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Introduction

The Hilo High School affair began as a feud between a principal and a new female teacher, but eventually involved the town, students, Department of Public Instruction, and Federal Grand Jury. The controversy escalated and unfolded over a period of ten months starting in October of 1910 and ending in August of 1911. Although the affair concluded with neither side emerging victorious it revealed much about the social structure of the 'local' White community in Hilo, the dynamics surrounding the New Woman in Hawai‘i, the importance of teachers, the shortcomings of the Department of Public Instruction, and the racial power structure in Hawai‘i. In addition, the conclusion showed who held power in the community, and that the officials intended to uphold the 'local', gender, and racial power hierarchies that composed the social fabric of Hilo.

This paper analyzes the events in the affair as they unfold through time and the chapters are organized around significant events in the controversy. The six chapters are The Americanization of Hilo, The New Woman of Hilo, The Investigations of the Department of Public Instruction, The Hearing Before the Commissioners of Public Instruction, The Federal Grand Jury Investigation, and The Summer of 1911. Each chapter examines different aspects of the thesis as they are revealed by the events in the chapter.

This paper does not refute the theses of the secondary source documents that it utilizes, but instead elaborates upon the authors' work. The main secondary sources on the New Woman that this paper uses include Dorothy Schneider's *American Women in the Progressive Era*, John Whiteclay Chambers II's *The Tyranny of Change*, and Martha H. Patterson's *The American New Woman Revisited*. However, none of these sources specifically discussed the dynamics surrounding the New Woman in Hawai‘i, and to date there has been no comprehensive work done on the New Woman in Hawai‘i. This paper differs from previous scholarship on the New Woman in that it examines her role in Hawai‘i, and how her life differed from her sisters on the mainland. The two main secondary sources that this paper uses to understand the education system in colonial Hawai‘i are Eileen H. Tamura's *Americanization, Acculturation, and Ethnic Identity*, and
Maenette K.P. Benham and Ronald H. Heck's *Culture and Educational Policy in Hawai‘i*. This paper heavily relies upon the work in these two books, and elaborates upon many of the ideas espoused in these works. For background information on Hilo the paper uses Sally Merry's *Colonizing Hawai‘i*, and this work served as base for understanding some of the intricacies of the Hilo community in the late nineteenth and into the early twentieth century.

The primary sources utilized for this project include personal letters, letters to education officials, newspaper articles, Commissioner of Public Instruction records, and tourist pamphlets.

The Americanization of Hilo introduces the two main protagonists, Mary Compton and Frank A. Richmond, and discusses the colonial world of Hilo. Compton was a college educated New Woman who had been raised in large Progressive mainland cities and was a teacher at Toledo University. In the summer of 1910, she was recruited by Richmond to relocate to rural Hilo and teach English at the new high school. Although neither side ever specified how Richmond described the city or the school to her, this chapter describes Hilo as the outside world saw it. To recreate Hilo from the perspective of an outsider the chapter discusses the two seemingly different, but mutually reinforcing images of the city that both served to support and sustain colonialism. The first image of Hilo justified colonialism by portraying Native Hawaiians as uncivilized and incapable of self government. The second image sold Hilo to the outside world as an all-American town to encourage further White settlement and support the developing tourist industry. By using this method this paper attempts to understand Hilo from the perspective of an outsider such as Compton, and what could have motivated her to relocate to a city that was so different from her life in Toledo and Chicago. Whereas the chapter does not answer how Compton viewed the city before she arrived, it does describe the images of Hilo that would have been available to her.

The New Woman of Hilo looks at Compton's early life in Hilo from September of 1910 to March of 1911, and the events that occurred before the controversy came to the majority of the public's attention. This chapter focuses on showing what constituted acceptable female gender behavior in colonial Hilo, a role that a New Woman could play
in a colonial setting, and the consequences for a newcomer who became involved in a feud with established community members. Compton's early life in Hilo revealed that it was unacceptable for women to adhere to the less constricted sexuality enjoyed by many women on the mainland, that the New Woman could be an agent of colonialism, and that newcomers who threatened established community members faced social ostracism. By threatening established community members and challenging the local standards of female gender propriety Compton damaged her reputation and threatened her position as an educator.

Chapter 3, The Investigations of the Department of Public Instruction, examines the two investigations conducted by Inspector General T. H. Gibson and Superintendent Willis T. Pope from late March of 1911 to early April of 1911. These investigations showed that the department did not possess a procedure to conduct an investigation, and that the officials intended to uphold the 'local', racial, and gender hierarchies that made up the social power structure in Hilo. Whereas the investigations were supposed to resolve the situation they were unable to do so, and Gibson's investigation made the situation much worse. Both investigations were criticized by the general public for not conducting their investigation according to an established procedure. Moreover, the shortcomings of Gibson's investigation resulted in a student strike and a petition from the parents of the students demanding an additional investigation. Finally, the investigators discovered a plethora of charges against Richmond and Compton that characterized them as immoral individuals and the incorrect people to Americanize the youth of Hilo. Richmond was accused of sexually assaulting two of his female students and the Lewis maid, of being engaged in consensual relationships with two of his staff members, and of abusing intoxicating liquor. It was alleged that Compton had enjoyed a hula from her male students, kept company unchaperoned with men, and was responsible for the student strike. Although the final decision would come from the Commissioners of Public Instruction the investigations showed who held power in Hilo, and that the department's officials did not intend to challenge the power hierarchies that composed the social structure of Hilo.

The Hearing Before the Commissioners of Public Instruction occurred over a
period of a few days at the end of April, and was ultimately unable to resolve the situation to the satisfaction of the general public. This fourth chapter focuses on the methodology employed by the commissioners, and the manner in which both sides were able to defend their charges and answer questions. Newspapers reported that many of Richmond's charges did not withstand questioning, but that the charges made by Compton and her supporters did. Despite this fact Richmond was acquitted of all charges, and Compton was found guilty of insubordination, a non-fireable offense. The verdict showed that the department needed a better method to dismiss its teachers, and that the commissioners intended to maintain the various power hierarchies in Hilo.

The Federal Grand Jury investigation commenced in late April of 1911 and although it reached a “verdict” in early May, the controversy surrounding the jury's “verdict” was not resolved until early August. It is unclear why the affair went before the Federal Grand Jury, but it is likely that it was due to the public disdain with the Commissioners of Public Instruction's findings. Although the Federal Grand Jury investigation is the least documented event in the affair, this chapter shows that the public was dissatisfied with the Department of Public Instruction, there was gender prejudice against Compton, and that Richmond may have been guilty.

