Chapter Three

*The 1934 Centenary Celebrations, The Shrine And Cooks’ Cottage*\(^{553}\)

Melbourne became the proud guardian of the one-time home of the man who had made that Centenary celebration possible—Captain James Cook.

Hermon Gill, 1934\(^{554}\)

Federation in 1901 loosened NSW’s hold on the ‘primal moments’ of Australian history, but did not, conversely, encourage the states to imagine nation-making history beyond state boundaries. That is, each state remained concerned only with its own history in terms of making the nation, carrying over themes from the previous century, including explorers, statesmen and the ever-emerging general category of pioneers. WWI introduced a modern political and social relationship between state and people characterised by critique and dissent, which provided a new, popular basis for imagining nation-making history. The cost of and mass contribution to progress was glaringly evident and fresh, and undermined the monumental history-making’s theme of ancient, singular, visionary men innocently romancing the world in the name of empire. Local communities showed their disenchchantment by inventing their own language of history-making, separate from the influence and monumental language of high level metropolitan boosters. Local communities repossessed history-making in the war memorial movement, where they underlined and mourned the extent and cost of each family’s contribution to the nation-state’s progress. A decade later, as the Depression exacerbated their disenchchantment, family genealogy also asserted itself as a popular history-making form.\(^{555}\) Further, people were simultaneously marginalised from the central civic sphere, and started to seek their history in more populist, private and less didactic forums, such as the cinema and radio.

History was losing its moral force, and yet in the face of this challenge, Melbourne’s boosters were more concerned than ever to reconfirm settler versions of Australian

\(^{553}\) See page 125 and footnotes 30 and 656 for the issue of Cooks’ Cottage and my punctuation. The question of punctuation is embedded in the controversy about whether the Cottage was Captain Cook’s or his parents.

\(^{554}\) Gill, Hermon, *Captain Cook’s Cottage*, Lothian, Melbourne, [1934], p.23.

\(^{555}\) Davison, Graeme, ‘Broken Lineage’, p.335.
history. In order to do this, they adapted their language, devolving history-making in various ways. The making of history started to shift from the direct hands of pre-eminent public officials, such as politicians and statesmen and high level board members, to ‘professional’ historians and educationalists in the universities, school education, historical societies and libraries. History was losing its public ‘boosting’ role: less public history was ‘made’ and the central civic sphere lost its didactic power. Professional historians and educationalists especially looked to schools to deliver their monumental historical lessons. In the more conventional public sphere, historical work began to concentrate on collecting historical sources than ‘making’ history, while the metropolitan, newly-professional history-makers also undertook a program of decentralisation of object lessons in history. However, their shifts in theme and form, moving the nation-making act away from singular men to the deed of exploration and symbolising it in more austere monumental forms, reflected a subtle move towards the democratic attribution of the colony’s foundation history.

The Depression of the late 1920s and early 1930s made the very assumption of progress questionable: each extended family had made a massive personal sacrifice in WWI, and within a decade the same families were devastated by unemployment and abject poverty. Victoria’s boosters had no control over the timing of the centenaries of the colony-state and Melbourne: in October 1834 the Henty family established Victoria’s first permanent white settlement, and in June 1835 John Batman putatively pronounced Port Phillip as ‘the place for a village’. The Victorian Government’s plans for a combined Centenary celebration between October 1934 and June 1935 reflected a sense of obligation rather than an eagerness to make monumental assertions about history’s centrality to the present, as we saw in the 1888 Exhibition. To begin with, the geopolitical frame of the 1934 centenary was the state, as opposed to the monumental frame the 1888 Centennial Exhibition offered to assert the precedence of Victoria’s history in the wider nation-building project. Further, the State’s Centenary occurred in a depression context, where boosters would have difficulty sustaining claims for monumental progress.
A twenty-two member Centenary Celebrations Council presided over the celebrations. Its membership represented the highest metropolitan State and local government officials, businessmen and the Melbourne Trades Hall Council,\textsuperscript{556} although its scale was far smaller than with the Centennial Exhibition. The Celebrations Council's continuous, severe financial difficulties reflected the Government's ungenerous mood and the tentativeness with which it approached the Centenary. Ultimately the private philanthropy of a handful of prominent Melbourne businessmen made many of the major Centenary events commercial rather than state initiatives. MacPherson Robertson donated £100 000, which doubled the Centenary's official budget,\textsuperscript{557} Sidney Myer raised £20 000 in public donations,\textsuperscript{558} and Russell Grimwade substantially funded Cooks' Cottage. The public supported the planning for the Celebrations in neither spirit nor money,\textsuperscript{559} and the press criticised almost every aspect of the Celebrations.\textsuperscript{560} The developmental patronage of the Celebrations was thus even more limited than any of the earlier public history-making projects we have seen, reflecting the strain between Melbourne's boosters and the people when it came to the prospect of any triumphalist articulation of the state.

Nevertheless, Melbourne's boosters sought a range of languages in which to confirm Victoria's progressive and secure context. The Government's crowning Centenary coup, so to speak, was the Duke of Gloucester's visit. Although Government's second choice as imperial representative,\textsuperscript{561} the public embraced the Duke: 500 000 people lined

\textsuperscript{556} Historical Sub-Committee of the Centenary Celebrations Council, \textit{Victoria: The First Century}, preface. The membership included, amongst others, the Premier, state politicians and Melbourne City Councillors, the prominent businessmen Sir McPherson Robertson, Russell Grimwade and Sidney Myer, Albert Monk, the Secretary of the Victorian Trades Hall Council, and May Moss, about whom more is said below.


\textsuperscript{558} Plant, Vikki, 'The Garden City', p.94.

\textsuperscript{559} Murphy, John, 'The Victorian Centenary of 1934/5: Celebration and Depression' in Leeuwenburg, Jeff (ed.), \textit{The Writing of Victoria's History, 1835-1986}, Baillieu Library, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, 1986, p.5.

\textsuperscript{560} Plant, Vikki, 'The Garden City', pp.87ff.

\textsuperscript{561} The Duke of Gloucester's elder brother, Prince George, was first choice, but was unavailable. Plant, Vikki, 'The Garden City', p.87.
the streets from Port Melbourne to Melbourne Town Hall to watch him open the
Centenary. The Duke offered an intense imperial rhetoric at a point when Australia’s
imperial relationship was undergoing increased public questioning.

The Council organised a Centenary program of over 300 events or products: its
determined dispersion across Victoria reflected the Council’s renewed respect for the
local possession of history. The program included ‘Centenary’ editions of regular
events, such as the Melbourne Cup and the Royal Agricultural Show. Other specific
Centenary events included Mac. Robertson’s London to Melbourne Air Race, the
Centenary 1000 Bicycle Race, the Eucharistic Procession and the Boy Scouts’
Jamboree—events which had little explicit association with history, distancing the
relationship between the past and the present.

The Centenary Council heralded the Celebrations as ‘an occasion of carnival and
culture’, not seeking to justify the ‘amusements’ on didactic grounds like they had in
the 1888 Exhibition. It was the biggest and most sustained public celebratory
commemoration of history since 1888, consisting of a nine month program, dotted
periodically with major public spectacles in the central civic sphere. Despite the
public’s lack of enthusiasm during the Celebration’s planning phase, they embraced the
actual events, and especially the free, central city spectacles, reminiscent of their
enthusiasm for the 1888 Centennial Exhibition. The Duke’s arrival set the tone for
public participation: in November 1934, 100 000 people welcomed the victors of Mac.
Robertson’s Air Race, Britons Scott and Campbell Black, along Swanston Street and
300 000 people watched the Duke of Gloucester dedicate the Shrine of Remembrance.
In December a crowd of 150 000 watched the Eucharistic Procession in Victoria
Parade and over 10 000 boys attended the Scout Jamboree. Cooks’ Cottage was

562 The Argus, 19 October 1934, p.11.
563 Murphy, John, ‘The Victorian Centenary’, pp.4-5 and Plant, Vikki, ‘The Garden City’,
p.87. For questioning of imperial links see footnote 159.
Melbourne, 1934, p.10.
565 As above.
566 State Library of Victoria, 1934. A Year in the Life of Victoria, State Library of Victoria,
567 The Herald, 10 December 1934, p.8.
inundated with visitors upon its opening in October 1934. The overtly spectacular
theatrics and non-didacticism of many of the Centenary events struck a chord with the
Melbourne public, keen to reclaim the carnivalesque use of central civic sphere,
especially in light of their increasing marginalisation and the oppression of years of
Depression.

