

Paper given at James Cook University, Cairns, 21 May 2010
John Molony Chair, Emeritus Faculty, Australian National University.

JAMES COOK IN SEARCH OF THE DISCOVERER

I thank the University warmly for inviting me to come among you to speak about James Cook today. I admire the manner in which your name as a university was chosen. Nothing could be more fitting than the simple name- James Cook. The man himself was as direct and genuine as his name. I have every confidence that, as a university, you will always live true to that name.

Had I not mentioned to my great and long time mate, Bob Dixon, that I was working with a research team at ANU on the alleged pre-Cook 'discoveries' of our east coast, our meeting today would not have occurred. Bob, with his customary alacrity, sprang into action and here I am. I hope you understand that to me, and to most deep southerners, yours is another and deeply fascinating world. Bob and his wife, Sasha, are even taking me to Cooktown where my almost boyish enthusiasm for all things Cook will doubtless overflow. Thank you my dear friends.

Before I come directly to Cook let me tell you something about our East Coast Project. Its membership is largely drawn from the only remaining Faculty at ANU- the Emeritus Faculty. Membership of the Faculty is not restricted to Emeritus Professors, but includes all levels of retired staff, as well as the professional staff without whom there would be no university worth its name.

For many years I had often been perplexed at learning that yet another book had appeared on the alleged pre-discoveries of our east coast before Cook in 1770. They dealt with the Spanish, French, Portuguese, Chinese and some even argued the Arabs. Added to this, from time to time, a discovery of an anchor, a vase, a vessel itself such as the Mahogany Ship and other artefacts were remarked on.ⁱ Finally, and to use a word of James Cook, 'providentially', Keith Crook, an Emeritus ANU geologist, approached me and asked, 'Who, among ANU historians, is closely following these debates about the discovery of Australia's east coast? I'd like to compare the ways historians and geoscientists assess and establish or reject "evidence" in such cases.' As a consequence the nucleus of the East Coast Group first met at the end of 2008, but the larger group did not get fully under way until April 2009.

In discussing this large and important question, some might call it a problem, too often there seemed to be little moderation or detached judgement. To the proponent of, say, an alleged discovery made by the Portuguese or Spaniards, everyone else was mistaken, while to those who held for Cook as the unique first beholder it was almost seen as blasphemy to argue for another. Then there were the charts, and especially the so-called Dieppe maps which are a collection of charts drawn and illustrated, in Dieppe, France, over thirty years in the mid sixteenth century for notables such as the French and English monarchs, Henry II and Henry VIII.ⁱⁱ Some argue that they are of the east coast while others debunk the idea with enthusiasm. The same mindset seems to apply to the artefacts.

Thus it seemed good to assemble a team to work collaboratively on several questions. Did anyone chart our east coast prior to Cook, which includes who they were and when did they do it? What charts and other evidence remain to prove the case? Why did Cook decide to sail from New Zealand to the east coast of New Holland? Why was he reluctant to accept that, in 1606, Torres had been through the strait that bears his name?ⁱⁱⁱ I say this while accepting Cook's claim that he was the first to chart the east coast which surely means that, had it been done before him, he was not aware of it having taken place.

Prudence thus indicated that in recruiting our team it was reasonable to restrict membership to those who had a moderately open mind on the matters we wished to examine. If, for example, a scholar had made up his or her mind that the Portuguese were preeminent or that all roads led to Cook, what purpose would they serve in the process? Gradually, however, we began to shape up- Keith Crook and me, geologist and historian respectively, a former head of the manuscript section of the National Library, a cartographer, a surveyor, a long time student of Cook, an archaeologist and a couple of generalists. Of the remaining two, one was the first submarine commander to take a British vessel under the Arctic. His knowledge of the sea is mighty and he once captained a submarine down our east coast where his compass played up near Magnetic Island as Cook's had done in 1770.^{iv} The other is an eminent authority on grasses. It had struck me that, given that the vessels of pre-Cook and later were floating zoos, the inhabitants in which needed grass to survive, was it possible that seeds of, say, European grasses had accidentally taken root here before Cook? So far, and he has been helped by some of his former colleagues from CSIRO and several universities,

this lead has not proved rewarding in a direct sense. Nonetheless, he proposes to persevere and broaden the search to plants and trees.

