

Response: DOUGLAS L. OLIVER
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

A word from the defendant's dock: There is nothing rejoinderish I want to add to Tom Harding's pertinent response to the criticisms leveled against my book. On the contrary, I acknowledge those criticisms, in the hope that the reviewers will avoid my errors and oversights when they get around to writing the kind of book they think I should have written—or should not even have tried to write.

First, I regret that the book's revisions and additions were, as charged, not "extensive" enough to merit publication. (How extensive is "extensive"?)

Second, I deplore the book's factual errors and infelicities, including: the beginning of French rule in Tahiti—which was 1842, not 1843; the mistaken notion that LMS resolutions originated in "Essex Hall"; the lack of an index entry for "administrators"; the Sullivanizing of "Sutherland"; the use of an outdated orthography for the names of certain Islanders; and some inconsistencies in the gender of pronouns (I never feel comfortable with "person").

And third, I apologize to the reviewers for what they call my ceramic (i.e., "potted") style of history writing, and for my pinched treatment, or omission, of some of *their* favorite topics—such as cargo cults, the convolutions of Maori-Pakeha relations, the jolly cooperative side of labor recruiting, and the "culture" of Hawaii in mid-century. (I do not apologize, however, for ending the book's time frame at 1950, which its preface firmly declared it would do.) It is my hope that the writer of the next general history of the region will possess more knowledge and wisdom than I have about those and countless other "vital" aspects of the region's history—and that he/she will find a publisher willing to produce and market a volume two or three times longer than mine (and one that undergraduates can be induced to read).