**History-making and the 1934 Centenary Celebrations**

Many explicit history-making ventures also underwrote the 1934 Celebrations, as
Melbourne’s boosters sought to express progress in a modern historical language. They
produced a range of historical events and products, especially encouraged by the
Historical Sub-Committee of the Centenary Celebrations Council, chaired by Russell
Grimwade and including as its other members four long-standing ‘professional’ history-
makers.\(^{568}\) Four major histories of Victoria were published, including one by the
Historical Sub-Committee.\(^{569}\) The State Library of Victoria held an Historical
Exhibition, the Australian Natives’ Association and the Victorian Chamber of
Manufactures mounted the stridently nationalistic All-Australia Exhibition at the Royal
Exhibition Building\(^{570}\) and the Art Gallery held a Centenary Art Exhibition. A Pioneer
Women’s Memorial Gardens was created in the Domain in South Yarra, while there
were also historical re-enactments, a pyrotechnic display across the Yarra River
celebrating Batman’s famous proclamation,\(^{571}\) and a ten-ton birthday cake representing

---

\(^{568}\) Tom Griffiths makes an elaborate study of these men and their omnipresent history-making in *Hunters and Collectors*, see esp. pp.69-158-9,207. The four other Committee members were Charles Daley from the Historical Society of Victoria, Alfred W. Greig, chief clerk then registrar of the University of Melbourne, A.S. Kenyon, amateur archaeologist, President of the Historical Society of Victoria and State Museum Keeper of Antiquities, and Charles Long, editor of the *School Paper* from 1896. These were the same men who led the explorer memorial de-centralisation project between the 1910s and the 1930s.

\(^{569}\) These were: Centenary Celebrations Council Historical Sub-Committee, *Victoria the First Century*, Robertson and Mullens, Melbourne, 1934; Bridges, Roy, *One Hundred Years: the Romance of the Victorian People*, Herald and Weekly Times (originally published as a series of articles for *The Herald*), Melbourne, 1934; Ussher, Kathleen, *Hail Victoria*, Hodder and Staughton, London, 1934; Pratt, Ambrose, *The Centenary History of Victoria*, Melbourne, Robertson and Mullens, 1934 (originally published as a series of articles for *The Age*).

\(^{570}\) Victorian Chamber of Manufactures and the Australian Natives’ Association, *Centenary All-Australian Exhibition Official Souvenir Catalogue*, Victorian Chamber of Manufactures and the Australian Natives’ Association, Melbourne, 1934. Like the 1888 Centennial Exhibition, this exhibition was an inextricable mixture of commerce and history.

\(^{571}\) Arnold, John and Julian Ross, ‘Introduction’, p.22; Murphy, John, ‘The Victorian Centenary’, p.6.
five tiers of Victorian history,\textsuperscript{572} 250 000 pieces of which were sold to the Victorian public at the Joyland ‘People’s Fair’ in Batman Avenue.\textsuperscript{573}

Some of the historical activities were subtle variants on the themes we have seen in earlier public history-making ventures. The 1934 Centenary especially witnessed the emergence of a more democratic notion of pioneers as an amorphous earlier generation.\textsuperscript{574} But each of them reflected departures in form and theme, implying the boosters’ response to a changed social and political context for history-making. This chapter looks broadly at history-making around the 1934 Centenary Celebrations in order to identify some of the shifts to a modern language. It then investigates in greater detail the Shrine of Remembrance and Cooks’ Cottage, which came to be the Centenary’s major and most enduring initiatives. It looks especially at Cooks’ Cottage as a hybrid history-making venture, falling on the cusp of the transition from a settler to modern language, deploying a traditional settler theme but in the modern form of the historic house.

Generally, Melbourne’s history-makers used history in a different way in the 1934 Centenary. The present played a less conspicuous historical role than we have seen in our earlier case studies. The thematic language of the Centenary’s history-making emphasised ‘ancient’ and rural history, both themes of which were especially encapsulated in the idea of the pioneering generation of land settlers.\textsuperscript{575} The distancing of history was not new: in the 1888 Exhibition we saw a range of ancient references, but these were often precisely in order to compare with or to historically contextualise the metropolitan present, while both of the monuments we have studied dealt with recent, metropolitan history. In the 1934 Centenary, however, the geographical and temporal distancing represented a retreat in a Depression environment, whereas the 1888 Exhibition and the inception of the monuments we have studied all occurred in the ‘boom’ economy of the 1880s.

\textsuperscript{572} As above, p.9.
\textsuperscript{573} State Library of Victoria, \textit{1934}, p.12.
\textsuperscript{574} See page 31.
\textsuperscript{575} Murphy, John, ‘The Victorian Centenary’, p.2; Plant Vikki, ‘The Garden City’, p.92.
The thematic treatment of distant history itself in the 1934 Centenary also differed from the earlier examples we have studied. The four published histories and the historical exhibitions focussed on chronological periods of mass movement, such as exploration and the early pioneer-settler period. As cases in point, the State Library’s Historical Exhibition, mounted jointly by the Library and the Historical Society of Victoria, stated that: ‘[T]he vast collection of original documents, pictures, maps, diaries and general records...afford an intimate glimpse of the far-away period with which they deal’, and stopped at 1880, while the Centenary Art Exhibition included paintings from the Australian impressionist school, including Frederick McCubbin’s famous 1904 triptych, ‘The Pioneers’. Their collective treatment of history as a series of chronological periods, many of which were enacted by ‘rugged’, nameless groups of individuals, represented a democratic, ostensibly classless and less exhortatory departure from monumental history-making, which positioned the colony-state’s progress in the hands of a few men. The treatment of pioneers in 1934 was more akin to that we saw in the Eight Hours’ Day monument, and less like we saw in Barry’s monument.

The Pioneer Women’s Memorial Gardens, built by unemployed workers on sustenance payments, reinforced the use of the pioneer theme. As importantly, it reflected a more radical thematic departure from monumental history. After much public debate, May Moss, President of the National Council of Women, was included as the only female member of the Centenary Celebrations Council. Melbourne’s Lord Mayor had protested against women’s inclusion thus:

There was no place for women on the committee and...women’s societies should amalgamate and form some plan for their own celebration.

Other protesters had argued that if women were included, this might open the floodgates to, say, sporting groups. Melbourne’s boosters thus placed women’s historical interests outside substantial, public history, implicating them as a frivolous, sectional,

576 The Age, 15 October 1934.
579 See footnote 556.
private concern. After considerable lobbying by Moss and the Victorian Women Citizens’ Movement, the Premier, Sir Stanley Argyle acceded to the creation of the garden. (Illustration 31) It was funded through the sales of ‘Sheets of Remembrance’, inscribed with the donor’s name or that of an ancestor, costing one shilling, and which were buried under the Garden’s sundial. The public fund-raising then, was more akin to the fund-raising intentions of the Eight Hours’ Day monument than the seeking of large donations which characterised the Barry statue. Its aesthetic, natural, domestic and useful form, was an emergent one, implying historical relegation. The Garden included Marguerite daisies, because they were the ‘homely flowers that women loved’, contrasting with the laboured aesthetic and symbolic considerations around both the Eight Hours’ Day and Redmond Barry monuments. The Garden signalled the boosters’ reluctant adaptation to a new historical language, incorporating women as distant pioneers—indeed, the cut-off point was 1860—but not as individual, public or contemporary actors.

Many of the historical forms of the 1934 Centenary were also emergent or new. The number of published histories demonstrated the boosters’ emphasis on the written word, confirming its emergence as the prime form of twentieth-century history-making, although it was not necessarily popular or affordable. In an associated vein, the number of exhibitions suggested an increasingly materialist rendition of the history of ‘the same’ which only fully emerged in the twentieth century, with the State Library and the Historical Society playing increasingly important roles. The shifting

581 As above.
582 Ridley, Ronald T., Melbourne’s Monuments, p.124.
585 As above, p.124.
586 For a complete list of official and unofficial Centenary publications see, State Library of Victoria, 1934, pp.54-64.
587 The Argus, 20 July 1935, p.22. Poor sales meant 2000 copies of the official Centenary history were given away.
588 The State Library of Victoria began building an historical collection in the 1880s and 1890s. In 1914 the Chief Librarian ratified the creation of a Victorian Historical Museum ‘for exhibiting portraits of governors, early colonists, and others of note in the establishment and history of the State, and also for the exhibition of prints, manuscripts, and other objects illustrative of the history and progress of Victoria’. In 1919 a Records Section was created at
Illustration 31
In the Pioneer Women’s Memorial Gardens, Melbourne, not dated
Courtesy La Trobe Picture Collection, State Library of Victoria
imagination of Australian history and its changed methodology meant that documents, maps and other visual material were increasingly collected as the authentic evidence. Each of these shifts in form pointed to a more circumspect history-making genre, which was less synoptic, singular and didactic than the monuments and Cook’s ‘colossal bust’. The newer forms were more privatized and domestic than the ‘open air museums’, and were less ambitious in their audience scope: the State Library’s Historical Exhibition was regarded as a source for the ‘historical student’ as much as for the ‘general public’.

The Centenary’s other object lessons in history, such as the re-enactments, the pyrotechnic display, and the cake were spectacular, theatrical or playful: the medium became the message. Melbourne’s boosters wrapped up their history in new technologies and novelties and keepsakes. The cake reflected a democratic, domestic gesture, enabling the public to take home a piece of Victoria’s history. While we saw the medium as the message in the 1888 Exhibition, we did not see it applied to history, which boosters regarded as too sacred for new or ‘trivial’ forms. The 1934 Centenary’s historical theatres were different to those we saw in Chapters One and Two: both their theme and form represented a more democratic, populist historical approach, infused by a generalized nostalgia rather than pointed didacticism.