The final chapter, The Summer of 1911, discusses how the controversy continued to impact the lives of some who were involved, and that the affair changed the Department of Public Instruction. That summer the Department of Public Instruction passed a series of regulations that clarified what constituted a fireable offense for a teacher and created a procedure to dismiss its teachers. The chapter also shows that the controversy continued to impact the staff at Hilo High School and one of the students who accused Richmond of sexual assault. Almost the entire staff at the high school was dismissed that summer, but the department never clarified why it came to this decision. Moreover, one of the students who claimed that Richmond had sexually assaulted her was not allowed to graduate. This student stated that her record was altered by the department to punish her for testifying against Richmond. The student in question was Japanese, and if her allegations were true it revealed that the department may have been punishing her for upsetting the racial status quo. Whereas there are no records to show
what happened to this student it is unlikely that she was able to graduate from high school. The events in the summer of 1911 showed that the affair changed the department, and that the affair continued to negatively impact the lives of many who were involved.

The Hilo High Affair is about a moment in time that reveals much about the 'local', racial, and gender power hierarchies that were a part of the social fabric of colonial Hilo and Hawai‘i. Compton's early life in Hilo showed what constituted acceptable behavior for a women in a colonial atmosphere, that the New Woman was an agent of colonialism, and that outsiders who challenged the social structure of the 'local' White community in Hilo faced social ostracism. Inspector Gibson and Superintendent Pope's investigations highlighted that the department did not possess a procedure to conduct an investigation of that nature, and more importantly, that the department intended to uphold the social power structures that supported colonialism. In addition, the charges that the investigators uncovered against the teachers highlighted the importance of teachers in maintaining a moral character and their role in the Americanization project. The Commissioner of Public Instruction's hearing called attention to the fact that the department needed a better procedure to solve disagreements, and their verdict showed that the commissioner also did not intend to challenge the 'local', racial, and gender power hierarchies that were part of social structure of Hilo. Public disdain over the commissioner's findings was the likely reason the affair went before the Federal Grand Jury, but although the jury believed that Richmond was guilty for unknown reasons they decided not to indite him for a crime. Finally, the following summer underscored the extent to which the affair changed the Department of Public Instruction, and that the controversy continued to negatively impact the lives of some who were involved. The affair's conclusion showed who held power, and that the officials intended to sustain the 'local', gender, and racial power hierarchies that composed the social structure in colonial Hilo.
Chapter I

The Americanization of Hilo

“Hilo is to-day the “Paradise of the Pacific!” What Honolulu was, years ago and still claims to be, Hilo is.”¹

Mary Compton

In mid September of 1910 Mrs. Mary Stevens Compton boarded a ship from San Francisco to begin a new job as an English teacher at Hilo High School in the Territory of Hawai‘i. Mrs. Compton was originally from Toledo, Ohio, had graduated from the University of Chicago in 1907,² was a Mason's widow, and was described as young and attractive. Although Mary Compton had been married it is unknown when her husband had died, how long they were married, and if this event was a factor in her decision to move to Hilo. Moreover, despite the fact that she was a widow individuals in Hilo still perceived her as a young, attractive woman. After graduating Compton taught at Toledo University and worked with Henry Holt and Company on grammar textbooks. During the summer of 1910 Compton was in Chicago where she “learned of the position in Hilo offered by Mr. Richmond who was a visitor at the University looking for a teacher.” Compton stated that “when the position was first offered to me I refused it, but after meeting Mr. Richmond and talking the matter over with him I decided to accept.”³ No motivations or reasons were provided as to why she left a position teaching at an established university for a small, rural, territorial high school.


Considering the known previous residences of Mary Compton it is surprising she moved to a small, developing, territorial town like Hilo with a population of only 20,000.\(^4\) The city of her birth, Toledo was imagined in the nineteenth century to “be the ‘Future Great City of the World,’” and beginning in the twentieth century “rose to national prominence” due to the city's adoption of Progressive Era reforms. Toledo boasted good government reforms, and in “the first two decades of the 20\(^{th}\) century produced improvements that made Toledo a more livable city.” These improvements “included the founding of the Toledo Museum of Art, the creation of new amusement parks made accessible by inter-urban transportation lines, the promotion of the women's suffrage movement, the beginnings of a strong labor movement, and the establishment of many social service agencies to assist the poor.”\(^5\) Compton had also resided in Chicago, another large progressive city that had housed the World's Fair in 1893 where “people came from all over the country to marvel at the achievements of technology and the evidence of rapid progress demonstrated at the ‘great white city.’”\(^6\)

Hilo was a town that had come under American control as a colony scarcely a decade before Mary Compton arrived, and was vastly different in many ways from her previous residences. In the mid to late nineteenth century the town was controlled by a small group of local judges and attorneys, who were mainly White men, and a few were Native Hawaiians. This group of people “had close connections to the sugar planters and many were themselves planters,” and “they generally shared the values of capitalism and work, Christian moral reformism, and hierarchical ideas of race and gender of the local elites in the community.” As there has been no research done on this group of people in Hilo in the early twentieth century it is unclear how much power they still held, but it is highly unlikely that in the beginning of the twentieth century they had relinquished their power. Moreover, into the twentieth century the plantation industry was huge in Hilo, and “ownership of the land and buildings was heavily concentrated in the hands of

---

Anglo-Saxons, despite their numerical minority.” The population breakdown of Hilo in 1915 shows that a vast majority of the population was Japanese, at about 42%, and the second largest group in Hilo were Native Hawaiians at only 16%. Although White Americans had held much of the power in Hilo in the nineteenth, and likely into the twentieth century they were one of the smaller racial groups at only 8%.

Following annexation in 1898, in the early twentieth century, Hilo was home to an emerging White middle class who had immigrated from the mainland. These individuals were not part of the established “old resident” population, but a few did come to occupy a position of some prominence in the Hilo community.

They were engaged in more professional occupational pursuits such as owning stores, managing businesses etc. It has been argued that “early contact and labor immigration in Hilo produced two distinct patterns of racial and class subordination and consequently two rather different sets of identities.” The relationship between Native Hawaiians and the White colonists “was a classic colonial relationship,” with the Americans “seeking to transform the society of the indigenous people and subsequently wrested political control from them.” The Asian immigrant laborers, of which the Japanese were a part, ranked at the bottom of the socioeconomic ladder, and were viewed as “undesirable citizens and characterized by morally repugnant habits.” In 1909 the Japanese laborers went on strike, and were “seen as an alien threat, even as they began to make claims in American terms to equal pay for equal work.”

In order to sustain colonialism in Hawai‘i Americans created a racialized power structure with White Americans on top, and all other groups below them. Since the United States had recently colonized Hawai‘i colonialism played a major role in shaping the dynamics of the town, and the reaching affects of colonialism would become apparent during Compton's time there. Life in Hilo would be very different from the large, urban, Progressive locations that Mary Compton had previously resided in.

