professor John Cawte Beaglehole, who has made Cook's and most of his companions' manuscript original observations on the Pacific (and elsewhere) available to succeeding grateful generations of scholars. One is reminded here of' the dedication by Douglas L. Oliver in his monumental *Ancient Tahitian Society* (Honolulu, 1974) to Kenneth Emory, Raymond Firth and the late John Beaglehole who, wrote Oliver, "have infused new life into the study of Polynesian culture." I was reminded, too, at the beginning of these important Cook proceedings of the question put to me in Dunedin in June 1977 by one of our eminent and emeritus New Zealand professors on the occasion of the 1977 Hocken Lecture: "Is there anything new to say about Cook after Beaglehole?" On that occasion, I think, we could show that there were new directions in Cook Studies which we needed to follow post-Beaglehole.[3] After Vancouver and Simon Fraser in April 1978 there is no doubt.

It is not my brief here to analyze exhaustively each of the twenty-three papers formally read (in summary) or any of the four tabled at the Vancouver Conference. Some ten or one dozen of those papers will appear in the important forthcoming book of selected essays to be edited by Dr. Robin Fisher and Dr. Hugh Johnston of the Department of History at Simon Fraser University (hereafter SFU).[4] It was my privilege, however, to be asked to deliver the first Conference paper[5] and to attempt in ten minutes (a totally inadequate time). a summary of the Conference. Since the former was retrospective and suggestive of "revision" in regard to the scholarship of J. C. Beaglehole, and the latter was able to draw upon the stimulus of ideas and discussion (much of the best of it coming from the floor!) I intend here simply to suggest some of the new research and directions which Cook Studies--particularly as they relate to the Pacific--may take or are taking. The op-

[2]See, for example, "Captain Cook Renown May Be Overdone," *Los Angeles Times,* 10 May 1978 and Alan Merridew, "Captain Cook Controversy on the Boil," Sydney *Bulletin,* 23 May 1978, pp. 19-20.

[3]Michael E. Hoare, *In the Steps of Beaglehole: Cook Researches Past and Prospect* (Dunedin, 1977).

[4]This volume goes to press in September 1978 and should be speedily available early in 1979 to Cook scholars as one example of the culmination over ten years of bicentenary research. The full papers have been issued in unedited original duplicated form in three volumes by SFU University. These are referred to hereafter as SFU Papers.

[5]Michael E. Hoare, "Two Centuries' Perceptions of James Cook: George Foster to Beaglehole," SFU Papers, I, 33 pp.

portunity to see some of the SFU Vancouver papers published in this issue of *Pacific Studies* will be especially welcome to students of the Pacific and of Cook as well as to the participants in the Vancouver Conference.

The SFU organizers had divided the offerings into seven very full sessions in which they sought to give full play to the influence of Cook's voyages on both the European and Pacific indigenous activities of the second three decades of the eighteenth century and later. One was reminded at the outset of George Forster's (Cook's assistant naturalist on the second voyage) prophesy of 1787 in his farseeing essay *"Cook der Entdecker:"*

> What Cook has added to the mass of our knowledge is such that it will strike deep roots and have the most decisive influence on the activities of men. . . . Only our present century could satisfy Cook's burning ambition by putting resources at his disposal, thus enabling him to become a discoverer, and Cook alone could come up to the expectations of his times.[6]

There was, as with any humanly devised classification, inevitably some overlap in the taxonomy of the Cook scholarship so divided. Our Linnean contrived or artificial system, however, soon evolved into something more natural--and exciting.

The first session on "Implications of Cook's Voyages" left us in no doubt of two things: that revision of Beaglehole--and thus Cook--would be a major conference theme and that, as befitted the venue-albeit at the "back door," so to speak--Canada had some rightful claim to Cook as a "hero."[7] Professor Glyndwr Williams of Queen Mary College, London, in his paper raised serious doubts about Cook's credibility as a reliable cartographer on the third voyage, especially in Alaskan-Russian waters.[8] Williams did not deny Cook's great achievements of the first two, mainly South Pacific navigations: his principal contention was that Cook seemed to have lost his healthy scepticism towards previous theoretical cartographers of the North Pacific and that he did not show the critical discernment and judgments of former years after July 1776. Ear-

[6]The translation is by Dr. Gerda Bell of Wellington for the forthcoming English edition of G. Forster's essay, *Cook the Discoverer* . . . , ed. M. E. Hoare (Wellington, at press).

[7]Barry Gough, "James Cook and Canada: A Chapter in the Importance of the Sea in Canadian History," SFU Papers, I, 16 pp.

[8]Glyndwr Williams, "Myth and Reality: James Cook and the Theoretical Geography of Northwest America," SFU Papers, I, 20 pp.

lier Cook had been looking for "the looming haystack of a southern continent" but on the third voyage he "was searching for the slim needle of a Northwest Passage."[9] Williams presented careful and ample documentary and original cartographical evidence to back up his strictures on "Cook's suspension of belief, and his evident failure to subject the maps in front of him to critical scrutiny."[10] But no one could deny that Cook did provide the first recognizable shape and position for the North Pacific littorals.

There was a hint emerging here that, for the wrong reasons, theoretical and practical, Cook achieved some undeniable degree of success. Cook wrote (or perhaps substantially wrote) his own instructions for the third voyage; relied too heavily upon previous cartographical theorists and hence spent too long exploring for myths and phantoms. And the phantoms may have proved fatal. From this first session (which included my own retrospective and heretical piece) we became aware of skeletons lurking in both Beagleholean and Cookian cupboards. Soon they would put on frail flesh!