These and other shifts emerged in complex ways in the Centenary’s two most prominent history-making endeavours: the Shrine of Remembrance and Cooks’ Cottage. Both the Shrine and the Cottage were ‘accidental’ Centenary projects, insofar as their timing was concerned. It was fortunate rather than planning that allowed both the Shrine’s dedication and the opening of Cooks’ Cottage in late 1934, although it was not accidental that both of them came to fruition in the 1930s. In a sense they were aberrant ‘Centenary’ projects, because they were both conceived as statements of national rather than state history. In this similar conception, they offer useful contrasts with each other, and with

---

the Public Library (this was the predecessor of the Victorian Public Records Office), after strong lobbying by the Historical Society of Victoria. In 1930 the Library held exhibitions on Charles Sturt and the Henty Family settlement. See LaTouche Armstrong, Edmund and Robert Douglass Boys, *The Book of the Public Library*, pp.25,29,32,40,49,91.


590 *The Age*, 18 October 1934.
some of the earlier history-making we have seen. Both the Shrine and Cooks’ Cottage offer major, contrasting continuities with monumental history-making, but both also pinpoint major, contrasting shifts in the language of public history from settler to modern.

**The Shrine of Remembrance**

We saw in the Introduction that at the end of WWI, Major-General Sir John Monash initiated moves for a *national* monument in Melbourne, reflecting the persistence of a colonial mentality in relation to history and nation-making. The War popularly redefined the story of Australia’s nation-making, replacing ‘first generation’ history, whether it be explorers, statesmen, or settler pioneers, with a contemporary history of the nation’s ‘pioneers’. The soldiers who made ‘the Great Sacrifice’ were the hundreds of thousands of nationing ‘sons’ rather than the handful of ‘fathers’ we have become accustomed to, shifting the generational sequence necessary to monumental history-making. The Shrine would honour by name all of the nation’s foundation historical actors. Further, and parallel with the Pioneer Women’s Garden, the Shrine’s major inscription acknowledged women, (but not anywhere else in its rhetoric, reflecting their attenuated entrance into the nation’s history). In the 1920s successive Victorian Governments gave protracted consideration to establishing a Civic Square or a Hospital as the national War monument, the former reflecting a democratic bow to the people in the central civic sphere, and the latter representing a modern idea of usefulness in commemoration. Nevertheless, costs precluded both developments, and Monash and his Legacy men mounted a conservative, clever campaign, especially based around the emerging tradition of Anzac Day, demanding that Melbourne’s civic planners commemorate this foundation lesson on Victoria’s contribution to imperial nationing in a form of metropolitan monumental classicism which would overwhelm anything preceding or following it.

---

592 As above, p.10.
594 Pratt, Ambrose, *National War Memorial*, p.11.
595 As above, p.20; Inglis, K.S., *Sacred Places*, p.282.
In 1928, the Victorian public and school children donated £88,000 and Victorian municipalities donated £62,000, consolidating the £50,000 Melbourne City Council and the Victorian Government had each committed to the Shrine project. The financial contributions were exceptional public and local statements of support for the Shrine, categorically distinguishing it from any other public history-making project we have yet seen. After more than a decade of Government delay, its construction occurred as an employment project for returned soldiers, who built it from Australian materials, underlining its nationalist emphasis. Politically, financially and socially, the Shrine was like a central city manifestation of the local war memorial movement: populist, conservative and ambivalent towards metropolitan leaders: ‘[I]t is the fruit and outcome of a people’s gratitude, a people’s agony, a people’s pride’, commemorating:

the typical Australian soldier...possessed by an intense corporate, democratic spirit; that they always spoke and acted freely in the presence of, and “when they thought fit, in opposition to the views of their leaders”.

The Shrine, in the Grange, near the Botanical Gardens along St Kilda Road, dominated Melbourne’s civic space, ‘its site...analogous to the Acropolis of Athens’ and:

‘isolate[d]...from the tumult of the commercial and industrial arenas of the Capital (thus preserving its sacred character), [but] nevertheless an integral feature of the daily life of the community.’

Architecturally evoking the Mausoleum of Halikarnassos, the Athenian Parthenon and the Pantheon in Rome, it belonged to a Periclean Grecian age ‘when the art and architecture and the moral strength of Greece attained a splendour...and present[ed] a

598 As above, p.21.
599 As above, p.18.
600 As above, p.10.
603 As above, p.12.
picture of the human intellect in its highest condition of perfection’, taking us back ninety years to Redmond Barry’s words about the ‘polite sciences’. It was:

a temple rising heavenwards, visible from all quarters of the compass, the last object to fade from the sight of every citizen who leaves the Capital and the first to greet his return, ever reminding him of the valour of his countrymen and the glory of his country.

The Duke of Gloucester’s dedication on 11 November 1934 opportunistically reinforced its makers’ imperial and conservative credentials, but its modern historical foundation demanded circumspection about the cost of progress. (Illustration 32) The Shrine was ‘irresistibly conducive to solemn introspective contemplation’, and the public would ‘bring in ever-swelling stream their bruising memories of grief’. Subsequent generations were to ‘give remembrance’ rather than act, distinguishing it from the imperatives of monumental history and bringing it closer to Davison’s critical history, with its connotations of suffering and desire for deliverance. That it reflected a language which could be understood and appreciated by modern eyes was reflected in the public’s contemporary embrace of the project, and the number of subsequent historical works which articulated its symbolism.

Cooks’ Cottage

Cooks’ Cottage, the Centenary’s other ‘accidental’ project, contrasted with the Shrine in most respects. It resurrected a monumental theme, but its form of the historic house was modern. This juxtaposition made it strange, reflected in contemporary bemusement at

---

605 Pratt, Ambrose, National War Memorial, p.9.
606 See p.19.
607 Pratt, Ambrose, National War Memorial, p.9.
608 As above, p.14.
609 As above.
610 As above, pp.9,14.
611 Davison, Graeme, ‘Use and Abuse’, pp.56,73-5.
612 Historians of memorials, such as K.S. Inglis and Michael McKernan, have written on the Shrine, along with Ambrose Pratt’s work and the later publication by W.B. Russell, We will remember them: the story of the Shrine of Remembrance, Shrine of Remembrance, Melbourne, 1980.
613 Young, Linda, ‘House Museums in Australia’ in Public History Review, Volume 3, 1994, p.167. Historic houses have become the most numerous form of history-making.
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The National War Memorial of Victoria, Aerial View of Dedication Ceremony, 1934
Courtesy La Trobe Picture Collection, State Library of Victoria
(although not alienation from) the project, and the fact that few historians have studied the Cottage.\textsuperscript{614}

Cooks’ Cottage became Russell Grimwade’s personal Centenary project. Grimwade, whose father was a Commissioner for the 1888 Centennial Exhibition,\textsuperscript{615} was a third generation partner in an outstandingly successful drug and chemical manufacture based in Melbourne. Born into and continuing to accrue significant wealth throughout his life, Grimwade pursued his passion for Australian history in both art and documents.\textsuperscript{616} The Government recognised his connoisseurship by appointing him chief Centenary history-maker.\textsuperscript{617} Grimwade thus led the range of Centenary historical initiatives, speaking, often reluctantly, in its new languages. However, as we shall see, Grimwade was a monumentalist at heart, and, well aware of the Centenary’s limited budget, he purchased Cooks’ Cottage as a personal expression of his ‘pride of citizenship’.\textsuperscript{618} (Illustration 33)

Grimwade conceived of the Cottage in nationalist terms. He wrote privately of the Cottage’s basic role as an imperial-national metaphor:

\hspace{1cm} It was to introduce some solid reminder of the old world to this young country that first stimulated me to bring out the Cottage and to endeavour to foster national traditions that must necessarily be absent in so young a country as our own.\textsuperscript{619}

The Cottage’s sponsors had lost their 1888 counterparts’ shyness about Victoria’s possession of the primal moment of national history, arguing that Cook had first \textit{set eyes} on Australia at Point Hicks, Victoria’s extreme south-eastern point, in 1770, and which

\textsuperscript{614} The sole contemporary work was Hermon Gill’s \textit{Captain Cook’s Cottage}, while Imara Walden and Chris Healy are the two historians who have subsequently studied the Cottage.
\textsuperscript{615} Executive Commissioners of the Centennial International Exhibition, \textit{Official Record}, p.4.
\textsuperscript{617} See page 111.
\textsuperscript{619} Grimwade Papers, 15/4, Russell Grimwade to J.H. Addeney, 7 December 1936; see also Gill, Hermon, \textit{Captain Cook’s Cottage}, pp.16-7. He expresses very similar concerns that ‘the tapestry of tradition...was but barely started weaving’ in such a young country.
Illustration 33
Russell Grimwade, Oil painting by Paul Fitzgerald, c.1950
was named after one of the *Endeavour’s* crew members,\(^{620}\) thereby justifying Victoria’s possession of the national figure.