Have we made any progress you ask? Yes. At least we have narrowed the field to the Portuguese principally, followed at some distance by the Spanish and, provided we can find expert help, we will also look at the Chinese. At the same time the large question of the possible authenticity and applicability to our east coast of several charts or maps is being examined.

And now let us move to an attempt to discover Cook himself. On looking back at my own work, it is clear that my knowledge of him until recently was rudimentary. The major reference to him I found in my books on Australian history is in a revised version of my *Bicentennial History of Australia*, 1988. This version, entitled *Australia Our Heritage*, was published in 2005 and the few lines are:

A former farm labourer, stable boy and grocer turned sailor, James Cook, became one of the finest navigators of the ages. Cook, aware of the Dutch voyages, sailed westward from New Zealand in the *Endeavour* and, on 19 April, 1770, sighted the east coast of New Holland. The great mariner was aware that he was doing nothing new and would be surprised to find that he has since been called the discoverer of Australia. ^v

In regard to the Dutch I was referring principally to Abel Tasman who, having charted the east coast of Van Diemen's Land in 1642 inexplicably turned east at about Bass Strait. The team, however, is satisfied that the Dutch made no claim to having charted the east coast proper and indeed had no grounds to do so. In justification of the remark that Cook knew he was doing 'nothing new' in sighting the coast there is the fact that Cook, after discussing the matter with his officers on 31 January, 1770, at Admiralty Bay on the South Island of New Zealand, decided that he would take a route home by sailing west from New Zealand. Using Tasman's chart he knew he would strike the coast of New Holland near where Tasman had left it in 1642. By sailing north he hoped to reach Batavia (Jakarta) eventually either through the strait in which Torres had sailed west in 1606 or, by sailing around the north of New Guinea and thereby adding greatly to the distance to be travelled. From Batavia he would sail home via the Cape of Good Hope. His own words are 'It was therefore resolved to return by way of the East Indies by the following rout: upon leaving

this coast to steer to the westward until we fall in with the East Coast of New Holland and then to follow the direction of that Coast to the northward or whatever other direction it may take us until we arrive at its northern extremity....^{vi}

Let us think about the above a little. Cook was not prepared to return home with little to show for his voyage beyond charting the coast of New Zealand. Through no fault of his or anyone else, the attempt at fixing the Transit of Venus had proved inconclusive and, as a man swayed only by reality, he had no faith in the existence of a great southern continent, which he had been ordered to seek once he left Tahiti. Thus there was no point in returning by way of Cape Horn. Furthermore, to track below Van Diemen's Land as Tasman had done seemed useless. Instead, he would chart the east of New Holland to the extremity of its coast line which he knew must exist unless New Holland was conjoined to New Guinea. In so doing he would chart an unknown coast and prove decisively whether Torres Strait offered a safe passage between New Holland and New Guinea. These two 'discoveries', if we wish to call them such, he singled out as important in his report to the Admiralty on his return to London on 14 July 1771. At that time he had been at sea for almost exactly three years having set sail in the first instance on 26 August 1768.

I do not propose today to traverse Cook's voyage along the east coast of New Holland. It is far better to summarize it in the words of Matthew Flinders, a great navigator in his own right.

This voyage of captain Cook, whether considered in the extent of his discoveries and the accuracy with which they were traced, or in the labours of his scientific associates, far surpassed all that had gone before. The general plan of the voyage did not, however, permit Captain Cook to enter minutely in the details of every part; and had it been otherwise, the very extent of his discoveries would have rendered it impossible. Thus, some portions of the east coast of Terra Australis were passed in the night, many openings were seen and left unexamined, and the islands and the reefs lying at a distance from the shore, could, generally, be no more than indicated; he reaped the harvest of discovery, but the gleanings of the field remained to be gathered.^{vii}

Flinders does not claim that Cook was the first ‘discoverer’; merely that what he did ‘far surpassed all that had gone before’ which seems to imply that Flinders had seen other less accurate charts than those done by Cook. In fact Flinders had seen some of the Dieppe charts and he remarked that those charts, at least insofar as the north and north-west coasts were concerned, made ‘the coincidence of form ... most striking.’ Incidentally, but importantly, it has often been asked why Cook chose to enter and stay for a week in Botany Bay when Sydney Harbour was so close. Flinders has the answer. Cook did not have any time to spare. He saw the Heads and partly saw the harbour beyond them, but he had only just left Botany Bay. Time and the paucity of his provisions meant that he had to sail on immediately.