Each paper-presentation-session was followed by open discussion. The first session was chaired by Dr. Timothy Beaglehole, the historian Indiologist son of J. C. Beaglehole and editor of his father's last *magnum opus*, *Life of Captain James Cook* (London, 1974). Dr. Beaglehole gave a résumé of his father's growth of interest in and commitment to Cook studies which arose out of the writing of his (J. C. Beaglehole's) *The Exploration of the Pacific* (London, 1934).[11] In the first session discussion Dr. Eric McCormick of Auckland University recalled at some length his association with J. C. Beaglehole as a younger colleague in New Zealand. Beaglehole, he revealed, had only thought of getting out of New Zealand early in his academic career and by being away researching in London in 1924-26, he "discovered New Zealand." Beaglehole's education had been literary in the English tradition: things could be seen therefore sometimes in terms of heroes and villains. This, suggested McCormick, might account for Beaglehole's interpretations of Cook and his times. Several points were made in defense of Beaglehole--if that critical, generous scholar needs defending!--before Professor Williams had his paper subjected to the searching scrutiny of hydrographical historians and historical hydrographers which resolved into a

[9]Williams, p. 1.

[10]Williams, p. 14.

[11]I have relied on my own conference notes and occasionally upon those of my friend and colleague, Dr. Peter J. P. Whitehead of London, in recalling the discussion.

learned exchange on Russian-Alaska-Bering Straits theoretical geography.

An earnest of chauvinistic and "nationalistic" things to come emerged in this discussion as various experts commented critically on the variable policies of different late eighteenth-century governments towards publishing maps of their servants' discoveries. Dr. James R. Gibson of York University, Ontario, commented that the Russians never allowed cartographers (even their own) full access to the requisite maps and Dr. Christon I. Archer of the University of Calgary noted that it was not only Spanish government policy deliberately not to publish maps but also to maintain an excellent network of spies. Dr. Alan Frost of Latrobe University, Melbourne, Australia, reminded us of the secrecy surrounding European claims to New Holland and the adjacent islands.

It was Dr. Helen Wallis of the British Library who brought the discussion into fine perspective by citing the Dutch desire to control trade in the Indies and South and their envy of the French hydrographic service of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. She reminded us, too, of Alexander Dalrymple's immense achievement in delving successfully into and publishing foreign (especially Spanish) exploration archives. Cook's "primary object" of the third voyage was to find the Northwest Passage, said Dr. Wallis, and she evidenced the important correspondence between the Earl of Sandwich and Canon John Douglas, Cook's second and third voyage editor, to confirm this contention.

The historian, most were agreed, needed commitment--here one was reminded personally of the work of the Australian Sir Keith Hancock and the tragic Frenchman Marc Bloch in this regard[12]--to face and interpret his subject. Slowly we were progressing collectively to the view that Cook, our hero, could (or might) make mistakes and that Beaglehole, his Boswell, might need some revision in the light of new research and interpretations. Not all, however, would subscribe to the view. Dr. William Stearn, the eminent botanist of London, remarked that Banks could not be forgiven by Beaglehole for his immense wealth but, surprisingly I thought, Stearn could not bring himself to contemplate sympathetically the "blaggard" botanist of the second voyage, Johann Reinhold Forster, either as *man* or *scientist.* [13]

[12]See W. K. Hancock, *Professing History* (Sydney, 1976) and Marc Bloch, *The Historian's Craft,* trans. Peter Putnam (Manchester, 1976).

[13]For my fuller answer to the still repeated and absurd "received" opinions on J. R. Forster, the scientist, see Michael E. Hoare, *The Tactless Philosopher: Johann Reinhold Forster (1729-1798)* (Melbourne, 1976).

Were we, some noted at this juncture, now dividing between a pre-Beaglehole or Beaglehole generation of Cook scholars on one hand and a post-Beaglehole group of revisionists and some heretics on the other?

The second session, "Cook's Influence on Subsequent Explorations of the North Pacific," took us away from the divided Cook scholars of the southern hemisphere and into the historical controversies, mostly contemporary, surrounding Cook's exploring activities in the north. The papers in this session ranged from the tendentious to the geopolitical. In Dr. James Gibson's account of "The Significance of Cook's Third Voyage to Russian Tenure in the North Pacific," we were presented with evidence of a Russian presence on the American coast much earlier than had been commonly accepted before, i.e. at Illiuluk in 1772 or 1773. But some were left, too, with the impression that Gibson was unwilling or unable to impute any positive quality to the Russian Pacific explorers or their contemporary and later *confréres.* That there was some ambivalence in Russian historiography towards Cook's voyages was amply shown by Dr. Terence Armstrong of the Scott Polar Research Institute (Cambridge, England) in his "Cook's Reputation in Russia" wherein he presented a graph of Russian reactions towards Cook down through two hundred years. The factors governing the Russians' blowing hot or cold--so to speak--*vis-à-vis* Cook were imperialistic ones. After the Second World War, Antarctica loomed larger in strategic thinking and it would not have done to allow Cook too much priority of discovery in the deep south, despite the adequately attested exploration of the second voyage.

Dr. Armstrong did a great service for the English language world of Cook scholarship in highlighting for a wider audience the immense labors of the Soviet Cook scholar Yakov M. Svet. Svet has done most towards restoring a balance in modem Russian writing on Cook, especially in his Russian translations and further editing of Beaglehole's Cook journals done for the Hakluyt Society.[14] By one of those accidents (or contrivances) which many have come to expect at international gatherings of this sort, Russian scholarship was denied its platform by the non-arrival of the designated paper-readers. Fortunately, however, the paper by Svet and Sevelana G. Fedorova "The Third Voyage of Captain James Cook in Russia" has been issued in volume three of the

[14]Terence Armstrong, "Cook's Reputation in Russia," SFU Papers, I, 15 pp., p. 9.

unedited typescript papers sent out by SFU after the Conference.[15] It was originally received too late to table for the Conference in Vancouver.

The researches of Russian scholars and of others like G. R. V. Barratt and Armstrong are now showing that Pacific historians and anthropologists still have to contend with and absorb a vast amount of unpublished materials in Soviet archives and repositories related to Russian voyages of explorations in the Pacific, for which Cook's expeditions were undoubtedly the catalyst.[16]

Dr. Christon Archer, having given a forewarning of his interests in the first session's discussion, severed temporarily the Russian connection to stake a claim for "The Spanish Reaction to Cook's Third Voyage." Archer reiterated again the old style cloak-and-dagger secret diplomacy and exploring of a Spain responding to English and Russian intrusion on the northwest coast. Drawing upon an impressive research experience and immersion in Spanish and South American archives, Archer highlighted the Spaniards' strengths as explorers: their ethnological abilities and "realistic view of Indian societies" based upon long experience. The Spanish weaknesses lay in a sort of innate intestinal inability to exploit the discoveries to commercial advantage. The Spanish--and this is not often the conventional wisdom--became more adroit as scientific explorers in their reaction to Cook than is sometimes allowed. Archer noted: "Cook gave them a growing awareness of the full importance of applying the enlightenment and of publicizing the national scientific exploits."[17] After 1795, however, Spain withdrew from the Pacific north and further important scientific and ethnological sources remained hidden from view until more recent generations of scholarship. But Dr. Archer met his own reaction in discussion! Heat, at times, one must suggest, almost threatened to obscure measured scholarship.