The foundation history that the Cottage enshrined was one of colonial Australia’s earliest. We first saw Cook’s appearance in the 1888 Exhibition, and by 1934 the refrain was familiar: Cook incarnated imperial, national, and colonial ‘genesis’\(^{621}\)—‘of all men [he] made the wide world his footstool’.\(^{622}\) (*Illustration 34*) In his monumental conception, Cook’s gender had given him exclusive access to the modern civic sphere and its pursuit of worldly conquest, and he had displayed extreme ‘manliness’, especially through physical risk-taking. His Britishness was emphasised as a virtue, reinforcing the centrality of race to epic narratives of nationality and empire.\(^{623}\) So too, history-makers highlighted his humble origins.\(^{624}\) Starting life as the son of a farmer’s hand, he went from an apprenticeship as a grocer’s assistant in Staithees to join the Royal Navy, to become a circumnavigator who recorded the transit of Venus in Hawaii, and who took possession of several continents on behalf of the British Empire. Cook, said his history-makers, had innate human virtues—courage, wisdom and faith to name just some of them\(^{625}\)—which made his rise to greatness inevitable, regardless of his origins.\(^{626}\) Finally, Cook was killed on his third voyage by indigenous Hawaiians, sealing the narrative of Cook the explorer as a lesson in imperial martyrdom and building a ‘sacred debt’ around him, which reinforced the patrilineal and racial descent of the social order.\(^{627}\)

\(^{620}\) Grimwade Papers, 15/2, Russell Grimwade to Preston Kitchen, 11 September 1934.
\(^{622}\) Gill, Hermon, *Captain Cook’s Cottage*, p.32.
\(^{623}\) For particularly rapturous examples of this, see Gill, Hermon, *Captain Cook’s Cottage*, esp. pp.4,10.
\(^{624}\) Gill, Hermon, *Captain Cook’s Cottage*, p.7; Grimwade Papers, 15/8, *Yorkshire Evening Press*, 4 October 1934.
\(^{625}\) As one contemporary historian noted, these were human attributes along the lines of the names of the ships in which Cook sailed. See Williamson, J.A., ‘The Exploration of the Pacific’ in Scott, Ernest, (ed.), *Australia (Cambridge History of the British Empire, Vol.7)*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1933 (Reissued 1988), p.53.
\(^{626}\) Gill, Hermon, *Captain Cook’s Cottage*, pp.4,7-8.
Illustration 34
Captain Cook, by Gordon Woodhouse, not dated
Courtesy La Trobe Picture Collection, State Library of Victoria
As early as 1879, NSW had erected a 'memorial to his greatness' and reinforced his 'colossal' historical status at the 1888 Centennial Exhibition, which Victoria then took possession of, in controversial inter-colonial circumstances, to display in its social history museum. Federation, however, increasingly allowed possession of Cook as the pre-eminent foundation historical actor across state boundaries, and Melbourne suburban history-makers erected a statue of 'heroic size' to Cook on the St. Kilda foreshore on the eve of WWI. (Illustration 35)

However, WWI saw Cook replaced by Victoria's War participants as the state's foundation historical actors. Determined 'to vindicate an outraged justice, to sustain liberty and to safeguard the basic principles of civilization', this narrative of mass contemporary loss and damage replaced the ancient, nostalgic romance 'of conquest' by a single nationing pioneer. It was only the coincidence of timing of the sale of Cooks' Cottage that saw him resurrected in the 1934 Centenary Celebrations as an historical actor who indeed, now represented earlier, simpler times.

On 13 June 1933, Russell Grimwade read in The Herald that a cottage to which 'Captain Cook always went in the intervals between his voyages to the South Seas', was for sale at Great Ayton, Middlesbrough, in England. He informed the Premier of Victoria, Sir Stanley Argyle, and Argyle notified Richard Linton, Victoria's Agent-General in London, requesting him to make inquiries about the Cottage. The auctioneers advertised the Cottage as 'renowned as the home of Captain Cook's early days', offering prospective purchasers the chance to buy 'history'. (Illustration 36) The vendors had a strong commercial imperative, and were prepared to use local historical memory in their cause. They were treading on ever-shakier ground, as the conventions of history increasingly demanded empirical evidence, but at this stage the project was still a commercial concern and the claim was not subjected to widespread public scrutiny. Nevertheless, with a view to its future public status, those involved

628 See footnote 90.
629 The Argus, 8 December 1914, p.6.
630 Pratt, Ambrose, 'National War Memorial', p.9.
631 National Trust of Australia, Victorian Branch, Cooks' Cottage: Melbourne, National Trust of Australia, Victorian Branch, Melbourne, c.1979, p.27.
632 Grimwade Papers, 15/8, Arthur Thompson auctioneer's leaflet, 28 June 1933.
Illustration 35
Captain Cook Statue on St. Kilda Foreshore, c.1920
HISTORY
"UNDER THE HAMMER."

HOME OF
CAPTAIN COOK'S EARLY DAYS.

Wednesday, June 28th, 1933

To be OFFERED FOR SALE at the
BUCK HOTEL, GREAT AYTON,
at 7.30 p.m. The FIVE ROOMED
BRICK & STONE BUILT COTTAGE
At the CORNER of EASHBY ROAD and
BRIDGE STREET, GREAT AYTON
AND
RENOWED AS THE HOME OF
CAPTAIN COOK'S EARLY DAYS

2 PARCELS OF BUILDING LAND
(One is approximately 0.5 acre with a frontage of
50 ft. to Great Ayton Road, Great Ayton.
THE PROPERTY may be inspected by arrangement with
Messrs. DIXON BROS, Great Ayton, Tel. No. 31, or through
Messrs. W. LOWTHIER CARRICK & CO., Solicitors,
Shortholm, Yorks.

AUCTIONEER:
ARTHUR THOMPSON, F.A.I.
THE PROPERTY MAY
BOROUGH ROAD, MIDDLESBROUGH. Tel. No. 982.

Illustration 36
History Under the Hammer, 1934
Courtesy University of Melbourne Archives
expressed concern about the historical legitimacy of the claims from the outset. The auction flyer in Russell Grimwade’s files contains hand-written annotations on the back—most probably by Richard Linton—that the value of the Cottage from an historical point-of-view was ‘problematical’.

Mrs Annie Dixon, the vendor of the Cottage, had initially stipulated that it was not to be removed from its site, but finally acceded to its removal within the British Empire. Within a fortnight, Russell Grimwade had purchased the Cottage for £800 ‘for the people of Victoria’. After the sale, the Agent-General advised the Premier of Victoria that he had secured ‘reasonable evidence of [the Cottage’s] authenticity’. These cautious words show the Cottage’s patrons’ ongoing doubts about the veracity of its historical associations.

With the sale of the Cottage, Great Ayton locals became aggravated that it was to be removed to Australia. The local Parish Council complained that ‘the whole thing had been carried out over their heads’. In claiming the precedence of ‘heroic patronage’ anchored in the authority of place, the Great Ayton locals reminded of the local re-possession of national history in Victoria’s war memorial movement. In Melbourne too, *The Age* was a lone critic of the removal of the Cottage from its original site, calling it an ‘American’ idea, an allegation which had long implicated modernity.

It is little to our credit to be classed with the Americans in displaying a lack of reverence for the old-world setting of historical associations, and a lack of that aesthetic sense which revolts against and incongruous mixture of old and new. The healthy sentiment of the people of Australia is antagonistic to the removal of Captain Cook’s Cottage from its original site.

---

633 Grimwade Papers, 15/8, 28 June 1933.
634 Gill, Hermon, *Captain Cook’s Cottage*, p.18.
635 Grimwade Papers, 15/1, Letter from Russell Grimwade to the Premier of Victoria, Sir Stanley Argyle, 30 June 1933.
636 Grimwade Papers, 15/3, Letter from Richard Linton to the Premier of Victoria, Sir Stanley Argyle, 30 June 1933.
639 Healy, Chris, *Ruins of Colonialism*, p.36.
Particulars of Property

Built A.D. 1755.
Brick & Stone built - tiles.
5 rooms (3 bed).
Interior walls recently replastered.
New wooden floors downstairs.
Few original rafters (encased).
Original floors upstairs.
One original fire place (not fitted).

Area: 2647 sq feet.

Conditions of sale.
No removal of property.

Value from historical point of view - problematic.
Various enquirers made, from London & Australia.
Sale expected to realise £750.

Illustration 37
'Value from historical point of view—problematical', 1934
Courtesy University of Melbourne Archives
Grimwade disregarded the Melbourne-based criticisms, and sent over an obelisk made from granite from Point Hicks in order to quell the Yorkshire locals’ ‘natural resentment’. Indeed, Grimwade asserted that the obelisk was ‘an object of greater interest even than the cottage they have lost’. (Illustration 38)

However, the Great Ayton Parish Council pursued the question of the Cottage’s authenticity, issuing the following statement:

The weight of evidence that Captain Cook lived at this cottage seems to be so small that it is doubtful whether he ever visited the cottage during his parents’ residence there...Needless to say the inhabitants of Great Ayton hold in highest veneration of the name of this great man, and are happy to feel that they possess authentic memorials to him.