Now it is time to try to discover something of the man-James Cook. I will not dwell on his early or later years which can be read about in almost countless books and articles. Rather, I will attempt the well nigh impossible and tell you something of the man and mariner, then aged 42, principally as he revealed himself to me in his own Journal written in those months during which he charted our coast. However, having finished this paper, I came across a paper entitled ‘Cook the Man’ presented by his great biographer, J.C Beaglehole, in 1969. I was in despair until, having read it, I concluded that, in some measure, I had seen another side of Cook. Therefore I can only give you my Cook while doing credit to Beaglehole by repeating some of his observations on ‘Cook the Man’. He was ‘good looking in a plain sort of way’, spoke with a ‘provincial accent’ and had an array of high qualities remarked on by his contemporaries. Thus he was ‘Cool, courageous, firm, vigilant, active, resolved, humane, patient’, but Beaglehole prefers to insist on his ‘stubbornness’ to which he devotes over half his paper. Beaglehole also observes that Cook was never seen to be drunk and that he refrained from passionate relations with the women of the Islands. He rarely swore and he refused to eat bananas.^{viii}

Back then to Cook’s Journal. As you probably know that original Journal, known rightly as Number One, is held and treasured in the manuscript section of the National Library of Australia. I have had the inexpressible joy twice in my life of holding and reading a manuscript so precious that it is beyond evaluating in money terms. In the Royal Academy of Ireland in Dublin in 1992 one of the librarians brought a beautiful, wooden casket to me within which lay the earliest, about 560 AD, Irish manuscript. It is small and contains, in Latin, some of the Psalms taken from the Vulgate version. Copied it is claimed, by Saint Columba from a version written by

St Finnian, an argument arose as to its ownership. The High King of Ireland, Diarmid, pronounced judgement and ruled in favour of St Finnian with the words, 'To every cow belongs her calf, therefore to every book its copy.' This is the first instance of the dubious procedure we know as copyright. I sat, almost breathless, and read the 'calf' for some hours. Likewise, by grace of the Head of the Manuscript Section of the National Library, Marie Louise Ayres, one day last year I sat and read Cook's Journal for some hours. I cannot describe my joy while reading and turning the pages of the Journal in his own handwriting, written, I assume often with great difficulty, as he tossed and turned on his voyage along our east and north coast. Thus, I must rely mainly upon the printed version of the Journal contained in J.C. Beaglehole's masterly *The Voyage of the Endeavour, 1768-1771* published in 1955.

The first matter I found worthy of attention was the seeming absence of emotion in Cook, or more properly his reluctance to express it. I will use one example in particular because it also serves to illustrate the lack of importance he attached to his alleged discovery of Australia. On Wednesday 18 April, 1770, Cook was sure by his sighting of a Port Egmont Hen and other birds that they were close to the east coast of Van Diemen's Land and about 230 kilometers to the north of Tasman's departure point. On the next day the coast of New Holland was clearly evident and Cook named one feature of it 'Point Hicks' because his lieutenant 'was the first who 'discover'd this Land.' How Cook could use this word, discovered, in the context is uncertain, but it is clear that he showed no emotion whatever on the doing of it. His colleague, Joseph Banks was more interested in a natural phenomenon in the form of 'three spouts' seen from the *Endeavour* to which he devoted about 300 words. He made no mention of the naming of Point Hicks or of experiencing any pleasure at sighting the land, and there is no evidence that the rest of the crew did otherwise.^{ix} However on 30 December 1771 Banks wrote a short account of the voyage to Count de Lauraguais and reported that, on 19 April 1770, 'we fell in with the coast of new Holland in Latitude 38 S. a coast which had never before been investigated by any navigator.' Thus the claim for investigation of the coast is asserted rather than its discovery.^x