The third session of the "Impact Upon the European Mind" of Cook's voyaging paraded the old master--if one can respectfully use

[15]Thirty-two pages. The appendix of this paper (pp. 28-32) comprises the important "Inventory of Objectives Delivery by Lieutenant-Colonel Behm from Kamchatka, 1780," now in the archives of the USSR Academy of Science, Leningrad. This material, hitherto largely unknown in the ethnographical literature of Cook and the Pacific, was given by Captain Clerke to Behm when the expedition called at Petropavlovsk, Kamchatka, in April-June 1799.

[16]See D. D. Tumarkin, "Twenty-five years after Captain Cook: the First Russian Round-the-World Expedition in Hawaii," SFU Papers, III, 40 pp. This paper relates the voyage of I. F. Krusenstern, which left Kronstadt in 1803.

[17]Christon Archer, "The Spanish Reaction to Cook's Third Voyage," SFU Papers, I, 38 pp., p. 3.

that term for one so seminal in the field as Professor Bernard Smith--and two younger scholars who are making their mark in Cook studies so far as the literary and iconographic legacies are concerned, *viz.* Dr. Alan Frost of Melbourne and Dr. Rüdiger Joppien of Cologne. A more senior New Zealand scholar, but still withal a relatively recent arrival in Cook historiography with his monumental study of *Omai: Pacific Envoy* (Auckland, 1977), was Dr. Eric McCormick of Auckland University. McCormick's exhaustive work on Omai has really left little else, it seems, to say upon the subject. The thesis of his paper, however, that "the return of Omai to the Pacific" was the primary aim of Cook's third voyage came under considerable criticism in subsequent discussion.

Professor Smith treated the Conference to some new, memorable and thought-provoking perspectives on "Cook's Posthumous Reputations." Cook, in his death, suggested Smith, was "the proto-typical hero of European imperialism."[18] Smith then gave us an exposé of the Cook eulogies in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, emphasizing at the same time the "new kind of hero" Cook was for his times as the master of contemporary science and of the practicalities of navigation, health and hygiene. He was a new professional in an age of technical expansion and achievement. Although Smith made no specific reference to George Forster's essay of 1787, one had the impression of having already passed this way, of having seen this Cook through the contemporary eyes of Forster before.

We passed quickly through Cook the missionary martyr; Cook the antipodean colonial nationalists' hero to Cook the schoolboy's model. Cook could even become an imperial commercial model, the darling possibly of free-trade and imperial progress. Certainly, for distant lands not intent at foundation on finding traditions in the lore of their own indigenous peoples, for lands like Australia and New Zealand, Cook could become a founding father. There were, it is true, too, a few what we today would perhaps call fatal impacters from the beginning to tarnish the hero's crown. Was there not, suggested Smith, "a pre-historic and sub-literate resentment among the indigenous people of the Pacific that rarely surfaced during the nineteenth century?" And there were, too, those anti-Cook, yet influential, European missionaries in the Pacific.

Smith was not out to discredit the achievements of Cook but he was intent rather on seeing them placed in a new perspective. Here, in Smith's paper, we moved swiftly to another major theme of the Confer-

[18]Bernard Smith, "Cook's Posthumous Reputation," SFU Papers, I, 38 pp., p. 3.

ence: Cook and his work should be interpreted in a less Europocentric fashion than they have been in the past.[19] Here was, indeed, another hint of heresy: Cook discovered little that was new in lands; indigenous peoples had preceded him by centuries; pre-historians are perhaps *the* legitimate scholars, said Smith, to interpret discovery. Cook's "ships began the process of making the world a global village."

Smith's was one of the really important papers of the Cook Conference. The man who had influenced so many Cook and Pacific researchers in the 1960s and 1970s with his *European vision and the South Pacific* (London, 1960) was, almost twenty years later, asking us to view the Pacific and Cook through non-European eyes to find a new perspective. The old master had gathered no dust: new oils had been applied. One wondered, indeed, if in ideas--as opposed to faithful and insightful reflection, reproduction, rumination and rendition--J. C. Beaglehole had ever been so seminal or provoking in the field of Cook studies.

Rüdiger Joppien--surely a Bernard Smith heir or protégé--delivered another reminder, as others would do, in his paper on "The Artistic Bequest of Captain Cook's Voyages" that the iconography of Cook's expeditions, even long decades after their completion, still provided rich lodes to mine. For about seventy years, noted Joppien, "illustrations from Cook's voyages were repeatedly used as illustrative evidence . . . an impressive record for the esteem of Cook as a naval man and explorer."[20] The iconography was for that long regarded as vitally and instructively sacrosanct. Alan Frost, with a native *élan* and building massively upon his earlier scholarship in the field, ranged deep and wide in the literature of the British Romantics to demonstrate the role and impact of the "new geographical perspectives" of "a second great age of modern European exploration" which began, Frost suggested, with Commodore John Byron in 1764.[21] Although Frost took nine--and in my opinion unnecessarily (for such an audience)--detailed pages on the history of eighteenth-century science and exploration to reach his central thesis, the prolonged overture was soon forgotten in the depth of the movements. It was a memorable paper on the interplay of exploration, *belles lettres* and ideas in the eighteenth century and later.

[19]Smith, p. 33.

[20]Rüdiger Joppien, "The Artistic Bequest of Captain Cook's Voyages, SFU Papers, I, 37 pp., p. 29.