Cook and his parents moved from Marton to Great Ayton in 1736, when Cook was eight years old, but the Cottage was most probably built nineteen years later, in 1755. This is deduced from the date etched in the stone entrance, along with the initials ‘G’, ‘J’ and ‘C’, presumed to represent the initials of Grace and James, Cook’s parents. However, 1755 was also the year that Captain Cook enlisted in the navy, when he was twenty-seven years old, and therein lies the problem. It remains unclear where the Cooks lived in Great Ayton between 1736 and 1755.

Nevertheless, from the outset of the purchase, Grimwade, the Premier, the Agent-General, and indeed the Historical Society of Victoria, amongst others, maintained publicly that the Cottage was associated with Cook’s childhood. They moderated their

641 Grimwade Papers, 15/8, 26 September 1933.
642 Grimwade Papers, 15/3, Russell Grimwade to Richard Linton, Agent-General for Victoria, 1 August 1933.
643 Grimwade Papers, 15/3, Russell Grimwade to Richard Linton, Agent-General for Victoria, 27 September 1933.
644 Grimwade Papers, 15/8, North Eastern Daily Gazette, 2 October 1934.
645 National Trust of Australia, Victorian Branch, Cooks’ Cottage, p.4.
Illustration 38
Obelisk Made of Granite from Point Hicks to be Erected in Great Ayton, 1934
Courtesy University of Melbourne Archives
claims, saying that it was Cook’s childhood residence,\textsuperscript{646} and then that it was either lived in briefly or visited by Cook during his leave from the Royal Navy.\textsuperscript{647}

There was a desperate search for documentary evidence to prove the claims. Victoria’s Agent-General publicised three pieces of evidence—some of them ‘ancient’\textsuperscript{648}—to defend the claim that Cook had at least visited the Cottage on his leave. (Illustration 39) A letter showed Cook requesting leave to visit his sick father,\textsuperscript{649} another letter in Whitby Museum detailed Cook’s journeyings during his leave, from which it was assumed he stayed at cottage,\textsuperscript{650} and a catalogue produced during the bi-centenary of Cook’s birth in 1928 stated that he had visited his sick father at Great Ayton.\textsuperscript{651} This latter piece of evidence was a document produced from the same process of historical reconstruction in which the Agent-General, Grimwade and others were engaged.

Hermon Gill, an English emigrant, mariner, journalist and military historian, wrote the handbook to Cooks’ Cottage.\textsuperscript{652} In his regular correspondence with Grimwade he quoted other ‘authorities’, including a secondary source and a Yorkshire emigrant who could remember the Cottage almost back to the time in question. Gill concluded that there was an element of legend in these stories, but that legends ‘do not grow without foundation’. In a decidedly ambivalent and yet defiant conclusion, he felt his claims were ‘more capable of proof than can be anything brought against it’.\textsuperscript{653} Like Grimwade, Gill had enough faith in the ‘imaginative performance’ of the raw data of

\textsuperscript{646} See, for example, Grimwade Papers, 15/4 Hermon Gill to Russell Grimwade, 9 June 1934 and Russell Grimwade to Secretary to the Premier, 17 May 1934; 15/8, A.S. Kenyon, President of the Historical Society of Victoria, Letter to The Sun, 23 September 1933.
\textsuperscript{647} See, for example, Gill, Hermon, \textit{Captain Cook’s Cottage}, pp.9,13-14; Grimwade Papers, 15/8, Richard Linton, Agent-General for Victoria quoted in \textit{The Nottingham Guardian}, 5 October 1934 (also quoted in many other newspapers over many months).
\textsuperscript{648} See, for example, Lowenthal, David, \textit{Foreign Country}, p.54.
\textsuperscript{649} Grimwade Papers, 15/3, Agent-General to Grimwade, 18 October 1934.
\textsuperscript{650} Grimwade Papers, 15/8, Agent-General quoted in \textit{The Nottingham Guardian}, 5 October 1934.
\textsuperscript{651} Grimwade Papers, 15/4, Hermon Gill to Russell Grimwade, 9 June 1934.
\textsuperscript{653} Grimwade Papers, 15/4, 9 June 1934.
AGENT-GENERAL SATISFIED

COOK'S COTTAGE BELIEVED TO BE AUTHENTIC

ANCIENT DOCUMENTS

THE ALLEGATION by the chairman of the Great Ayton Parish Council that the Australian Government had been "sold a pup" when "Captain Cook's cottage" was bought and shipped to the Antipodes, has been promptly answered.

In a telephone conversation with the Town Clerk of Middlebrough to-day the Hon. Richard Linton, whose wife has promised to unveil the obsticle at Great Ayton marking the site of the cottage, expressed his conviction that the house was the authentic home of the famous circumnavigator.

AGENT-GENERAL'S STATEMENT

Mr. LINTON has issued the following statement by telegram:

"The Australian Government has decided, after consultation with the War Office, to accept the offer of the Great Ayton Parish Council of the cottage where Captain Cook lived as a child, and which is said to have been purchased by the Government of Queensland in Australia.

"The cottage is situated in the village of Great Ayton, near Middlesbrough, and is said to have been purchased by Captain Cook's father, who is believed to have been a fisherman.

"The cottage is of considerable historical interest, and is believed to be the only surviving building of its kind in the region."
history to know that he could play within the realms of its modern, western conventions without major hiccup.\textsuperscript{654}

Most public mention of the Cottage continued to refer to it as Captain Cook’s Cottage, even though most in fact knew that this claim could not be sustained. The plaque for the Cottage, the wording for which Grimwade wrote, read:

\begin{quote}
THIS BUILDING \textit{KNOWN AS CAPTAIN COOK’S COTTAGE WAS BUILT AT GREAT AYTON, YORKSHIRE, ENGLAND BY THE PARENTS OF CAPTAIN JAMES COOK, R.N. IT WAS REMOVED TO THIS SITE AS A CENTENARY GIFT TO THE PEOPLE OF VICTORIA BY RUSSELL GRIMWADE IN 1934.}\textsuperscript{655} (My italics)
\end{quote}

while the wording for the plaque for the obelisk that was sent to England, which Grimwade also wrote, claimed ‘here marks the site of Captain Cook’s Cottage, removed to Melbourne in 1934’.\textsuperscript{656} The Great Ayton Parish Shire boycotted the obelisk unveiling, unwilling to support ‘a mis-statement…perpetrated in bronze and stone’.\textsuperscript{657}

After fifteen months of debate, Grimwade was ‘not greatly perturbed by the doubts that have been cast on the authority of the cottage’\textsuperscript{658} and he had tired of it anyhow.\textsuperscript{659} This certain lack of concern could be read as a man psychologically bolstering himself against his critics, or Grimwade may have been genuinely tired, or he may have been blase towards his own possible duplicity.

\textsuperscript{654} Healy, Chris, \textit{Ruins of Colonialism}, esp. p.35.
\textsuperscript{655} Grimwade Papers, 15/2, 29 June 1934.
\textsuperscript{656} Grimwade Papers, 15/2, circa 10 October 1934. As can be noted by the footnote citations, most contemporary publications continue (almost defiantly, it seems) to refer to the cottage as Captain Cook’s Cottage, and my impression is that it is still known overwhelmingly as Captain Cook’s Cottage in popular parlance. However, the National Trust of Australia’s official publication and the cottage signage refers to it as Cooks’ Cottage, reflecting a relatively recent decision to promote it as accurately as the historical evidence allowed. Unless one is attuned to the finer points of English punctuation however, it leaves the Cottage’s association with Cook ambiguous.
\textsuperscript{657} Grimwade Papers, 15/6, \textit{The Nottingham Guardian}, 5 October 1934.
\textsuperscript{658} Grimwade Papers, 15/3, Russell Grimwade to Richard Linton, Agent-General for Victoria, 12 November 1934.
\textsuperscript{659} Grimwade Papers, 15/3, Russell Grimwade to Richard Linton, Agent-General for Victoria, 28 November 1934.
It may also have been due to the fact that since its opening, the Cottage had been inundated with visitors, which must have vindicated Grimwade’s faith in the imaginative work the audience could bring to bear on the Cottage. Grimwade and others saw themselves carrying out a larger project of imperial-national sentiment: ‘the main point to consider [was] the link between the Mother Country and one of its daughters’. Cook and the Cottage became metaphors for imperial bonds rather than literal narratives, so the accuracy of Cook’s physical connections with the Cottage came to matter less, especially as the Cottage became a successful attraction.