**The Scandal and Thesis**

Six months after she arrived in Hilo Compton was suspended from the high

---

7 Merry, *Colonizing Hawai‘i*, 118., 127., 198.
8 Hawai‘i State Archives, Department of Education, Correspondence by Subject, Series No. 261, Box No. 261-55-5, The Hilo Tribune Article, “Hilo School Closed Until Board Acts.” April 11, 1911.
9 Merry, *Colonizing Hawai‘i*, 127-134.
school, and found herself at the center of a heated public scandal. Shortly after arriving in Hilo Compton claimed that she discovered that the principal of the high school, Frank A. Richmond, was engaged in a variety of immoral behaviors. When Compton resided in the same home as Richmond she allegedly uncovered an affair between the principal and their boardinghouse lady, Mrs. Lewis, and that he had also attempted to sexually assault the boardinghouse maid. Moreover, Compton alleged that she observed Richmond abusing intoxicating liquor on numerous occasions. The other residents of the boardinghouse stated that it was not Compton's discovery of Richmond's alleged indiscretions that caused her to fall into their disfavor, but Compton's bad attitude. In addition, when the affair went public Compton's detractors denounced her controversial sexual behavior and used it to discredit her moral reputation. Whatever caused the initial conflict was not the issue, but that Compton, a newcomer, had accused established community residents of immoral behaviors. Compton's accusations against established members of the Hilo community caused her to lose her support networks, and eventually resulted in her social ostracism from the 'local' White community in Hilo. The feud continued to escalate and eventually started to impact the environment in the high school. Students stated that they observed numerous spats between Compton and her detractors in the school, and some students even alleged that they had also observed sexual interactions between Richmond and some of his staff members.

Due to the tense atmosphere in the school the Department of Public Instruction launched two largely unsuccessful investigations. The first investigation was conducted by Inspector General Thomas H. Gibson and instead of alleviating the situation, Gibson made the situation much worse. The Inspector's investigation had culminated in the suspension of Mary Compton, but this conclusion would not be accepted by the students of Hilo High School. Following their favorite teacher's suspension the students went on strike from school and drafted a petition to the department where they demanded another investigation. Since their children were on strike, the parents drafted their own petition to the department where they also requested an additional investigation into the conditions at the school. The shortcomings of Gibson's investigation revealed that the department did not possess any procedure to conduct an investigation, and highlighted that the
department intended to uphold 'local', gender and racial power structures that composed the social order of Hilo. Superintendent Willis T. Pope conducted the second investigation into the conditions in the high school. Pope did attempt to correct some of the criticisms waged against Gibson's investigation, but his investigation was also unable to diffuse the situation. In addition, Pope's investigation was also criticized for not utilizing pre-existing regulations, and revealed that he also intended to uphold 'local', gender and racial power structures in Hilo.

Since the department's officials did not resolve the situation in Hilo the department intended to settle the affair in a hearing presided over by the Commissioners of Public Instruction. However, this body was unable to come to a conclusion that satisfied the general public, and the affair went before the Federal Grand Jury in Honolulu for a resolution. In mid May, the Federal Grand Jury concluded its investigation where neither Compton nor Richmond emerged victorious. That summer it was revealed the extent to which the affair changed the department's policies, and that the affair continued to negatively impact the lives of some who were involved.

The Hilo High affair sheds light upon the social order of the 'local' White community in Hilo, the New Woman in Hawai‘i, the importance of the teaching profession, the Department of Public Instructions policies, and race relations in Hawai‘i. When the affair ended after ten months of turmoil it revealed the extent to which the controversy changed the Department of Public Instruction, highlighted the importance of teachers, and that the 'local', gender and racial hierarchies that composed the social structure of Hilo were maintained. Despite the eventual outcome of the affair, the events surrounding the controversy shed light upon various power hierarchies that composed the social structure of Hilo.

The social order of the 'local' White community in Hilo played an important role in Compton's social ostracism, and influenced the Department of Public Instruction's investigations. Compton was a newcomer to Hilo who accused established, well-connected community members of immoral actions. Since Compton did not possess any strong social networks in the community, the majority of the White community sided with her detractors who were established residents. This resulted in her social ostracism
from the Hilo community during the first few months that she resided there. The social order of the White community in Hilo also played a role in the department's investigations. By excluding Compton and only interviewing individuals with pre-existing social connections in the community, both investigators showed that they did not intend to challenge the social order of the White community in Hilo. Whereas it is unclear the degree to which the social order of Hilo impacted the department's hearing, the department's verdict also upheld the social structure of the 'local' White community in Hilo. This affair underscored that social connections were very important in Hilo, and that newcomers who challenged this social order did not fare well.

Compton's early life in Hilo highlighted the expectations surrounding the New Woman in a colonial setting, and how her failure to conform to acceptable female propriety was used against her by her detractors. The Progressive Era witnessed the advent of the “New Woman” who replaced Victorian notions of appropriate female behavior. The American “New Woman” represented “one of the most significant cultural shifts of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries.” She was “conceived differently in the South, North, East, and West,” occupied a range of contradictory social and economic positions, and enjoyed freedoms that her Victorian predecessors did not. No matter what occupation she was engaged in “her emergence signaled a tidal change in women's roles.”

The ascendency of the New Woman was a contentious issue, and this tension was reflected in the Hilo affair. The community's disdain towards Compton's behavior unveiled the dynamics surrounding female gender expectations in the colonial setting of Hilo. Compton's early life in Hilo showed that she embraced the less constrained sexual freedoms that were being enjoyed by many women on the mainland. However, the community's aversion towards her behavior revealed that women who embraced these new freedoms confronted an environment in Hilo that either forced them to conform to Victorian sexual norms, or face social ostracism. In addition, Compton's controversial sexual behavior was also used by her detractors to discredit her moral reputation, and in turn, tarnish the credibility of her accusations against Richmond and the Hilo High staff.

Compton's failure to adhere to acceptable female gender propriety in Hilo not only discredited her, but also threatened her position as an educator in the school.

The affair revealed the importance placed on teachers to maintain a strong moral character and their role in the Americanization project. Morality was a large issue in this controversy, and charges of immorality were made by both parties. These charges mirrored Progressive Era moral reform initiatives, and were used by both sides to discredit their adversaries' moral reputation. Since a strong moral standing was a prerequisite for obtaining a job at a territorial school, questioning an individual's morality would jeopardize their position.

Americanization was an important facet of Progressive Era education, and during the affair both Compton and Richmond were accused of not being able to properly Americanize their students. During the early first half of the twentieth century the term Americanization was used interchangeably with the term assimilation, and this concept is now referred to as Anglo-conformity. On the mainland, the Americanization campaigns targeted the recent immigrants from southern and eastern Europe, and encouraged these immigrants to “absorb the culture of the dominant, white middle class until all vestiges of their old cultures disappeared.” The goal of the mainland Americanization campaigns was that it would result “in cultural uniformity and homogenousness in the country.” Moreover, Americanizers believed that “the immigrants and their children would remain in their “places” at the bottom of the socioeconomic ladder, at least until they disappeared as recognizable cultural groups.”