[21]Alan Frost, "New Geographical Perspectives and the Emergence of the Romantic Imagination," SFU Papers, I, 45 pp. See also Alan Frost, "Captain James Cook and the Early Romantic Imagination," *Captain lames Cook Image and Impact: South Sea Discoverers and the World of Letters,* ed. Walter Veit (Melbourne, 1972), pp. 90-106.

Towards its middle, the SFU Cook Conference moved into two sessions on the more scientific aspects of the voyages. The first of these (session four) embraced the well-tilled theme "Cook and Navigation." But this was not simply a further eulogy on Cook's legendary achievements in this 'branch of his business" or upon the superiority of the British Navy over all others. Dr. James Pritchard of Queen's University, Ontario, presented a very important paper on the history of French Canadian science before British annexation in his "The Precursors of James Cook on the Saint Lawrence River." With this he effectively demolished the long-standing English myth that scientific surveying in eastern Canada began with the arrival of the British naval hydrographers in 1759. To historians of eighteenth-century science (or earlier) it would seem inconceivable that the French, with their mastery of fine instrumentation and mathematics, should have been behind or lax in scientifically mapping and surveying their overseas possessions and, more especially, of a waterway so arterial and vital as the St. Lawrence. Dr. Pritchard did a great service in boldly bringing the men and techniques which were the products of a superior French science to the fore.

Admiral G. S. Ritchie in his "Captain Cook's Influence on Hydrographic Surveying" preceded from this same premise of French hydrographic preeminence in the late seventeenth century into a very closely argued summary of the background leading to Cook's revolutionizing of British hydrography. Good health, a belief in the use of the latest and best instruments and, most interestingly indeed, Cook's "feeling for science" were seen by Ritchie as three of several factors in Cook's success. His association with his other scientists, however tedious those scientists may have seemed, 'broadened his mental horizons far beyond those of a practical seaman."

Here, I suggest, from Admiral Ritchie, is an insight--by others it might be regarded as a "concession"-- which future Cook biographers or interpreters may examine more closely with profit. J. A. Forster had espoused the same theme in the 1780s.[22]

The subsequent session was expressly devoted to "Scientific Aspects of Cook's Voyages" by which was understood the sciences of botany, zoology and medicine. Here three of the four lecturers were already acknowledged scholars of Cook and the fourth, Surgeon Vice-Admiral Sir James Watt modestly introduced himself as a novice in the field. But his noviciate proved short-lived for he presented a closely argued paper

[22]Hoare, *Tactless Philosopher,* p. 237.

on "Medical Aspects and Consequences of Captain Cook's Voyages" which became another highlight of this revisionary Conference.

Watt addressed himself first to the age-old idea that Cook's greatest contribution--among many--to naval hygiene was the reduction of scurvy at sea. His critical re-examination of the evidence was made more pointed by the fact that he concentrated initially on the second voyage as the hitherto acknowledged basis for Cook's reputation for preserving life at sea. This voyage was fraught with more illness and disease than the taciturn Cook revealed in his journals. "We have," argued Watt penetratingly,

> no idea how many men were ill in the *Resolution* either from scurvy or any other illness. There is ample documentary evidence of at least four outbreaks of scurvy in *Resolution* during this epoch making voyage which for two centuries, has been identified with the conquest of scurvy by Cook.[23]

And there was more. As I have suspected from editing J. R. Forster's second voyage journal the psycho-medical aspects of this gruelling navigation should claim more attention.[24] Then there is the subsequently crucial subject of Cook's nearly fatal illness of early 1774, which the navigator at first tried to hide and treat by starvation. Departing completely from previous medical commentary, Watt suggested that Cook's intestinal obstruction and other acute symptoms was caused by "a heavy round-worm infestation of the intestine," a result of eating native foods. From this second voyage investigation the two medical men in the *Resolution,* James Patten and William Anderson, emerged in a most favorable light. Those in the *Adventure,* however, under the laxer Tobias Furneaux were slated roundly.

With similar innovative medical penetration, Watt carried us through the other two voyages. Of the first, in the *Endeavour,* he concluded that Cook's surgeons did not produce "an impressive health record." Even in the matter of the malarial and dysentery epidemic at Batavia--which decimated Cook's crew and which Watt, arguing from contemporary and historical evidence, attributed to the contamination of local drinking water by a species of sea-slug--Cook was, perhaps, not entirely blameless: "his preoccupation with the ship at Batavia rather than with men is evident from his journal." Even his predecessor, Wal-

[23]James Watt, "Medical Aspects and Consequences of Captain Cook's Voyages," SFU Papers, II, 34 pp., p. 8.

[24]See my Introduction to *The Resolution Journal of Johann Reinhold Forster,* 1772-1775 (Cambridge, at press), 4 vols.

lis, had been stricter in enforcing the precepts of James Lind for visits to tropical ports.

In a further historically scrupulous examination of the competing merits of malt wort and lemon juice on the arresting of scurvy, Watt emphasized the adverse effect of patronage on medical ideas and practice in the Royal Navy. Cook (and other influentials) espoused malt wort and the brilliant clinical demonstrations of the efficacy of lemon juice made by Lind were officially considered useless until 1796. But Cook's scurvy work was not all negative, since he did contribute to its arrest by his insistence on short sea passages between refreshment landfalls and, although unconsciously, by reducing the rate of his mens' utilization of vitamin C by providing warm, dry clothing and the implementation of the less stressful three-watch system.[25]

Lind emerged, again justifiably, as Watt's naval medical hero in his criticism of Cook's failure to exploit water distillation to the full. On the third voyage there were no major innovations, no experiments, but the medical history or climaxes were, Watt argued, the keys to that navigator's history. Venereal disease was the central problem. The red-blooded young blades of the third voyage, over whom Cook now exercised little real control, gave and received the diseases (syphilis and gonorrhoea) almost with abandon. All of Cook's efforts to enforce abstinence or moderation were frustrated: Cook was defeated.