The purchase of Cooks’ Cottage was on the cusp of substantial shifts from traditional imperial to newer allegiances, which Grimwade bemoaned. Fifty-six years old with English lineage, Grimwade was troubled by the nation’s youthfulness and modernity, and especially the tenuousness of ‘the bonds of kinship that are the fundamental links of Empire’. Like many of his academic and political contemporaries, he shared an ‘ideological’ commitment to imperialism. The Cottage may be seen as a hybrid symbol between some of the last vestiges of orthodox monumental history and its profound imperial associations—especially thematically—and a more modern form of history, the historic house, the emotional and aesthetic terrain of which was domestic

660 The Agent-General for Victoria, Richard Linton, quoted in Grimwade Papers, 15/8, Northern Echo, 8 October 1934. Also see, for example, 15/2, Mrs Annie Dixon to Preston Kitchen, 11 September 1934.
661 Healy, Chris, Ruins of Colonialism, pp.17-37. He discusses the making of Cook into a metaphor for both Empire and nation.
663 Grimwade Papers, 15/2, Russell Grimwade to Preston Kitchen, Yorkshire Town Clerk, 11 September 1934.
664 Macintyre, Stuart and Julian Thomas (eds.), Discovery of Australian History, esp. pp.7,14,19,34,37,43-4,76-7,87. The chapters by Brian Fletcher, Elizabeth Kwan and Stuart Macintyre emphasise amongst key academic history-makers their contiguity of thinking between British imperialism and Australian colonialism. This contiguity began to undergo some questioning in the 1920s and 1930s. See also Alomes, Stephen, A Nation at Last?, esp. chapters two and three. He identifies official Australian nationalism being conceived of in profoundly imperial and colonial terms for the first three decades of this century
665 Poynter, John, Russell Grimwade, p.196.
and nostalgic,\textsuperscript{667} representing a significant departure from the monumental form of the Shrine and the other statues we have studied.

The Cottage’s evocation of England was, for Grimwade and others, as important as its connections with Cook. Hermon Gill suggested that Yorkshire, the county from whence the Cottage came, was, ‘of all the counties of England’, particularly English, with its ‘bluff independence’, its ‘unmade, untamed beauty...Here is glorious England’.\textsuperscript{668} Upon its transplantation to and reconstruction in Melbourne, \textit{The Herald} read the ‘Englishness’ of the Cottage’s new site:

There was a typical English atmosphere about the Fitzroy Gardens today when late Autumn leaves rained down...and the smoke of burning leaves increased the effect of the morning mist.\textsuperscript{669}

This evoked a domestic, pastoral idyll,\textsuperscript{670} even though the Cottage’s original English site was municipal. (\textit{Illustration 40}) For some the Cottage was, ultimately, a historical shrine\textsuperscript{671} to Australia’s British lineage. Such enshrinement required an epic, not necessarily encumbered by facts. Seven years after the opening of the Cottage the Historical Society of Victoria suggested that a series of explanatory notes be erected around the Cottage. Grimwade, even though a Society member, dismissed the idea as ‘distracting and prosaic’.\textsuperscript{672} Elsewhere, he stated that it was important for the Cottage to ‘tell a good story’.\textsuperscript{673} The uppermost imperative of the Cottage’s sponsors was its discourse as a triumphant imperial foundation metaphor, which preferred a seamless monumental narrative over the demands of modern historical conventions for facts and evidence.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{668} Gill, Hermon, \textit{Captain Cook’s Cottage}, p.10.
\item \textsuperscript{669} Grimwade Papers, 15/6, \textit{The Herald}, 9 May 1934.
\item \textsuperscript{670} Young, Linda, ‘House Museums’, p.176.
\item \textsuperscript{671} Davison, Graeme, ‘What Makes a Building Historic?’, pp.69-71. To Davison’s statement about buildings being linked to famous people and events, we could also add famous ‘nationalities’.
\item \textsuperscript{672} Grimwade Papers, 15/3, Russell Grimwade to the Town Clerk, City of Melbourne, 18 April 1940.
\end{itemize}
Illustration 40
Cooks' Cottage Being Dismantled in Great Ayton for Export, 1933
Grimwade remained sensitive to the claims of the Cottage’s authenticity, and found other ways in which to attempt to give it scientific and sacred significance.\textsuperscript{674} Grimwade insisted that the Cottage be re-constructed ‘exactly as it stood when it was first occupied by Captain Cook’s parents in 1755, and doubtless as it existed when Capt. Cook himself visited them’.\textsuperscript{675} The Cottage was painstakingly dismantled and re-built with accuracy ‘to the last detail’,\textsuperscript{676} including retention of the slight lean of the roof.\textsuperscript{677} (Illustration 41) In upholding both the imperial and material purity of the project, all materials for the re-construction of the Cottage were imported from England,\textsuperscript{678} contrasting with the Shrine’s use of Australian materials. The ivy attached to the Cottage was re-rooted and transported to Australia,\textsuperscript{679} bolstering the Cottage’s imperial and domestic purity. To Grimwade, the legitimacy of the project had come to rise and fall on the closeness of its physical and material imitation of the original, which gave it veneers of ‘naturalness’ and ‘scientific factualness’. The Cottage became an antiquarian endeavour, encouraging conservatism and reverence for the past, and indicating a characteristic modern language of history-making.\textsuperscript{680}

The things inside the Cottage were to properly represent ‘Cook’s time’.\textsuperscript{681} A York antique dealer was commissioned to select ‘various pieces of furniture of the correct period’,\textsuperscript{682} defined as between 1700 and 1750.\textsuperscript{683} A table, panel back seat, desk, six spindle chairs, two arm chairs and a small dresser and back were procured for the

\textsuperscript{673} Grimwade Papers, 15/3, Russell Grimwade to Richard Linton, Agent-General for Victoria, 23 July 1935.
\textsuperscript{674} Healy, Chris, \textit{Ruins of Colonialism}, p.36. The ‘scientific’ and ‘sacred’ may be seen as contiguous in two ways: that modern conceptions of science had bestowed upon that discipline a sacred significance, and that always running in parallel with the ‘scientific’ study of history was its secular but overtly missionary purpose, for which it required the construction of ‘icons’ in the original sense of the term. See Macintyre, Stuart and Thomas, Julian, \textit{Discovery of Australian History}, esp.pp.11,13,22,81,90.
\textsuperscript{675} Grimwade Papers, 15/5, Brierley, Rutherford and Syme, Architects to Richard Linton, Agent-General for Victoria, October 1933.
\textsuperscript{676} Grimwade Papers, 15/8, \textit{Sunday Sun}, 3 September 1933.
\textsuperscript{677} Grimwade Papers, 15/8, \textit{The Argus}, 16 October 1934.
\textsuperscript{678} Grimwade Papers, 15/8, \textit{The Herald}, 19 October 1933.
\textsuperscript{679} Grimwade Papers, 15/3.
\textsuperscript{680} Davison, Graeme, ‘Use and Abuse’, pp.56,66-70.
\textsuperscript{681} Grimwade Papers, 15/8, \textit{Argus}, 9 October 1933.
\textsuperscript{682} Grimwade Papers, 15/3, List of accounts, 24 July 1934.
\textsuperscript{683} Grimwade Papers, 15/3, Richard Linton, Agent-General for Victoria to Russell Grimwade, 29 August 1933.
The Key to the Assembly of Cook's Cottage

A plan of Captain Cook's cottage handed over by Mr Russell Grimwade (the donor) to Messrs Stephenson and Meldrum (the architects) showing how the cottage appeared on its original ground at Great Ayton (Yorkshire). Each piece of the cottage was carefully numbered before being packed and the positions of the pieces are shown in the plan. This will ensure that the building is correctly restored.

Illustration 41
The Key to Assembly of Cooks' Cottage, 1934
Courtesy University of Melbourne Archives
Cottage, while the antique dealer also 'kindly included a gift...of a child’s chair'. These objects had nothing to do with Cook, but were seen as important to the integrity of the initiative. They lent it an ‘authentic’ aura which the project was having difficulty sustaining otherwise.

Grimwade and others often suggested that the overriding function of the Cottage was as a museum, especially during the public controversy about Cook’s association with it. Evoking the nineteenth-century idea of object lessons, Grimwade wrote to the Town Clerk of Yorkshire:

> It is hoped that it will become the repository for articles connected with the great man, so that his name will come to be revered by the rising generations of Australians who are now dependent on written history rather than the hearsay that was available to our forebears in this young country.

Thus while we here see the characteristic materialism of other Centenary history projects which Grimwade encouraged, he also explicitly bemoaned their very languages, including the documentary methodology of the youthful present. There was a call for items associated with Cook, to which many people responded. Donations included ‘two pieces of tappa or native cloth made by Polynesian women...a Maori pendant’, a ‘typical paddle of Maori workmanship of the period when Cook made his voyages’, a map of the world tracing Cook’s voyages, a tea caddy which Captain Cook allegedly had made for his mother and which Grimwade described as ‘quite the most authentic

684 Grimwade Papers, 15/5.
685 Grimwade Papers, 15/3, Richard Linton, Agent-General for Victoria to the Premier of Victoria, 1 March 1934.
687 See, for example, Grimwade Papers, 15/5, English press release by Richard Linton, Agent-General for Victoria, circa 5 July 1933, 5/3 Russell Grimwade to Richard Linton, Agent-General for Victoria, 23 July 1935 and 15/1, Russell Grimwade to Town Clerk of Melbourne, 29 January 1936.
688 Grimwade Papers, 15/2, Russell Grimwade to Preston Kitchen, Yorkshire Town Clerk, 11 September 1934. Also see footnote 162. Grimwade obviously felt and bemoaned the disjunction between social memory and modern historical methods.
689 Grimwade Papers, 15/3, AS Kenyon to Russell Grimwade, 22 September 1934.
690 Grimwade Papers, 15/3, Richard Linton, Agent-General for Victoria to Premier, 3 May 1934. The first three items were presumably booty taken from the invaded people.
691 Grimwade Papers, 15/3.
and valuable gift that has been made by anybody and items said to have been made from a stringboard to which the ‘Resolution’ was moored. Other items offered included a telescope allegedly used by Cook to observe the transit of Venus, a mahogany chair ‘which came off Capt. Cook’s original boat in which he discovered Australia’, a china mug ‘which was presented to my mother by Mrs Cook’, a writing table, some buttons ‘that came off two of Captain Cook’s coats’, a ‘nice corner cupboard which belonged to Capt. Cook’ and a bureau and a spy-glass. The vendor of the last two items had signed an affidavit as to their authenticity. Each artefact was offered with its own story of provenance, some extremely convoluted. Some wanted significant amounts of money for their wares; others offered donations.