In Hawai‘i the goals of Americanization were very similar, and would be used by the public schools to assist with the assimilation or cultural colonization of Hawai‘i’s youth. The driving force behind the Western education system in Hawai‘i was to assimilate the Hawaiian population to American cultural values, and to “replace Native thinking with Western thinking.” In addition, the main objective of the colonial school system was to socialize “Hawai‘i’s children to U.S. beliefs and ways of thinking” while denigrating Native Hawaiian culture. During the affair it was alleged

---

that Compton was responsible for the student strike, and had enjoyed a hula from her male students. Claiming Compton was supporting the hula or a student strike would have depicted her as the anti-thesis of Americanization efforts, and therefore not an appropriate person to be a teacher. Moreover, the Native Hawaiian culture was heavily discouraged under colonialism, and any support of Native Hawaiian cultural practices would have been viewed as subverting Americanization. The strike and general disharmony in the school made individuals question Richmond and Compton's ability to teach their students how to be proper American citizens. Finally, this affair was an embarrassment to the Americanization program. The teachers who had the responsibility to “civilize,” Americanize, and teach proper morality were charged with immoral acts and attempting to compromise the morality of their students.

Throughout the affair individuals challenged the racial power structure, but the eventual outcome showed that the authorities upheld the racial status quo which supported colonialism. An aspect of colonialism in Hawai‘i was that White Americans in the islands eventually remade “the social structure along racial lines, with themselves at the top, various Asian peoples in between, and Hawaiians at the bottom.” During this period the White community occupied the top tier of this structure, and all other racial groups were below them. Colonialism was based upon the idea of White racial superiority, and imperialists believed that it was the “White Man's Burden” to “uplift” non-White populations abroad. By charging their White principal of immoral acts the Native Hawaiian and Japanese female students challenged the established racial power structure. Although they challenged this power structure their challenge was not sustained, and the outcome revealed that this controversy upheld the racial status quo that colonialism was based upon.

Hilo's dissatisfaction with the Department of Education's inefficient procedure in conducting its investigations plagued the department during this affair, and was a reason subsequent investigations and a hearing were held. Business-like efficient management of government organizations was an important agenda for Progressives, and this agenda

---

affected nearly every aspect of the American government. However, when the Progressive agenda was applied abroad it was intricately linked with, and helped to support, colonialism. By institutionalizing Progressive policies within a colonized government, individuals were ensuring that the Hawaiian government was remade in an American image. While Hawai‘i’s government had adopted some aspects of Progressive education the affair shows that the Department of Public Instruction did not have adequate procedure to conduct investigations and dismiss its teachers. This lack of procedure made it difficult for the department to conduct the two investigations, and became a topic of public disapproval. Following the affair, the Governor of Hawai‘i did pass new regulations to clarify the dismissal of its teachers.

The Two Images of Hilo Created by Colonialism

The Hilo High School affair took place in the period following the illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy in 1893, and the controversial American annexation in 1898. The overthrow of the monarchy and the colonization of Hawai‘i had taken place scarcely a decade before Compton arrived. These major events would have continued to play an influential role in the political and social landscape, and would have shaped the way Mary Compton viewed Hawai‘i. Colonial politics created two seemingly different, but mutually reinforcing, images of Hilo that both served to support colonialism in Hawai‘i. The first image justified American colonialism in Hawai‘i by portraying the Native population as savage, uncivilized, and incapable of independence. The second image depicted Hilo as an established, American town to encourage further White settlement and tourism, and to sustain colonialism in Hawai‘i. It is unknown how Richmond described the city to Compton to convince her to take the position, but she would later accuse him of misrepresenting the city to her. However, neither party ever specified what Richmond had said to Compton that misrepresented the dynamics of the city to her.

In order to attract tourism and potential White settlers tourism literature portrayed Hilo as the quintessential progressive city, an up and coming town, and a “Paradise of the Pacific.” This characterization served to lessen White American fears that Hilo was “uncivilized” or unsafe. Individuals, unfamiliar with Hilo, could find an abundance of
information on the town in various tourism literature that described Hilo as progressive, full of opportunities, and home to only a White residential population.

According to the promotional literature, Hilo boasted the types of amenities and urban planning that were becoming commonplace during the Progressive Era. *Godfrey's handbook of Hawaii* described downtown Hilo as “cleanly and healthy; has suitable hotel accommodations, excellent water supply, a telephone and electric light system, which surpasses those in vogue in many of the larger cities of the United States, good, cheap cab service and is well policed.” A variety of local businesses existed in downtown Hilo which ranged from the Hilo Emporium where one could buy items ranging from clothing to medication, to Spreckles Hall “where theatrical and other performances are given.” In addition, the city had a public library, hospital, Masonic Hall, American style court house, churches, schools, water company, telephone company, US consulate, police headquarters, and the first class Hilo Hotel. Behind the business sector, the residential area was picturesque where “living waters present themselves everywhere; each house seems to possess a clear bright stream which is arrested in bathing houses and again liberated amongst taro patches and other vegetation of the brightest green. Here roses and castor beans alike take upon themselves the similitude of trees and here the fruits and flowers, indigenous to the soil, as well as others from far away places, flourish and bloom.”

Tourism literature marketed Hilo as a wholesome, all American town where foreigners could experience a tropical climate without forgoing the securities and amenities that were expected during the Progressive Era.

To entice potential entrepreneurs, tourists, and settlers *Godfrey's handbook of Hawaii* and the *Hawaiian Annual* advertised Hilo's recent growth, and promoted the city as the ideal place for investors. At the turn of the century Hilo experienced a population boom, and was ripe with business opportunities for entrepreneurs. In 1899 *Godfrey's handbook of Hawaii* commented on the local economy in Hilo, and stated “Within even the past two years there has been an increase in the number and size of business houses and businesses, mounting up close to half a million dollars, is now being transacted monthly with the surrounding plantations, which represent the sugar, coffee and

---

agricultural interest, and which furnishes a substantial, steady and enduring basis for the permanent prosperity of the city.”

Following the Reciprocity Treaty in 1876 Hilo had become a plantation town, and the plantation industry dominated the economy. Whereas the tourist pamphlets focused on the positive aspects of the plantation industry, they do not mention the harsh labor conditions that the plantations used. Plantations offered its immigrant laborers “low pay, grim working and living conditions, brutal treatment by lunas (overseers), and a quasi-slave contract labor system.” The plantations did not offer the most grueling work to White individuals, but instead employed Native Hawaiian, Japanese, Chinese, and Filipino workers. Therefore, the plantations helped to create a racialized hierarchy which “allocated members of each nationality to a clearly defined status with the whites virtually always at the top.”