Occasionally Cook allowed his humanity and his inner beliefs to come through during the voyage. There is no indication that he observed the Sabbath while at sea and he made no provision for its public observance, despite the injunction of the Admiralty that such be done. The first occasion on which he refers to an ecclesiastical event is when he names Cape St George on 24 April 'having discovered it on that Saints day.'^{xi}

However, when he was already ‘embarrassed by Shoal water’ caused by coral reefs, he began to bestow place names with religious overtones. He named Whit Sunday Island and Whitsunday’s Passage on Monday 4 June, 1770, observing that the Passage was ‘discovered on the day the Church commemorates that Festival’. It is known more commonly today as Pentecost Sunday.^{xii} On the following Sunday, 10 June, which was and is celebrated as Trinity Sunday by the Church, he named Trinity Bay with its northern point of Cape Tribulation. This name was clearly added later with the poignant remark, ‘because here begun all our troubles.’^{xiii} I thought of all this while taking my breakfast at Trinity Beach this morning and looking out at Cook’s nearby passage. It came to me that the great mariner instinctively knew he was travelling in deeply troubled waters. That he turned to religion by the simple act of invoking names did not surprise me.

Under great pressure to reach Batavia before his supplies ran out, on the next day, 11 June 1770, Cook seems to have lost his customary prudence and to some degree his keen sense of seamanship. He was already taking full advantage of a light moon and sailing at night without a lookout in a boat to precede the *Endeavour*. Thus there was no one to warn of an impending reef except for the linesman at the stem who called out the depth. At nine o’clock their depth was 14 to 21 fathoms, which suddenly fell as low as eight fathoms, or 14.64 metres. Despite this warning the *Endeavour* sailed on, admittedly gently, until at 11 p.m ‘the Ship Struck and struck fast.’^{xiv}

I leave aside the details of the saving of the *Endeavour* and the time spent at the *Endeavour River* (Cooktown) so as to pass on to the next great danger Cook encountered. Three days after leaving the safety of the river mouth on 4 August, 1770 Cook described their situation as being ‘surrounded on every side by dangers’ and he confessed that he was ‘quite at a loss which way to steer when the weather will permit us to get under sail, for to beat back to the South-East the way we came, as the Master would have had me done, would be an endless piece, as the winds blow constantly from that Quarter, and very Strong, without hardly any intermission; on the other hand, if we do not find a passage to the Northward we shall have to come back at last.’^{xv} Clearly he was in two minds as to proceed further north and, had the weather not improved, he would surely have attempted to go back south on his tracks and the whole venture of finishing charting the coast would have been futile.

The weather did improve, an adequate passage was found through the reef and, understandably, he sailed well offshore and thus outside the reef for several days until he realized that in so doing he might miss Torres

Strait. On 16 August he came in closer to the shore to avoid that outcome. At dawn they could see ‘vast foaming breakers ...not a mile from us (and) we had nothing but Providence and the small Assistance our boats could give us to trust to...in this truly terrible situation.’ In the event they were again saved, prompting Cook to repeat his turn heavenwards and name the route *Providential Channel*. Later, he described this episode to be of a kind even more perilous than the previous one in which he had run onto the reef off Cooktown. On this later occasion salvation was impossible given the awful size of the reef and the fact that they were too far from the coast to have made safety in small boats. He wrote, ‘I must own I have engaged more among the Islands and shoals upon this coast than may be thought with prudence I ought to have done with a single Ship.’^{xvi} It was not easy for a mariner of his stature to admit that he might have lacked prudence, but he did so while aware that his words would be read at the Admiralty. As a man of truth and one who knew and accepted his own limitations and his grave responsibility for the lives of others, Cook wrote those words. Thereafter, he demanded that he have another vessel with him on his voyages.

It is of some relevance, however, to set down here the reason why Bougainville turned away from this exact area on 6 June 1776, having sailed west from the New Hebrides. ‘The sea was breaking at intervals on these reefs, and several heads of rock rose from the water. This last encounter was the voice of God which we heard with docility. Prudence did not permit us to follow an uncertain route during the night amidst such dangerous places.’^{xvii} All, I can say is that, unlike our brave, but slightly impetuous, captain, Bougainville’s prudence would not permit him to sail at night. Whether he had the potentially uncertain benefit of a good moon, as did Cook did, I am unclear. One thing is certain however. In the midst of all the great dangers to which his vessel and its crew were exposed Cook appears to have never once lost his head or showed the slightest sign of despair. To a man his crew followed his example.