He was, indeed, in Watt's prognosis defeated not only by stress--Beaglehole's and others' assessment and reason for the navigator's passions, ravings and trances--but also by his physical failure in health. If Cook had contracted a parasitic infection of the intestine on the second voyage he could, Watt was tempted to suggest, have had a concomitant thiamine (vitamin B_{12}) deficiency which would account for his loss of his normally rigid mental controls. Had he, Cook, recognized, too, the early symptoms of the tuberculosis which carried away some significant men on this last voyage?

The medical and psycho-medical bases for reinterpreting or reinforcing naval history and other historical writing are becoming increasingly important as a field of study. There is no doubt that Admiral Watt has given this work a significant new impetus for Cook studies and for the wider field of Pacific voyages and settlement.[26]

[25]Watt, p. 22.

[26]For a recent antipodean reinterpretation of history along these lines see Bryan Gandevia, "Socio-medical Factors in the Evolution of the First Settlement at Sydney Cove, 1788-1803," *Journal of the Royal Australian Histotical Society,* 61 (March, 1975), 1-25.

The natural historical session was somewhat overshadowed by Watt's new perspectives. But Phyllis Edwards in her essay on "Banks and the Botany of Cook's Three Voyages" and Dr. Peter Whitehead with his up-dated summary of people and institutions involved in the complex zoological dispersal of Cook-based specimens, brought forward much new evidence to supplement our knowledge of this now quickly expanding branch of Cook studies. For too long in the history of the natural history there has been a naïve uncritical trotting out of old prides and prejudices concerning the work of Cook's scientists. The modem growth of history and philosophy of science as a major new discipline has now spread over into the Cook and Pacific studies arena and there is a greatly improved and critical writing ahead in the field.

Evidence of this was given in the tabled paper of David G. Medway entitled "Some Ornithological Results of Cook's Third Voyage."[27] Medway is introducing to Cook ornithological studies something of that same tenacious determination to track down provenance and specimens which has characterized the writings of Whitehead in zoology and Adrienne Kaeppler in ethnograhy. Medway, in a paper which will attract a wide audience, is giving here an earnest of his grander design to present monographs and, perhaps, a complete study in the future of the ornithology of Cook's Pacific voyages. His will be a career to be watched closely in the Cook studies field.[28]

The penultimate session of the seven convened at SFU dealt with "Cook and Indigenous People." The three papers presented occasioned some lively and penetrating discussion.

Peter Gathercole in a critical reappraisal of the historiography of Polynesian ethnography from the time of Cook, with particular reference to New Zealand--the sphere of some of Gathercole's own field researches from the 1950s--neatly turned his essay to conform with a schema of the "New Zealand scholar" as outlined in 1954 by J. C. Beaglehole: the perspective of the man of two cultures, European and Polynesian.[29] Gathercole reminded us that Polynesian historiography had taken great strides forward in recent years with anthropologists' attempts to discern and understand indigenous "Polynesian societies in their own terms" and the bringing by archaeologists of a more precise concept of time to Polynesian studies, wherein Cook's arrival and ac-

[27]SFU Papers, II, 49 pp.

[28]See also David G. Medway, "Extant Types of New Zealand Birds from Cook's Voyages," *Notornis,* 23, Nos. 1 and 2 (1976), 44-60 and 120-137. Medway has fully identified and annotated hundreds of bird references in my edition of J. R. Forster's *Journal.*

[29]John C. Beaglehole, *The New Zealand Scholar* (Christchurch, 1954), 24 pp.

counts represented a "major chronological marker." Polynesia has and now reveals a prehistory. With Cook many widely scattered Pacific indigenous societies pass from prehistory into history.[30]

Gathercole showed that of all Polynesian societies the richest sources of historical ethnography relate to the New Zealand Maoris. Post European-settlement Maori ethnology was scarcely pristine: Europeans and Maoris themselves wrote within a society and culture affected, if not dominated, by "history in European terms." Gathercole showed perceptively that the clashes between Europeans and Maoris in the nineteenth century (and one might also add today) were not only over land but also over *ideas.* In short Gathercole was saying that Cook's accounts are more significant for attempting to study traditional Maori society than those of the nineteenth century.

Gathercole, seeing with ethnographers "as much significance in localised everyday behaviour as in that which is unusual," spent over half of his paper relating the written and visual observations of Cook, the Forsters, Wales, and the artist Hodges during their visit in the *Resolution* to Dusky Sound, New Zealand, in March and April 1773, to modem knowledge about Maori ceremonial, ritual and customs. There were some remarkable correlations between observed contemporary evidence and the *assumed* Maori cultural responses consistent with those observations. But, Gathercole reminded us, there are still serious limitations in contemporary European recorded evidence.

The evidence is, indeed, ambiguous; the result of a "two opposites ... dialectical interaction," i.e. the Maoris' assumption of European values by their very tacit acceptance of the visiting Europeans ceremonially and courteously into the Maori world of values. This question--which much recent research is throwing up again and again--is very much related to the fundamental one of the points and times in change of Maori culture. Old assumptions that change was prehistoric are now challenged by the growing and more common thesis that European ideas and technology influenced Maori culture for change in the protohistoric period.[31]

[30]Peter Gathercole, "Perceptions of Order: the Significance of Cook's Voyages for the Study of Polynesian Ethnography, with Particular Reference to New Zealand," SFU Papers, II, 27 pp., p. 5.

[31]Gathercole cites the unpublished dissertation (M.A. Auckland University, 1964) by L. A. Groube, "Settlement Patterns in Prehistoric New Zealand," as evidence for change in the protohistoric period. A recent B.A. dissertation by one of my own students, James Belich (Victoria University of Wellington, 1977), "Some Critical Observations on the Modem Military Interpretation of the Maori Wars," graphically treats the same theme.