While the plantations dominated the local economy many of Hilo’s White residents were self-employed or engaged in white collar jobs, and operated a variety of businesses in the downtown area. To further develop Hilo's economy, and establish the town as a major shipping port, the Hawaiian Annual reported that “Congress has appropriated the sum of $400,000.00 for beginning the construction of a breakwater to enclose this harbor, giving a protected area of 3,000 acres.” The Hawaiian Annual believed this project in turn would help with “drawing more trade, more people and creating new business.” Moreover, the Hilo Railroad was under construction which, according to the Hawaiian Annual, would continue to benefit Hilo by opening up more land for agriculture and allow tourists to see the natural scenery of the Big Island. As detailed by the pamphlets Hilo was a town on the rise, an investor's dream, and an ideal place for entrepreneurs to invest. These pamphlets claimed that the potential settler “would travel far before finding a place with greater natural advantages, more beautiful surroundings, superior business opportunities and pleasanter social conditions than here prevail.”

15 Ibid., 37-38.
16 Merry, Colonizing Hawai‘i, 124-127.
18 Godfrey, Godfrey’s handbook of Hawaii, 37.
To lessen racial fears, tourism literature depicted Hilo as Americanized and home to only a White residential population. Most of the street names in the city were given English names such as Pleasant St., School St., Bridge St., and Front St.\textsuperscript{19} English names replaced Hawaiian ones for many geographic locations, and as a consequence Hilo's waterfalls were renamed The Bridal Vail, Maid of the Mist, Lover's Leap, Silver Cascade, and Rainbow Falls. The renaming of Hilo's street names and geographical locations is an example of the type of cultural colonization that Hilo experienced following the American colonization of Hawaiʻi. Hilo's residential population was portrayed as “most cosmopolitan in character and includes a large portion of people of education, wealth, and refinement, hospitable to stranger and delightful neighbors and friends.”\textsuperscript{20} By only mentioning the White residential population and using English names the tourism literature recreated Hilo as American, White, and therefore a safe place for tourists to visit or foreigners to relocate.

At the same time Hilo was sold as progressive, Americanized, and full of opportunity, a second image was circulating about Hawaiʻi. To justify colonialism in countries like Hawaiʻi Americans portrayed their “colonial adventures as self-sacrificial attempts on their part to bring Christian civilization to hopeless brown heathen.”\textsuperscript{21} Rudyard Kipling promoted this mindset in his poem “The White Man's Burden,” where he encouraged Americans “to ‘“civilize” and “uplift” the non-white peoples of the world.”\textsuperscript{22} The goals of American colonialism in Hawaiʻi were the assimilation of the Native Hawaiian population into American culture, economic success of the plantation economy, and cementing of the social structure according to race with the White population on top.

Education played a vital role in the colonizing project, and was an important mechanism in implementing Americanization. The aim of education in Hawaiʻi was to Americanize the indigenous population and the Asian immigrants to American norms. To

\textsuperscript{21} Spickard, \textit{Almost All Aliens}, 252.
\textsuperscript{22} Chambers, \textit{The Tyranny of Change}, 45.
hasten the Americanization efforts in Hawai‘i English speaking, American teachers were employed to instruct the youth. In 1894 Inspector General Atkinson “discussed the qualifications of teachers, suggesting that the first requisite was a good moral character and the second was ability...it was expected that the teachers by example and tone would also teach temperance and morality—essentially, how to be good U.S. citizens.”

On the boat from San Francisco Mary Compton was accompanied by two of her future co-workers, Principal Frank Adams Richmond and Miss Etta Sandry. Principal Richmond was originally from Redlands, California, and had graduated from Leland Stanford Junior University with a degree in Zoology in 1903. Following his graduation Richmond had secured a teaching position as Vice Principal of Honolulu High School from 1904-1905, and had been the principal of Hilo High School since 1905. Miss Sandry was from an unknown location on the mainland, and was in charge of teaching commercial typewriting at the high school. All three teachers epitomized the type of educator that the Territorial Department of Education desired. They were White, American born, and would be charged with teaching their students “to read, write, and think in English as well as to believe that the right way was the U.S. way.”

The school that Mary Compton was hired to teach at contradicted the representation of Hilo which was sold to attract White tourists and settlers. Hilo High had only recently been founded in 1905, and had graduated its first senior class in June 1909. Between the classes of 1909 and 1910 only eleven students had graduated. In September of 1910 Richmond reported that the high school's total enrollment slightly surpassed sixty students. The demographics of Hilo High School are unknown, but
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Richmond did state that the majority of the students were from non-English speaking homes. Since a little less than half of Hilo's population was Japanese it is likely that the majority of the students were Japanese. In his 1910 annual report Richmond discussed the type of education offered at the school, and addressed problems with the school that included English language issues, attendance, Japanese students, and the condition of the building.

The high school offered vocational education which was “part of a concerted effort by industrial, governmental, and educational leaders to use public schools to channel youths to plantation work,” and college entrance to cater to the emerging, White middle class. Principal Richmond described the quality of education as designed “to meet the needs of the community and at the same time to maintain the standard required for college entrance.” The high school had two types of study that a pupil could pursue, college entrance or commercial. A majority of the students followed the commercial education program which included, “two years of bookkeeping, two years of shorthand, typewriting, commercial arithmetic, commercial law, commercial English, and its graduates have proved their ability to fill responsible positions in Hilo.”

According to Richmond, assisting students in achieving proper English language skills was a major complication, and was exacerbated by poor attendance from the students. In 1896, under Act 57 issues such as good attendance, and English only instruction became the norm in the public schools. Hawaiian Creole English (HCE) had started to develop in the 1890's, and many Native Hawaiians spoke HCE “instead of standard American English.” In addition, “during the first two decades of the twentieth century...(Japanese) children entered the school in Hawaii with little or no knowledge of standard English—that is, English associated with professional, middle class Americans.” Richmond lamented the students' lack of “proper” English language skills, and stated this was a serious issue within the school. He complained that “a majority of our pupils come from non-English speaking homes...To give such students sufficient command of English
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to do high school work is a momentous task imposed upon the grades.” Concerning the attendance Richmond stated many of the students attending the school came from poor homes. Richmond stated that poverty caused “to debar them from a high school education, or defer their entrance til so late that they can afford but one or two years in the High School.” To alleviate the English language issues, and lack of home study Richmond began “an after-school study period of an hour and thirty minutes.”

Richmond's second major issue with the school was that the majority of the students were of Japanese ancestry. Japanese were one of the ethnic groups that immigrated to Hawai‘i, and “provided the territory with unskilled and semiskilled labor, most of it in arduous plantation fieldwork.” They placed high emphasis on education, “because they saw schooling as an avenue into American middle-class life.” The areas surrounding Hilo were home to many plantations, and “by the early twentieth century, there were some thirteen plantations along the Hāmākua coast.” Due to the sizable amount of plantations in the area it is not surprising that Richmond reported that a majority of his pupils were Japanese. Richmond was concerned that the Japanese pupils divided “their effort between learning English in the public schools and Japanese in their own schools.” Americanizers believed that Japanese language schools “impeded good citizenship...because the schools promoted loyalty to Japan by fostering nationalism, Japanese culture, and Buddhism.” In his report Richmond commented that the state of affairs with the Japanese pupils “acts as a serious drag.”