Another matter about which Cook shows nothing but practical action was the uncertain area of when and how he should take possession of newly discovered lands. A few words on the Instructions given to Cook may be helpful. The first, marked Secret, meaning for Cook only, is dated on 30 July 1768 and is largely confined to the observation of the transit of Venus on 3 June 1769. He was, however, instructed to ‘endeavour by all means proper to cultivate a friendship with the Natives,’ as well as giving them presents, exchanging provisions and ‘Shewing them every kind of Civility and regard.’ The second Instruction, dated on the same day and also marked Secret, is directed towards the discovery of the Great

Southern Continent. On this matter he was to go West ‘as far as New Zealand (sic)’ and, if he found the dreamt of Continent beforehand, he was to examine it carefully and ‘also with the consent of the Natives to take possession of Convenient Situations ...or, if you find the Country uninhabited take Possession for His Majesty by setting up Proper Marks and Inscriptions, as first discoverers and possessors.’^{xviii} It is worth keeping in mind that Cook was not told explicitly to take possession of any other land than the newly discovered continent and then under specific circumstances. How he was able to stretch his Instructions further demands closer attention.

First he took possession of the Society Islands and later of both the North and South islands of New Zealand without consultation with the ‘natives’ with whom he was able to communicate freely having found that, in New Zealand, ‘a very intelligent person’ Tupia, ‘a Chief (sic) and a Priest’ who Cook had brought with him from Tahiti, could converse easily with the Maori peoples.^{xix} This does not imply that Cook acted in an underhand manner. He must have been aware that, in respect of the Admiralty, he was free to make up his own mind as to what he would take possession of for the Crown. Officialdom has its own way of making its own meaning obscure but clear to its initiates.

On our east coast and before leaving Botany Bay, Cook stated that ‘During our stay in this Harbour I caused the English Colours to be display’d ashore every day, and an inscription to be cut out upon one of the Trees near the Watering place, setting forth the Ship’s Name, Date, etc.’^{xx} This seems to imply that he was already laying down a claim to British possession, although he knew that it was the east coast of New Holland, the remainder of which had been charted in large measure previously by the Dutch. That Cook had already decided when landing on the east coast that it was free for the taking becomes clear. Incidentally, there is not a trace of Cook having engaged in speculation as to prior use or ownership by the Maoris or Aborigines. Ownership of such lands was only conceivable when they were acquired by an act of discovery by Europeans, followed by a proclamation of possession.

In any event, his later act and his words in respect of possession are worth consideration. By 22 August, ‘Having satisfied my self of the great Probability of a Passage (*Torres Strait*) thro’ which I intend going with the Ship, and therefore may land no more upon this Eastern Coast of *New Holland*, and on the Western side I can make no new discovery the honour of which belongs to the Dutch Navigators; (*and as such they may lay claim to it as their property*- these words are crossed out in Cook’s

original text) But the Eastern Coast from the Latitude of 38° South down to this place I am confident was never seen or viseted before us (*and therefore by the same rule belongs to Great Britton-* again crossed out) and Notwithstand [ing] I had in the Name of His Majesty taken possession of several places on this coast, I now once more hoisted English Coulers and in the Name of His Majesty King George the third took possession of the whole Eastern Coast from the above Latitude down to this place by the name of New South Wales together with all the Bays, Harbours, Rivers and Islands situate on the said coast, after which we fired three Volleys of small Arms...^{xxi} Banks makes no mention of any of the acts of taking possession in his Journal, almost as if to him they were an irrelevant distraction from his scientific purposes and of little moment in the overall scheme of things.