Dr. Adrienne Kaeppler's paper on "The Significance of Cook's Third Voyage for Hawaiian Art and Society" built very much upon her earlier research essays in the fields of Cook or prehistoric ethnography and ethnology. Not surprisingly her arguments paralleled for Hawaiian society very much those of Gathercole's for New Zealand. "Classic" Hawaiian forms in the material culture of the island group "evolved from specific traditional forms in the post-contact period." Taking feathered cloaks and capes as one functional and symbolic feature of material cultural evolution, Kaeppler showed first of all how, according to her hypothesizing, their form and shape had changed since pre-contact times, when they were worn "as visual symbols of status, rank and power"--including protection in warfare--to become in style "the most appropriate for ceremonial purposes." Kaeppler's study then ranged over other forms of apparel, adornment and images known to have been ccollected on Cook's third voyage. Inevitably, therefore, as Gathercole had demanded drastic revision of a number of prominent nineteenth century and later workers on "classic" Maori culture, writers such as Elsdon Best and Stephensen Percy Smith, so Kaeppler called into question some of the writings of such authorities as Peter H. Buck (Te Rangi Hiroa) and William T. Brigham on Hawaii. Kaeppler's work purported to show the immense changes down through time wrought by the introduction of metal tools on Hawaiian material culture. European weapons "changed the balance of power and chiefs gained prestige by warfare rather than by genealogy. . . . In short," she concluded, "changes in material culture were material manifestations of changes in society."[32]

Here we might pause to suggest that, not unexpectedly, Cook studies may dwell heavily upon Hawaiian themes for the next few years. The fatal 14 February 1779 duly (and, Admiral Watt argued, almost inexorably--if medicine and psychology are to be believed--quite apart from complex anthropological questions) plucked our "hero" from the stage, although most of the *dramatis personae* sailed on for nearly another two years. There will be, indeed there are warnings enough already, of more books and writings on the death of Cook. Clearly many are convinced that Beaglehole, even at the height of his literary powers in the *Life of Cook*,[33] has not said the last word on what one speaker from the floor of the SFU Conference called "the greatest thing that happened to Cook," i.e. his death at Kealakekua Bay.

[32]Adrienne Kaeppler, "The Significance of Cook's Third Voyage for the Study of Hawaiian Art and Society," SFU Papers, II, 23 pp., p. 22.

[33]See especially the chapter "Kealakekua Bay," Beaglehole, *Life*, pp. 636-672.

At the time of this writing we already have promise from the University of Strathclyde of Gavin Kennedy's new book *The Death of Captain Cook* [34] which claims that the circumstances of Cook's death have never been satisfactorily explained. Kennedy's work also purports to be based on a study of all the contemporary evidence of the men on the third voyage and on field work carried out in Hawaii. Captain King's version of the incidents are, we will be shown, deficient in many respects.[35]

To add to this "death harvest," so to speak, there is the as yet unpublished--but now at press--essay by Professor Gordon Parsonson of the University of Otago, Dunedin, entitled *On the Death of Captain Cook*.[36] Parsonson, in brief (and here we can scarcely do his stimulating essay justice) demands that we attempt to understand Cook's death, "perhaps one of the most famous events in Pacific history" as an incident arising out of the complex divisions and religious practices and beliefs in Hawaii. Cook became dedicated to the inferior god, Lono, whose followers were tributary to an upper class, "a true military aristocracy" worshipping the war god Kukulaimoku. Cook's death, therefore, argues Parsonson, was somewhat unrehearsed or a sacrifice after he laid sacrilegious hands on Kalani'opu'u, a chief of the higher order. In Hawaiian terms Cook was, therefore, no god but "a lesser being, the representative of a lesser god, a popular god."

Parsonson in his essay takes issue with Beaglehole over many interpretations of Polynesian culture and history. In the case of Hawaii he accepts as axiomatic--unlike Beaglehole, Buck, Dahlgren, Stokes and others, but raising some evocative support by implication for Robert Langdon's theses of *The Lost Caravel* (Sydney, 1975)--that the "evi-

[34]To be published by Duckworths, London, in the Fall of 1978. Dr. Kennedy is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Economics, University of Strathclyde.

[35]I am grateful for this pre-publication information to the SFU Cook Conference office which received it from Dr. Kennedy in April 1978. Kennedy is suggesting some provocative findings in his other Cook studies works now at press. Of his *Bligh* it is predicted that the book will be the first biography of Captain Bligh to examine all the sources, offering a new interpretation of the mutiny on the *Bounty* and its aftermath. Kennedy has also edited R. T. Gould's *Captain Cook* (London, 1935) as evidence of the best short summary still available on Cook: "hardly any corrections were needed even in the light of forty years' scholarship" [sic]. These are large claims on the dustjacket of *The Death of Captain Cook* (1978).

[36]Originally a lecture delivered to the Historical Section of the Otago Branch of the Royal Society of New Zealand, Dunedin, 19 July 1976. An expanded version (24 pages) is deposited in the Hocken Library, Dunedin. I gratefully acknowledge Professor Parsonson's generosity in letting me quote from it.

dence in favor of an earlier Spanish contact . . . in Hawaii . . . seems overwhelming."[37] In so doing he, like Kaeppler, makes a a strong appeal for evidence to Hawaiian material culture. But their premises and conclusions, of course, are, shall we say, contacts apart! In Parsonson's absence to defend himself in Vancouver, Kaeppler did, however, openly disagree with him in discussion.

Kaeppler's recent major contribution to Cook studies is undoubtedly her organization of the major exhibition of Cook cultural artifacts collected on the three voyages and brought together again from January to August 1978 in a magnificent, imaginative exhibition at the Bernice P. Bishop Museum, Honolulu. The pieces are from all over the world. The associated catalogue *Artificial Curiosities*. . . (Honolulu, 1978) is in itself a major contribution to the illustrative Cook literature.[38]

Dr. Robin Fisher, a new scholar in the field but nevertheless a prime mover of the Vancouver Conference, gave promise of some new directions in culture contact research in the Cook field in his paper "Cook and the Nootka."[39] Fisher set out, too, to revise and review some of the received opinion on "dominance" of the significant longer landfall situations in the Pacific by Europeans in Cook's and in contemporary and later vessels of exploration. Fisher showed a deep acquaintance with the Nootka Sound sources and with the previous Canadian and other literature on the subject. Fisher's principal thesis was that, both during Cook's visit and for many years subsequently, the Indians controlled the fur trade and not their sea-borne guests. On Vancouver Island, as in New Zealand, Hawaii and, presumably, also elsewhere, the indigenous peoples "were on the threshhold of an immutable process of cultural change, began and sustained by European contact."[40]

Dr. Fisher promises to give us further culture contact studies of Cook's significant landfalls: it is a research task in reciprocity between cultures which may well spell a major new trend in Cook studies.