The Hilo High School building was a relatively new structure, but Richmond described it as in need of significant repairs. In his report Richmond spent considerable time describing the state of the school:

“Its most conspicuous need is a coat of paint. The plastering is falling in many places, thus giving to the interior as well, a very dilapidated
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appearance. If sentimental and artistic considerations do not warrant repair, there is the matter of financial loss which should appeal, for the building is rapidly deteriorating. The fence about the grounds needs repair, and a concrete walk to the street is a necessity in rainy weather. The rear part of the school lot is rocky and overgrown with brush. A little blasting and grading at no great expense would render it available for playgrounds which are greatly needed."

Richmond's description of the high school bears a stark contrast to the image that was elicited to attract White tourists and settlers to Hawai‘i. *Godfrey's handbook of Hawaii* had depicted downtown Hilo as “cleanly and healthy” with all the modern amenities one could desire. While Hilo High was only a few years old it had never been painted, had a dilapidated appearance, and was already in disrepair. The people of Hilo were described as cosmopolitan, educated, wealthy, refined, and White. However, Richmond stated the majority of the student body were Japanese, poor, and did not have command of standard English. For White Americans the city was marketed as an investor's dream with a growing downtown business sector, and a permanent prosperity base provided by the plantations. By emphasizing vocational education it was clear that educational leaders did not intend for the students to capitalize on Hilo's investment opportunities. Rather, vocational education was intended to limit upward mobility by keeping students as laborers on the surrounding plantations. It is unknown if Compton subscribed to the image of Hilo as a “Paradise of the Pacific,” or in need of colonialism, civilization, and moral uplift. Whereas Compton's opinion of the city is unknown, through her role as a teacher she performed an important role in the colonial agenda by assisting with the assimilation of Hilo's youth into American cultural norms.

**Mary Compton as a New Woman**

Mary Compton's freedom to relocate to Hilo as a single woman was one of the many opportunities that had only recently started to become socially acceptable for women. She had come of age in a period when female gender roles were experiencing significant change. Throughout the late nineteenth and into the twentieth century Victorian gender expectations were declining, and a “New Woman” was emerging.

---
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While some heralded the New Woman she still had many detractors who “accused her of egotism, selfishness, self-assertion,” and “too much dirty, nasty, independence.”

No single role defined the New Woman, and she occupied a variety of contradictory positions that ranged from missionary to suffragist. However, prior to 1919 most Americans believed that the New Woman stood for the female suffrage movement. In short, the majority of Americans thought that the New Woman was trying to upset the traditional balance of power between genders. Mary Compton embodied some of the aspects of the New Woman in that she was college educated, geographically mobile, economically self-reliant, and single.

The Boat Ride to Hilo

During the trip to Hilo Compton alleged that she observed a possible relationship between Sandry and Richmond. Compton claimed that Richmond paid a lot of attention to her and her room-mate, and this particularly upset Miss Sandry who “showed signs of jealousy.” Curious why Sandry should be jealous Compton asked “him what had been his relations with her.” Richmond replied “that he had gone around with her some and written to her and they had gone to the mainland together.” Although Richmond had brushed away her suspicions Compton still “thought it strange that Miss Sandry should only stay such a short time with her mother on the mainland and that she should return on the same steamer as Richmond.” Compton further questioned his intentions by telling Richmond, “his attentions to me could not be serious.” In an attempt to further dissuade Compton’s accusations of sexual immorality Richmond told her “that he had already picked out a girl to marry.” Compton replied, “that I, too, would only marry one man.”

The exchange on the boat revealed that early in their relationship Compton was
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already questioning Richmond's moral character, and in doing so she was threatening his social position in Hilo. During this period Victorian sexual morals were being challenged, but educators were still expected to maintain a strong moral character or face dismissal. Accusing Richmond of traveling unchaperoned with Sandry placed both Sandry and Richmond outside the bounds of acceptable morality. For women, dating without a chaperone had recently started to become socially acceptable, but traveling was another thing entirely. Furthermore, insinuating that Richmond and Sandry enjoyed any type of sexual relationship would have compromised their positions at the school. Richmond's statement that he was going to marry not only dismissed Compton's accusations, but also told her that he was not challenging acceptable morality. Compton informing Richmond of her intent to marry was a way of relating that she was also morally conservative, and not contesting acceptable morality. Before they had reached Hilo Compton was already questioning her future co-workers morality, and in doing so was threatening their livelihood and challenging their integrity. Moreover, since Compton was a newcomer by questioning the morality of established citizens she was threatening the established social order of the 'local' White community in Hilo.

In late September Mary Compton arrived in Hilo, Hawai‘i to begin her new life as an English teacher in the public high school. As she arrived in Hilo she would have noticed the construction of a massive breakwater that would soon encase the Hilo harbor. This breakwater was meant to bring more business to the town and protect the harbor. A small wharf with a few stores would mark the entrance to Waianuenue St. where her new home and place of employment would lay. A large beach would encompass the front of the town, and next to its shores stood Front St., which housed a range of homes and businesses. The city was quaint, on the rise, but still miniscule in comparison to the past cities she had resided in. To the right, down the Hāmākua coast, lay the plantations where a majority of the city's economic prosperity came from. Surrounding the plantations were vast fields of sugar cane where the racialized underclass of the territory performed backbreaking work in the warm Hawai‘i weather. Scarcely a mile away from the city, next to the Wainaku mill, lay the Japanese plantation worker village called the Nakai Camp. This camp housed many Japanese plantation workers in small bamboo
dwellings with thatched roofs where whole families resided. Like most days in Hilo it was probably raining which would have blocked her view of the dormant volcano Mauna Kea. If by chance it was a rare cloudless September day she would have seen Mauna Kea looming large in the distance, framing the backdrop of the town. The scenery must have been breathtaking and exotic to her. Palm trees, coconut palms, volcanic rocks, black sand beaches, rivers, and an array of plants unseen in Toledo or Chicago. The humidity and warmth in Hilo would have been shocking in comparison to the cold weather she was used to. Leaving the ship and entering Hilo Mary Compton had no idea what trials would await her, and how the true nature of the town and her companions would shortly reveal themselves.
Chapter II
The New Woman of Hilo

“She told me that I had misrepresented things about Hilo when I engaged her for the position at the High School.”