Before concluding, and despite any reservations I may have on the matter of possession, I wish to give two examples which go far to explain why Cook as a man has won my deepest admiration. By 3 September the *Endeavour* was close to shore on the south west coast of New Guinea. Cook, Banks and Solander wanted to investigate further and he landed with the two scientists and walked a small space along the shore when they were 'attack'd by 3 or 4 men'. Thus, 'Finding that we could not search the Country with any degree of Safety, we return'd to the boat'. Once on board he rejected the proposal of some of his officers to send men ashore to cut down trees to obtain cocoa nuts. To him it would be 'a thing that I think no man leiving could have justified; for as the Natives had attacked us for meer landing without taeking away any one thing, certainly they would have made a Vigerous effort to defend their property, in which case many of them must have been kill'd, and perhaps some of our own people too -- and all of this for 2 o[r] 300 Green Cocoa-nutts, which, when we had got them, would have done us little service; besides nothing but the u[t]most necessity would have oblige'd me to have taken this Method to come at refreshments.'^{xxii} His great common sense and humanity shine through in this simple example. Incidentally, he always shared the available food equally among the ship's company making no distinction of rank. On 4 August, while at the Endeavour River, he wrote, 'Whatever refreshments that were got that would bear a division I caused to be equally divided amongst the whole company generally by weight, the meanest person in the Ship had an equal share with my self or anyone on board, and this method every commander of a Ship on such a Voyage as this ought ever to observe.'^{xxiii}

On 11 October, 10 October by Banks's reckoning because it was 4 PM, the *Endeavour* had 'Anchor'd in Batavia Road'. The repair of the vessel

took much longer than expected because it had been more seriously damaged on the reef than anyone had imagined. When he saw the bottom of his ship, Cook was stunned and amazed that they had been able to keep 'her above water' and then remarks 'in the same conditions we had sailed some hundreds of Leagues in as dangerous a Navigation as is in any part of the world, happy in being ignorant of the danger we were in.'^{xxiv}

By 14 November the repairs had been almost completed and Cook wrote in his Journal, 'In justice to the Officers and Workmen of this Yard, I must say that I do not believe that there is a Marine Yard in the world where work is done with more alertness than here, or where there are better conveniences for heaving Ships down both in point of safety and dispatch. Here they heave down by 2 Masts, which is not now practised by the English. But I hold it to be much safer and more expeditious than by heaving down by one mast; a man must be not only bigotted to his own customs, but in some measure divested of reason, that will not allow this, after seeing with how much ease and safety the Dutch at Onrust heave down their largest Ships.'^{xxv} I dared not bid '*Bon voyage*' to the great captain and his valiant crew without recording those last words of Cook on his own compatriots, the English. They so admirably substantiate his genuine understanding of the essence of nationality, his balanced attitude to authority and his consummate common sense.

The *Endeavour* set sail from Batavia on 26 November and the remainder of the voyage home can be passed over. However, it is to the point to remark that almost all the ship's company was struck down at Batavia with dysentery, fever, a variety of influenza and malaria. At least eight died at Batavia and twenty more on the voyage to the Cape of Good Hope. Cook often recorded the deaths without pausing to remark on the misery he felt at the disasters that befell his crew. Nowhere does he record the fact, but Banks tells us that his captain was also was 'taken ill on board' probably with malaria on 14 November while still at Batavia.^{xxvi} James Cook recovered and survived until his death on Hawaii on 14 February 1779 in that vast Pacific Ocean for which he had done so much to reveal its wonders to the world.

i

Some classic and recent works are (**Spaniards**) Spate, O.K. *The Spanish Lake*, Canberra, 1979; Shaw, Carlos Martinez, 'Terra Australis: the Spanish quest' in John Hardy and Alan Frost, (eds.) *Studies from Terra Australis to Australia*, Canberra, 1989, pp 37-46 (**French**) Bonner, Elizabeth, 'Did the French discover Australia?: the first French scientific voyage of discovery, 1503-1505, in David W. Lovell, (ed.) *Revolution, politics and society: elements in the making of modern France*, Canberra, 1994, pp. 40-48; (**Portuguese**) Collingridge, George, *The Discovery of Australia*, Sydney, 1895; Fitzgerald, Lawrence. *Java la Grande: the Portuguese discovery of Australia*, Hobart, 1984; McIntyre, Kenneth G, *The secret discovery of Australia: Portuguese ventures 250 years before Captain Cook*, Adelaide, 1966; Richardson, William A.R., *Was Australia charted before 1606: Java la Grande inscriptions*, Canberra, 2006; Trickett, Peter. *Beyond Capricorn: how Portuguese adventurers secretly discovered and mapped Australia and New Zealand 250 years before Captain Cook*, Adelaide, 2007; Wallis, Helen. 'A Portuguese discovery? The enigma of the Dieppe maps', in John Hardy and Alan Frost, op.cit., pp.47-55; (**Chinese**) Menzies, Gavin. *1421: the year China discovered the world*, London, 2002; Menzies, Gavin, *The Year a Magnificent Chinese Fleet Sailed to Italy and Ignited the Renaissance*, 2008 ; Wei Chu-Hsien, *The Chinese discovery of Australia, Hong Kong, 1961*; Jack-Hinton, Colin. Early Asian contacts with the continent, in John Hardy and Alan Frost, op.cit.