The items were referred to interchangeably as ‘ornaments’ and ‘relics’. Certainly they acted as antiquarian props, but like the Cottage itself, each was also claiming to carry Cook’s spirit. The claims relied heavily on oral testimony and memory, and to this extent proved more comfortable for Grimwade and his cohorts than the need for documentary evidence to prove Cook’s physical visitation to the Cottage. Nevertheless, given the amount and eclecticism of the things which were offered, all of which were said to carry Cook’s spirit, the material represented a complex and probably irresolvable equation between assertion, social memory, history and money-making.

692 Grimwade Papers, 15/3, Russell Grimwade to the Secretary to the Premier, 22 August 1934
693 Grimwade Papers, 15/3, inventory.
694 Grimwade Papers, 15/5, H.L. Newman to Richard Linton, Agent-General for Victoria, 10 October 1933.
695 Grimwade Papers, 15/5, John Kealey to Richard Linton, Agent-General for Victoria, n.d.
696 Grimwade Papers, 15/5, Mrs MA Plowman to Richard Linton, Agent-General for Victoria, 24 August 1933.
697 Grimwade Papers, 15/5, Thomas B. Tittenson to Richard Linton, Agent-General for Victoria, 2 July 1933.
698 Grimwade Papers, 15/5, Percy J. Barrow for Mrs Arbery to Richard Linton, Agent-General for Victoria, 21 July 1933.
699 For example, Grimwade Papers, 15/2, list of artefacts.
700 For example Grimwade Papers, 15/2, from Director of Australian Trade Publicity in London, 23 January 1934.
701 Walden, Imara, ‘Cook’s Cottage’, pp.221,224.
From the announcement of the Cottage’s purchase, the next six months saw a great deal of public controversy about its ‘proper and fitting’ location.\textsuperscript{702} By September 1933, many prominent citizens had made suggestions. These included near the Cook statue on the St Kilda foreshore, many public gardens including Parliament and Fitzroy, and both inside and outside the Public Library, Museum and Art Gallery, amongst many other now well-established monumental conglomerations.\textsuperscript{703} (Illustrations 42 - 43)

Apart from the Cottage’s final resting place in the Fitzroy Gardens, the only suggestion to receive sustained public attention was its placement both in and outside the Public Library, Museum and Gallery. In October 1933 Russell Grimwade attended a meeting of the Tee Square Club of Melbourne, which he described to the Premier as consisting ‘of artists, architects and gentlemen who depend for their livelihood upon the exercise of good taste’. They resolved:

that the cottage was most definitely a “museum piece” and should be committed to the care of the Gallery Trustees who are responsible for the maintenance of the national treasures, that being a museum piece it should be housed inside the building and not outside,\textsuperscript{704}

thus asserting its form as an historical artefact over its monumentalism. In November 1933, however, the Premier put the proposal to the Board of Trustees, which approved the placement of the Cottage in front of the entrance to the Library on the north lawn, near Redmond Barry’s statue, thus asserting its monumentalism over its historical materialism. The oscillation over the Cottage’s position reflects its timing on the cusp between monumentalism and modernism in public history’s language.

When made public, the decision caused major press controversy.\textsuperscript{705} Grimwade was adamant that the decision was right:

\textsuperscript{702} Grimwade Papers, 15/3, Russell Grimwade to Richard Linton, Agent-General for Victoria, 27 September 1933.
\textsuperscript{703} Grimwade Papers, 15/8, The Herald, 23 September 1933.
\textsuperscript{704} Grimwade Papers, 15/2, Russell Grimwade to Sir Stanley Argyle, Premier of Victoria, 23 October 1933.
A site for Captain Cook's Cottage is proposed in the triangular garden on the south side of Parliament House, which at present contains a fountain and the statue of General Gordon. The picture shows how the garden would appear with the cottage in position.

Illustration 42
Cooks' Cottage Superimposed in Gordon Square, 1933
Courtesy University of Melbourne Archives
Illustration 43
Cooks’ Cottage Superimposed near Cook Statue in St. Kilda, 1933
Courtesy University of Melbourne Archives
This institution houses the valuable possessions of the people of Victoria, there is ample room, the setting it would have there is not uncongenial, and it has clearly been shown by scale drawings that it would not conflict with the design of the existing buildings.\textsuperscript{706}

*The Herald* agreed that ‘[T]he Cottage is a “Museum piece” rather than a picturesque or architectural ornament’.\textsuperscript{707} A Library Trustee, Fred Eggleston, urged tolerance: ‘I feel certain that once the mind gets used to the incongruity it will be inspired by the contrast’.\textsuperscript{708}

Others disagreed. Mr Shirlow, a Gallery Trustee who had earlier pledged to support Grimwade’s proposal, said:

The Cottage might look romantic in Yorkshire, but a whole pile of rubbish cluttering up the lawn would be anything but sentimental...The imposing facade of the building would be spoiled by this squalid little building in front,\textsuperscript{709}

while others called the decision ‘preposterous’ and an ‘aesthetic abomination’.\textsuperscript{710}

(*Illustrations 44 - 45*)

The Cottage exposed the tension between historic artefacts on the one hand and aesthetic values on the other. Boosters were confused as to whether to treat the Cottage monumentally, as its theme would suggest, or whether to treat it as a domestic, nostalgic artefact, as its form would suggest. The ‘good taste’ of the men of the Tee Square Club was seen as an exercise in bad taste by many other ‘good taste’ men. The history the Cottage enshrined was forgotten, and the classic aesthetic of the monumental conglomerations gained precedence;\textsuperscript{711} the architectural contrast between the classic facade of the Library on the one hand, and the relatively humble eighteenth-century

\textsuperscript{705} Grimwade Papers, 15/3, Russell Grimwade to Richard Linton, Agent-General for Victoria, 27 September 1933.

\textsuperscript{706} Grimwade Papers, 15/3, Russell Grimwade to Richard Linton, Agent-General for Victoria, 27 September 1933.

\textsuperscript{707} Grimwade Papers, 15/8, *The Herald*, 23 September 1933.

\textsuperscript{708} Grimwade Papers, 15/8, 27 September 1933.

\textsuperscript{709} Grimwade Papers, 15/8, *The Sun*, 22 September 1933.

\textsuperscript{710} Grimwade Papers, 15/8, *The Sun*, 23 October 1933.

Illustration 44
Cooks’ Cottage Superimposed in Front of Public Library, 1934
Courtesy University of Melbourne Archives
Illustration 45
If Cooks’ Cottage Gets Placed in Front of the Library, Where Will it all End?, 1934
Courtesy University of Melbourne Archives
English rural cottage was too stark for many. The Cottage, instead, was assigned a domestic, nostalgic setting, reflecting its modern, antiquarian form. In December 1933, Grimwade bowed to the public’s desire,\textsuperscript{712} and the City of Melbourne agreed to place the Cottage in Fitzroy Gardens.\textsuperscript{713} (Illustration 46)

Overall, the Cottage initiative received strong public support throughout its development and upon opening by the Premier in October 1934.\textsuperscript{714} Grimwade wrote that ‘it seems to have won popular fancy judging by the hundreds of letters and expressions that have come my way’.\textsuperscript{715} Upon opening, the Cottage received masses of visitors—estimated as 600 per day in 1936\textsuperscript{716}—and continued to do so for many years. The extent of visitors caused maintenance and security problems, and forced Grimwade to abandon his wish to make the Cottage a museum for fear of vandalism and theft.\textsuperscript{717}

Ironically, its popularity forced Grimwade to compromise on his definition of the public for whom the Cottage was offered. Due to the overwhelming visitor numbers, he came to believe that it was important ‘to exercise a selection of the visitors who enter’,\textsuperscript{718} and suggested the introduction of an entrance fee to assist in discriminating between ‘earnest visitors and historians [who] deserve some preference over idle and curious people who are merely taking advantage of a free show’.\textsuperscript{719} It might also be seen as revealing a contradictory rhetoric which we also saw in the 1888 Exhibition and with Redmond Barry’s politics and monument: a democratic claim to be for everyone, regardless and indeed perhaps because of their presumed level of ignorance, co-existing with a sense that it is ultimately for those who are already able to bring the proper earnestness and