Mary Compton's experience in Hilo revealed a role that a New Woman could play in a territory, what constituted acceptable behavior for a woman in a colonial setting, and the consequences for a newcomer who challenged the social structure of the 'local' White community in Hilo. Compton had been raised in Progressive cities on the mainland which would have exposed her to a less conservative atmosphere concerning female gender propriety. Her actions in Hilo underscored that she took advantage of the less constricted sexual, social, and economic freedoms enjoyed by the New Woman. The community's reactions towards her behavior showed what constituted acceptable behavior for women, and the consequences for a woman who did not conform to the community's female gender expectations. In Hilo it was acceptable for a woman to have a career, be educated, stay attractive, join clubs, help other woman, and be a public housekeeper. However, the community's disdain for her less constricted sexual behavior showed that in a colonial setting sexual freedom for women was still unacceptable. By not adhering to the local female gender expectations Compton was threatening the gender status quo in Hilo. Moreover, the community's reactions towards some of her more controversial behavior grew out of the scandal between herself and the principal, and was used by her detractors to discredit her accusations against established members of the community. Compton was a newcomer and almost immediately after her arrival was involved in a feud with well-connected and established residents in the community. By feuding with well-connected members of the community Compton was threatening the social order of 'local' White community in Hilo to which her detractors belonged and to which she did not. Finally, Compton's position as an educator in the community showed that in a colonial setting the New Woman could be an agent of colonialism. Compton's

clash with local gender expectations and the social structure of Hilo damaged her reputation, and in turn, tarnished her credibility and threatened her position as an educator.

**The Lewis Boardinghouse**

Mary Compton took up residence in a boardinghouse close to the school on Waianuenue St. owned by Hilo High teacher, Mrs. Hattie Lewis. The boardinghouse was also home to Principal Richmond, Hilo High teacher Jennie Allen, and household staff. While the New Woman enjoyed more liberties than preceding generations they “might not be able to move into their own apartments without damaging their reputations.”

In a time when women lacked suffrage maintaining a high moral standing in the community was vital. Besides safeguarding Compton's morality, the boardinghouse would also serve as an invaluable support system for her in Hilo. Boardinghouses “often made their own communities, including deep and lasting friendships that served as alternatives to family life for people who otherwise lacked family connections in the city.”

The residents of the boardinghouse would be Compton's family, friends, and support system while she adapted to life in Hilo. In addition, since these people had lived in Hilo for some time they would assist Compton in joining the social fabric of the White community in the town.

The boarding lady, Mrs. Lewis, was married, young, middle class, had taught music in all Hilo's public schools since 1907, and was probably not college educated. Like other middle class women of the Progressive Era Mrs. Lewis augmented her income by taking in boarders and giving music lessons. Married women from this era were “expected to keep themselves attractive,” and it was reported that “Mrs. Lewis was always bragging about her form...and told of how the dressmakers would not believe it
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was real until they had seen her stripped.”

Her husband, Jarrett Lewis, was frequently absent, and it was reported their marriage was unhappy. The Lewis cook, Margaret Andrews commented on the marriage, stating that “during the four years I lived in the home of Mrs. Lewis her husband was not there more than one year, and Mrs. Lewis seemed to care very little for him. I remember on one occasion she said to me, “Oh, I cannot bear men in my sight,” and she was constantly nagging at him to get out and go to work somewhere.”

Although Lewis was reportedly unhappy with her marriage she did not seek divorce. Due to changing views on marriage divorce rates were on the rise, and some “marriages ended when affection and respect disappeared.” Despite the rising divorce rates, divorce was still a contentious issue, and did not appear to be an option for Lewis.

Hilo High teacher Miss Jennie Allen also boarded at the Lewis home. Miss Allen was young, “head of amateur theatricals in Hilo,” and a “great friend of Mrs. Lewis.”

Her classroom faced Compton's, and they were located directly across the auditorium from each other at the school. Allen taught grammar at Hilo High, and like many territorial teachers she was not from Hawai‘i.

The maid and cook, Margaret Andrews, was a single, young woman, of unknown origins who had been employed by, and resided in the Lewis home for four years.

Domestic servants usually endured “longer hours of work, loss of control over their

---
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personal lives,” and their work was considered “a low-status job.” During the “Progressive Era only the most disadvantaged women would accept jobs as servants.”

The Public Housekeeper in a Colonial Setting

Compton's early life in Hilo revealed that she assumed the popular, female, Progressive Era role as a “public housekeeper.” American women of the Progressive Era “believed in progress,” and took their role as the guardians of virtue and morality from the private sphere into the public sphere “to improve public housekeeping.” New Woman reformers “believed that society and the race would improve if the ethics of pure, altruistic, rational woman prevailed.” This rationale was used by the New Woman for a variety of different aims such as the temperance movement, abolition of prostitution, or “civilizing” non-White populations. Compton's involvement in this role can be seen through her social position as a teacher in a colonial school, membership in a women's Christian Science Club, and willingness to aid young women. In addition, her interest in the poetry of Rudyard Kipling showed how an individual could be exposed to the message of “The White Man's Burden.” Most importantly, through her social position as a teacher in a colonial environment Compton was fulfilling the public housekeeping role. A majority of her students were not White, were characterized by the American colonizers as “uncivilized,” and were targets of the Americanization campaign. By teaching in a colonial setting Compton fulfilled the public housekeeping role in that she assisted with the assimilation of Hilo's youth into American cultural values. Through the public housekeeping role Compton showed that the New Woman could be an agent of colonialism.

Rudyard Kipling's poetry was read by Mary Compton during her first months in Hilo. Compton's friend, “newspaperman, Editor Conness of the Hawaii Herald,” would frequently “drop in during the evening and read Kipling” to her. In 1898, the United States became an “oceanic imperial power...when it seized the Philippines, Puerto Rico,
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Guam, and Hawai‘i...Rudyard Kipling summed his sentiments in favor of the American action in the Philippines in the poem, “The White Man's Burden.”" This poem urged “the Anglo-Saxon race to “civilize” and “uplift” the nonwhite peoples of the world,” and “Kipling's poem was widely read and approved in the United States.” It is unclear if she believed in the messages advanced by his poetry. However, the fact that she read Kipling's poetry revealed how she could have been exposed to the message of “The White Man's Burden.”

Furthermore, through her social position as an English teacher in a territorial school she was fulfilling the message of “The White Man's Burden” by Americanizing her Native Hawaiian, and Asian students. Through this position Compton also showed that a New Woman could be an agent of colonialism. Compton established a strong relationship with her students, and it was rumored she was “well liked by her pupils and keeps them from going to sleep.” Her teaching style was described as “being stern and unbending in the class room, but loving and friendly with the children out of school.”

To improve the Standard English skills of her students she founded the Hilo High Literary Society. Her pupils stated the Literary Society was invaluable for them “in their acquirement of the use of the English language.” In addition, the “grammar in use in the Hilo school did meet with her approval in certain ways,” and she attempted to change the curriculum. While her intentions may have been good she played an important role in assimilating her students into American culture, a role that was acceptable for the New Woman in Hilo.