ⁱⁱ See T. M. Perry, *The Discovery of Australia: the charts and maps of the navigators and explorers*, Melbourne, 1982.

ⁱⁱⁱ For a readable and well documented work on the Strait see Miles Hordern, *Passage to Torres Strait*, John Murray, London, 2005.

^{iv} See Cook's entry for 6 June, 1770 in J.C. Beaglehole, (ed) *The Voyage of the Endeavour, 1768-1771*, Cambridge University Press, 1955, pp. 338 and footnote 3. Cook named it 'Magnetical Head or Isle' and added 'the Compass would not travis well when near it. I change Cook's spelling only lwhen the word in question cannot be clearly understood.

^v John Molony, *Australia Our Heritage*, Australia Scholarly Publications, Melbourne, 2005, p. 27

^{vi} See Cook's entry for 31 March, 1770, in *Beaglehole*, pp. 272-3.

^{vii} Matthew Flinders, *A Voyage to Terra Australis*, London, 2 vols, 1814 vol. 1 pp. lxxxii-iii.

^{viii} J.C.Beaglehole, 'Cook the Man' in G.M.Badger, *Captain Cook: Navigator and Scientist*, ANU Press, Canberra, 1970. pp. 11-29.

^{ix} Cook's Journal of 18 and 19 April, 1770 in Beaglehole, *The Voyage*, pp. 298-9

^x Beaglehole, J.C., (ed) *The Endeavour Journal of Joseph Banks, 1786-1771*, 2 vols, Sydney, 1962, vol 11, p.326

^{xi} Cook's Journal, 24 April, 1770, p. 302.

^{xii} Cook in Beaglehole, *The Voyage*, pp. 335, 337. 4 June, 1770. Cook dated his Journal entry as Monday, 4 June, because he was observing the sea going practice of dating the day from noon to noon. The Passage was found in the afternoon of 3 June which was Pentecost Sunday. Banks and the others on board who wrote Journals used the normal practice which sometimes causes difficulty in deciding on the precise day in question.

^{xiii} *Ibid.*, p. 343

^{xiv} *Ibid.*, pp.343-4 Cook says that he had all hands ready to ‘put about and come to anchor but in this I was not so fortunate for meeting again with deep water I thought there could be no danger in standing on.’

^{xv} *Ibid.*, p.370

^{xvi} *Ibid.*, pp. 377-81

^{xvii} Bougainville in Beaglehole, *The Endeavour Journal*, p. 326

^{xviii} The Secret Instructions to Cook, 30 July 1768, in Beaglehole, *The Voyage*, pp. cclxxix-cclxxxiv.

^{xix} *Ibid.*, pp. 117,169

^{xx} *Ibid.*, p. 312, 6 May 1770

^{xxi} *Ibid.*, pp. 387-8, 22 August, 1770

^{xxii} *Ibid.*, pp. 409-10, 3 September, 1770

^{xxiii} *Ibid.*, p. 366, 4 August, 1770

^{xxiv} *Ibid.*, 11 October, 1770, p. 430; 9 November, 1770, pp. 435-6.

^{xxv} *Ibid.*, 14 November, 1770, p. 438

^{xxvi} See J.C. Beaglehole,(ed), *The Endeavour Journal of Joseph Banks 1768-1771*, 2 vols, Sydney, 1962, vol. 11, p. 192.