\textsuperscript{712} Grimwade Papers, 15/3, Russell Grimwade to the Honourable J. Hume Cook, 19 October 1934.
\textsuperscript{713} Grimwade Papers, 15/1.
\textsuperscript{714} Many businesses in both England and Australia donated their time, labour and support, some stating that it was an honour to do so. The Australian Government waived sales tax for its importation. The Argus, 16 October 1934, p.10; Grimwade Papers, 15/3, Maine Carrying Company Pty. Ltd. to the Premier of Victoria, 31 January 1934.
\textsuperscript{715} Grimwade Papers, 15/3, Russell Grimwade to Richard Linton, Agent-General for Victoria, 19 October 1934.
\textsuperscript{716} Grimwade Papers, 15/1, Report by Melbourne City Council, 16 December 1936.
\textsuperscript{717} Grimwade Papers, 15/1, Russell Grimwade to the Premier of Victoria, 20 November 1936.
\textsuperscript{718} Grimwade Papers, 15/3, Russell Grimwade to Captain Peters, 12 April 1935.
\textsuperscript{719} Grimwade Papers, 15/1, Russell Grimwade to Town Clerk, City of Melbourne, 6 February 1935.
Illustration 46
Captain Cook's Cottage, 1939
Courtesy La Trobe Picture Collection, State Library of Victoria
appreciation to bear on the subject matter. Certainly, Grimwade’s gesture of defining a hierarchical audience or citizenry for his venture may have signalled his loss of faith in history’s monumental project, and thus the need for all citizens to encounter it.

The immediacy of the success of the Cottage bore witness to the strength and breadth of the Captain Cook legend already in the public imagination, and testified to the success of monumental historical methods elsewhere in fulfilling their didactic and imaginative functions. With regard to Cook’s association with the Cottage, perhaps people’s desire to believe was stronger than their concern about the absolute ‘authenticity’ of the claims. In the scheme of things, the Cottage itself was a rather late and novel addition to the Cook liturgy,\textsuperscript{720} and its didactic function was less important for makers and consumers alike than its sentimental, symbolic and imaginative roles. Indeed, the boosters’ exhortations for the present generation at the Cottage’s opening were modest compared to what we have seen in earlier cases, and referred to the Cottage as opposed to the Cook himself. The Premier stated that ‘[T]he task of the present generation was to see that this precious cottage was cared for and protected as a valuable link with the past’.\textsuperscript{721}

People may have patronised the Cottage for reasons of curiosity, nostalgia, sentiment and aesthetics, reflecting a generalised modern public relationship with the past \emph{per se}.\textsuperscript{722} The Cottage may have let them into a fascinating imaginative space ‘about the social history of British working-class village life in the second half of the eighteenth century’,\textsuperscript{723} even though its portrayal of this scenario was also questionable. Its success was probably due to all these reasons, rather than the exact realisation of the history-makers’ ideals in the public’s patronage of the Cottage, and like the other public history projects we have seen, points to a more general tension between the official rhetoric of the history-makers, and the characteristics of the public’s patronage.

\textsuperscript{720} Walden, Imara, ‘Cook’s Cottage’, pp.221,225.
\textsuperscript{721} The Age, 16 October 1934, p.8.
\textsuperscript{722} Lowenthal, David, \emph{Foreign Country}, esp. pp.35-124; see also Healy, Chris, \emph{Ruins of Colonialism}, p.40.
\textsuperscript{723} Walden, Imara, ‘Cook’s Cottage’, p.228.
Grimwade became disenchanted with the management of the Cottage. The Melbourne City Council refused to appoint a caretaker to assist in telling the story of the Cottage and to maintain repairs and guard against theft and vandalism. A 1936 Report found that there was ‘congestion, confusion and unsatisfactory conditions’, and Grimwade demanded that the Melbourne City Council ‘devise a means of exhibiting it and its contents in keeping with what I believe to be the wishes of the citizens of this State’. In late 1936 Grimwade returned from an overseas visit to find that the Council had ‘mutilated’ the Cottage by adding a wall which ‘callously disregarded [its] antiquarian value’. ‘I spared neither pains nor expense to rebuild the Cottage here with complete historical accuracy’, Grimwade wrote to the Premier. Thus, according to Grimwade, the antiquarianism which had legitimated the project for him was also being corrupted, and he refused further involvement in it.

Conclusion
The history-making around the 1934 Centenary Celebrations indicated shifts to a modern public historical language. In the first place, there was less of it in the central civic sphere. History-making had been decentralised, localised, popularised and institutionalised, some of which was reflected in the major forms of Centenary history-making, such as books and exhibitions. It was an accident of timing that the Centenary occurred, impelling another round of history-making and the reassertion of the central civic sphere to enact some of those histories, and further, that it happened in the wake of the Depression, which amplified the question of the relationship between the past and the present. Unlike the 1888 Exhibition, many of the history-making forms were playful and unapologetically theatrical: history’s gravitas was not carried into the 1934

724 Grimwade Papers, 15/1, Russell Grimwade to Town Clerk, City of Melbourne, 29 January 1936.
725 Grimwade Papers, 15/1, Russell Grimwade to Premier of Victoria, 21 December 1936.
726 Grimwade Papers, 15/1, Russell Grimwade to Town Clerk, City of Melbourne, 29 January 1936.
727 Grimwade Papers, 15/1, Russell Grimwade to Albert Dunstan, Premier of Victoria, 21 December 1936.
728 Grimwade Papers, 15/1, Russell Grimwade to Albert Dunstan, Premier of Victoria, 20 November 1936.
729 Grimwade Papers, 15/4, Russell Grimwade to the Premier of Victoria, 19 January 1937.
Centenary Celebrations like it was in 1888, reflecting a distancing between the past and the present in 1934.

The Centenary’s histories concentrated on the distant past, not historicising the present, and on the rural past, rather than metropolitan history, as we saw in our earlier case studies. In the use of the distant past, however, the pioneer trope emerged in its more democratic, generalised sense of ‘first generation’, and history-makers gave another reluctant bow to democracy when they granted women attenuated entry into the state’s historical terrain. The emphasis in the Centenary’s history-making language on the distant past was shared with one of the Centenary’s two ‘accidental’ history-making ventures, Cooks’ Cottage, which took the viewer on a nostalgic trip back to an eighteenth-century English pastoral idyll—a ‘foreign country’, if you like.

Indeed, it was Russell Grimwade’s very concern, both generational and political, about the impact of modernity, that prompted his initiative. He desired a return to a simpler relationship between social memory and history, where the juncture between sentiment and fact was less problematic and less subject to the modern demands for and methodologies of proof. He wanted history to return to epic, seamless nation-making narrative—a resurrection of history’s ‘romance’—of which Cook had long been imperial history-makers’ chief subject. The Cottage and the museum objects were to convey the spirit of Cook, and the materialist focus was to work in the more nineteenth-century sense of object lessons. Grimwade was on his most comfortable ground with the artefacts, because they represented an intersection between assertion, social memory and history which modernity had not yet interrupted.

The Cottage’s main sponsors found the modern demands of public history-making burdensome to their monumental intentions, and felt their way in response to the modern history-making conventions implied in the Cottage’s form. They deployed antiquarian methodologies—the ‘science’ of dating, exact reconstruction and a purist approach to the use of materials, and its establishment in a floral setting of English provenance—to place the Cottage’s ‘accuracy’ and ‘authenticity’ beyond dispute,
foretelling of the hallmarks of the modern heritage movement which emerged in Australia after WWII.

Cooks’ Cottage exposed the possibility of tension between historic material on the one hand and the classical aesthetic of monumental conglomerations on the other. The tension between history and aesthetics had been evident in public history projects we have seen previously. In the instance of the Cottage, the classical aesthetic of the monumental conglomeration gained precedence over the monumental historical message, and Cooks’ Cottage was relegated to a domestic setting, signalling a form and a methodology of public history-making which would predominate in a post-settler, post-monumental environment.

The Centenary’s other ‘accidental’ project, the Shrine of Remembrance, addressed a determinedly contemporary nation-making narrative which focussed on and mourned the contribution of the nation’s youth to progress, reversing the generational sequence common to monumental history. It demanded that the thousands of War participants be enshrined, by name, as the nation’s foundation historical actors. It was a troubling nation-making narrative, underlining contemporary mass loss as an outcome of the nation-building project, whereas Cook’s story was always presented as one man’s monumental sacrifice in the name imperial conquest. The Shrine had popular though conservative public backing, and it was almost a communal movement—the metropolitan equivalent of the local war memorial movement—which obliged Melbourne’s civic planners to acknowledge the contemporary foundation narrative in an overwhelming monumental form. The Shrine came to represent the last and grandest use of Melbourne’s central civic sphere for history made in the monumental genre, but now represented the nation’s progress as a massive tomb—a major site for modern displays of public grief and suffering.
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