We left the session and concomitant animated discussions on indigenous cultures and exploration with the distinct view that there was a welcome revitality in culture contact and pre-contact scholarship. As Professor Megaw of Leicester (formerly Australia) said, "native peoples had now also discovered Cook." Contributions from the floor were as

[37]Parsonson, "On the Death of Captain Cook," pp. 10-24.

[38]In association with the "Artificial Curiosities" exhibition and the SFU Conference, a series of lectures was delivered by overseas scholars on aspects of Cook studies at the Bernice P. Bishop Museum.

[39]SFU Papers, II, 29 pp.

[40]Fisher, "Cook and the Nootka," p. 24.

before most stimulating. The highest form of art for the Polynesian, reminded one Hawaiian delegate, was the canoe *not* the artifact. Another student of Asian culture recalled that some scholars remained confident of a Chinese exploration and presence on the northwest coast aeons before Cook. One commentator asked *the* apposite question, "In Cook studies aren't we all antiquarians?"

The final session in Vancouver was devoted to "Cook's Contemporaries" or rather the work and influence of some of them. There is still one great gap in late eighteenth-century (and Cook) historiography and biography: the life and work of Sir Joseph Banks. This last session forecast at least two important books on this important subject.

One *leitmotif* of Harold B. Carter's paper "Cook's Oxford Tutor: Sir Joseph Banks and European Expansion in the Pacific Region, 1767-1820" was one to which we had grown accustomed: revision of Beaglehole's writings and perceptions. Carter has for some years been gathering the immense, widely scattered but influential epistolary and manuscript relics of Banks ("*H. M. Ministre des Affaires Philosophiques, "* as William Eden called him so appositely)[41] at the British Museum (Natural History) in London. For many years one has been aware, both through personal contact and by reading some of his preliminary writings on Banks, that Carter has harbored very different views about his subject to those expressed by Beaglehole. Here the pent-up scholarly resentments found fuller expression. "After a century and a half of desultory essays at a biography" of Banks enough materials--one suspects, indeed, a superfluity for any one scholar in a lifetime--are known to "exorcise the pejorative appreciations of the literary historian which have established the warped image of Banks as the amateur and dilettante."[42] This is a reference to Beaglehole's essay "The Young Banks" published in the first volume of his two-volume edition of *The* Endeavour *Journal of Joseph Banks, 1768-1771* (Sydney, 1962, second edition, 1963), which some, however, have seen as one of Beaglehole's best literary essays.[43]

Carter was at great pains to establish Banks's place as "the young professional just fledged" in science at twenty-five years of age when he first rubbed up against "Cook the professional at forty" in the *En-*

[41]Harold B. Carter, "Cook's Oxford Tutor: Sir Joseph Banks and European Expansion in the Pacific Region," SFU Papers, II, 27 pp., p. 19.

[42]Carter, p. 1.

[43]This view was expressed to me by, among others, one of Beaglehole's former Wellington colleagues, the Pacific historian Mrs. Mary Boyd.

deavour. Carter here brought us back to the thesis raised by Admiral Ritchie earlier (and J. R. Forster in the 1780s): "Banks was no elegant, useless or irritating burden carelessly flung on the shoulders of a long-suffering naval cammander."[44]

One profound appendix to Carter's paper on Banks was that tabled--but unfortunately not read in the full time allotted to other speakers--by Dr. David Mackay of Victorian University of Wellington, Beaglehole's *Alma Mater*. Mackay, building upon his doctoral work at London University (1970) and more recent research, saw Banks, in Beaglehole's words, as "A presiding genius of exploration." He became "the virtual guardian of the Cook tradition . . . the custodian of the model" so expertly established by Cook in the business of exploration. The *Endeavour* experience "established Banks as the general director of exploration in the late eighteenth century."[45] He was, too, the British government's principal adviser on matters of science and, very often, colonial policy. One of the great merits of Mackay's research has been to expand immensely our understanding and knowledge of Banks's seminal role in the general organization of scientific voyages of exploration after Cook. He presided, indeed, over a whole fifty years of British imperial and scientific expansion. Mackay is steeped in the official and quasi-official correspondence and memoranda of the period. While Carter may unravel the Banksian biography it is to Mackay that we will look to elucidate "the intellectual and administrative context in which the voyages of Cook and his followers went forward" and wherein Banks gained "the opportunity to achieve his extraordinary authority."

> His career tells us much about the nature and role of science in the eighteenth century; the particular legacy of Cook's voyages; the expansion of governmental functions; and the problems of imperial administration following the American War of Independence.[46]

It would be churlish here to take issue with either Mackay's scientific history or with Carter's placing of Banks into the innovative scientific research of the eighteenth or early nineteenth century. Certainly, I agree, we must see Banks as a mediating, catalytic figure and, most definitely, as the purveyor to empire and the Pacific of a Baconian and

[44]Carter, p. 15.

[45]David Mackay, "A Presiding Genius of Exploration: Banks, Cook and Empire, 1767-1805," SFU Papers, III, 25 pp., p. 17.

[46]Mackay, p. 2.

utilitarian view of science. His role in acclimatization was seminal and vital in some cases to the successful establishment of European outposts of empire on the Pacific rim and in the islands.

Mackay, Fisher, Archer, Gibson and others gave sufficient proof in their reported research that Cook studies can lay claim to some important perceptions and reinterpretations in the writing of European imperial history. The Conference was, in this and other respects, a great boost to eighteenth-century studies.

Dr. Howard Fry of the James Cook University of North Queensland at Townsville was no unexpected disputant in the lists of controversy over the influence of Cook's contemporaries. Fry's principal work *Alexander Dalrymple and the Expansion of British Trade* (London and Toronto, 1970) came, it seems, too late to influence Beaglehole's sometimes damning and, we now know, largely unwarranted strictures on the Scottish hydrographer, geographer and polemicist, Dalrymple. In my view Fry's critical reassessment of Dalrymple and Beaglehole on Dalrymple should now gain wide recognition in Cook studies. As I have pointed out in several places, Beaglehole did in fact tone down some of his more sweeping and unfounded earlier epithets and strictures on the Scot in the course of his writing and editing of Cook,[47] but the New Zealander could never satisfactorily see Dalrymple as anything more than a theoretical and outspoken rival to his hero, Cook.

More than most at the SFU Conference, Fry was bold and brave in his outspoken criticism of Beaglehole's scholarship. His paper on "the creative interplay" between the careers of Cook and Dalrymple cleared up many of the received misconceptions on Dalrymple as a geographical theorist and sort of self-appointed devil's advocate of South Seas' exploration. Dalrymple is Fry's eighteenth-century Richard Hakluyt. Beaglehole was accused directly of the "cavalier treatment of evidence and the brushing aside of contradictory testimony."[48] At times one was conscious that Dalrymple might be creatively linked with Beaglehole since it was the latter, argued Fry, who, as the eighteenth-century Scotsman's "leading twentieth-century detractor," employed too much so-called "cautious and non-commital scepticism" in failing to read and research Dalrymple's real role and influence upon British exploration at the time of and following Cook.

[47]See Hoare, *In the Steps of Beaglehole,* pp. 13-14 and "Two Centuries' Perceptions of James Cook," pp. 7-8.

[48]Howard T. Fry, "Alexander Dalrymple and Captain Cook: the Creative Interplay of Two Careers," SFU Papers, III, 32 pp., p. 1.

Fry showed convincingly that historical antipathy to Dalrymple over Cook has been based upon the "false theory" of an obscure Frenchman, Frédéric Metz, in 1805 who dreamt up an "emnity" between Dalrymple and Cook. It was a myth as fatal and pervasive down through time as any the French or others had concocted over false straits or islands. It is to be hoped that Fry's direct, uncompromising and honest plea for a reassessment of Dalrymple's role in the opening of the Pacific Ocean will be heeded by future writers on Cook and his times. Fry, needless to say, was roundly challenged in discussion.

That ubiquitous scholar Dr. Helen Wallis of the British Library terminated the Vancouver Cook feast with her "Postscript to the Voyages: Some New Sources and Assessment." Dr. Wallis, with all the authority of a Hakluyt Society editor of Carteret's voyage, led us in effect through the complicated, sometimes murky territory, of Cook's contemporary editors. Some ground, let it be admitted, was already well known but not the complicated relations between Canon Douglas, Captain King and others in connection with the publication of the official account of the third voyage of 1784.

Whither then Cook studies? Firstly, unlike all previous Cook anniversaries, this one, the highpoint of over ten years of intensive bicentennial research, will scarcely, like so many before, fade away in plaudits and encomiums. It will not wither. This one junket, if such it was, may become a juggernaut in some areas of Pacific studies. The ideas, new researches, new materials, new interpretations and critical scholarship must affect the whole spectrum of European and indigenous research and writing on the Pacific basin; historically, anthropologically, scientifically, biographically and editorially. We still await Smith and Joppien's Catalogue of the artistic legacy and, now, from Australia, comes the announcement of a series of works on the botanical artists of Cook's voyages. The science of Cook's voyages is still relatively neglected but much good work is in prospect. We await, too, soon the unpublished Journals of J. R. Forster and King, and where is William Anderson's vital missing Journal? The bicentenary year of Cook's death is now upon us with the promise of major exhibitions in London and Wellington. In Middlesborough some exciting research--if it can remain rigorously scholarly--is likely to throw new light on Cook's connections and influences of youth. More myths may dissipate.

SFU Vancouver was, as we have said, a revisionary Conference in intent and results. Cook was, in effect, "demythologized." But do we see a smaller Cook, a more human Cook? We certainly see latterly a suffering, physically weak Cook. We see Cook as a whole man. We see

a Cook set into the matrix of his increasingly complex yet expansive age. With Bernard Smith we see Cook discovering "a golden age" but substituting for it just as quickly--as science and enlightenment dictated--an "iron age." We see Cook's contemporaries emerging, too, as men of stature in science, government and letters. They helped Cook grow and grew with him. We sense a timely revitalizing of Polynesian, Melanesian and other Pacific and Pacific coast indigenous studies and, most welcome, a less Eurocentric view of pre-contact and post-contact societies. Art, iconography, artifacts, canoes and specimens: materials of men and biota of nature command more exact and meticulous study. Cook is no longer a proto-hero: others most certainly went before: perhaps Chinese, Portuguese, Spanish and, certainly, Polynesians. We see Cook studies, too, as part of a now meticulously-documented Russian, Spanish, French and British expansion at different phases, as part of the gaining of successful European toeholds of empire in the Pacific.

Cook studies embrace academics and laymen alike, since its exponents are "antiquarians in the highest sense and historians in the antiquarian sense." Those who are historians or use historical methodology in their work can no longer approach along tunnels since scientists, medical men and others have mastered, too, the historical method. It has not always been so. We have been led to ask interdisciplinary questions about what "truth" it is that the artist, the scientist, the anthropologist and the historian are after.

If many of our cherished childhood and received ideas on Cook have taken a battering it has been in a good cause. Truth and scholarship are not advanced by sycophancy, by perpetuation of myth or arrogance of particular disciplines. Cook studies are an interdisciplinary and cross-cultural exercise.

Our debt of gratitude for giving corporate and individual new momentum to Cook and Pacific studies is great to all the scholars and devotees who assembled at Vancouver. But our debt is greater to Professor Phyllis Auty, the Conference Director, and her SFU colleagues for guiding with vision the bark into port. To J. C. Beaglehole, the absent voyager but the master who charted the shoals, our debt was the very possibility of SFU Vancouver. Now we must await expected further commentaries from incisive minds guiding scholarly Pacific pens like those of that silent watcher (and poet) of the Vancouver proceedings Professor Oskar Spate of Canberra.

Venus may have been observed and violated by Syphilus: gold became iron in fact and in the philosophy of men. But what we have

come away with is' a European re-vision of the South *and* North Pacific. That alone is a memorable marker in Pacific studies,

Royal Society of New Zealand, Wellington.