Shortly after she arrived in Hilo Compton joined the local woman's Christian
Science Club that met at the home of Mrs. W.H. Smith. Women's clubs were very popular during the Progressive Era, and “women joined in record numbers to improve their situation in a changing society and give support to each other.” Clubs were important in expanding “the public role of women into new areas of concern to society-social work, public health, even international peace.” Christian Science was one of the “most successful and institutionalized” of the women's clubs. This club was based on “New Thought” which “feminized the deity and gave women a particularly direct pipeline to spiritual reality,” and suggested “that women as a sex could lead in ushering in a new and better world.”

Compton's club would also serve as an important support network and would assist her in joining the social structure of the White community in Hilo. Clubs provided women with “their own private female support networks,” and “emphasized the importance of the solidarity of women.” The club host, Mrs. W.H. Smith, was a well-connected resident related to prominent families in Hilo. Her father, Charles E. Richardson came from a family that owned plantations, and her mother was the sister of a former, prominent Hilo judge, George Washington Akao Hapai. In 1904 Smith married her husband, “an attorney in private practice in Hilo.” The remaining club members are unknown, but making a connection with the established Smith family would have been important for someone in Compton's position. The women of Hilo, like other women in the United States, joined women's clubs, and this fraternization was considered acceptable in Hilo.

Like other middle class woman Compton was involved in protecting the welfare of working class women. Middle class women considered working women “the mothers-to-be of future Americans,” and “the middle-class women tried to teach workers their own values.” Compton's relationship with the maid, Margaret Andrews, showed that
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she was active in advising, poor, working class women. Margaret Andrews stated that Compton “always seemed to take a personal interest in any girl or girls who were alone and needed a friend and some one with whom to advise. In my own case she was always very helpful, frequently talking with me about my welfare, and advising with me in matters that pertained to my own good, and assisting me in every way possible to be a good, true woman.”75 Whereas there is no indication that other women tried to assist women less fortunate than they it highly unlikely this behavior would have been unacceptable, because Compton received no public backlash for it.

Female Sexuality in Hilo

Whereas Mary Compton was a “guardian of morality” she was contesting long established Victorian sexual norms. From 1900-1920 adolescents and young adults “challenged long-standing restraints and taboos of the Victorian era.”76 During this time some young women were engaging in premarital sex, keeping company with young men without chaperones, socializing at night, and delaying marriage and childbearing. Despite changing sexual norms marriage and children still remained the acceptable goal for women, and delaying marriage “provoked alarm among many prominent social critics.”77 This disintegration of Victorian sexuality was a “process evolving first in certain urban areas and particularly among young adults.”78 Having resided in large urban areas her entire life Compton would have been exposed to the changing sexual norms of this era. Compton embodied this new sexuality in that she had not re-married, did not have children, and soon after she arrived in Hilo was keeping company with a prominent newspaperman and socializing at night. Later, Compton would be linked with a visiting Mason, seen in his company unchaperoned at the Volcano, and would be accused of writing an endearing letter to an unidentified man. In large, urban cities this behavior was only slowly becoming acceptable, but in a small town like Hilo her behavior would have been questionable at best. The criticism that Compton received over her behavior showed that Hilo had not yet accepted these norms for women, and that
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in a colonial setting women were expected to adhere to a more conservative, Victorian notion of female gender propriety. Since Compton was not conforming to local gender expectations she was damaging her moral reputation, and threatening her position as an educator. Furthermore, when the scandal erupted between herself and established members of the community her less-conservative sexual behavior would be used to discredit her.

Mary Compton enjoyed an active social life, and within a month of arriving in Hilo was keeping company with Editor Conness of the Hawaii Herald. Economic independence granted women like Compton the ability to insist “on the freedom to conduct herself socially as she saw fit.” Compton was seen frequenting social events in Hilo society such as “dinners, card parties, etc.” Moreover, Compton kept company, unchaperoned, with Editor Conness at the boardinghouse, and he “called on Mrs. Compton occasionally and read Kipling to her.” Since teachers were supposed to be examples of morality in small towns across the mainland they could be dismissed for smaller indiscretions than Compton had committed. Small towns generally “held the teacher to standards of behavior more suitable to convents than to secular communities: In some places she could be fired for getting into a carriage with a man other than her father or brother...loitering downtown in ice cream stores...not being home between 8:00 P.M. and 6:00 A.M.” Whereas there is no evidence to show that her relationship with Conness upset people, her fraternization with other men did, and this relationship also could have caused talk as well.

The Controversy at the Lewis Boardinghouse

The details of the feud between Compton and the other teachers in the boardinghouse would not come to the majority of the public's attention until after the scandal escalated. When the allegations were brought to the public's attention they were used by the opposing parties to advance their own positions and discredit the opposition.
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While she was living at the boardinghouse Compton claimed that she discovered that Richmond had attempted to sexually assault Margaret Andrews and was having an affair with Mrs. Lewis. The other teachers asserted that it was Compton's bad attitude that caused her to fall into their disfavor. However, the issue was not who was at fault in the feud. The issue was that Compton, a female newcomer, had accused well-connected community members of immoral actions and was involved in a feud with those community members. This action severed her main social connection and support network in the community, and she would come to be perceived as a female newcomer threatening the social structure of the White community in Hilo.

By October 30th, 1910 barely a month after she had arrived in Hilo, Compton was asked to leave the Lewis boardinghouse following a huge row at the breakfast table. During this row Compton was alleged to have said she was going to “‘fix’ Mrs. Lewis,” and “that Hilo is a very gossipy town.” Various reasons were given by the women of the boardinghouse as to what caused the tension, and why Compton was asked leave the home. Miss Allen claimed that the friction was caused by Compton's dissatisfaction with the boardinghouse, and that “Mrs. Compton expected a great deal of attention from Mr. Richmond and because she did not get all that she expected she was angry.” Mrs. Lewis stated that Compton was asked to leave due to a bad temper, but never elaborated on what may have provoked her. Margaret Anderson alleged that Mrs. Lewis was a very jealous woman, and became jealous if Richmond “paid any attention whatever to any lady other than herself...This jealousy was the cause of extreme dislike of Mrs. Lewis for Mrs. Compton, and was very apparent to any one living in the house where the two ladies were.” Richmond never provided any reasons why the conditions in the boardinghouse deteriorated. Compton agreed that Mrs. Lewis' “petty jealousy” was “the cause of the
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row,’’\textsuperscript{86} and Mrs. Lewis made it so unpleasant for her “that she could no longer live in the same house where the other teachers lived.” However, Compton alleged that she came into disfavor with Richmond when she discovered his relations with several women of Hilo. After she discovered “some of the details of Richmond's relations with women, his manner toward her changed entirely and he tried to drive her out of the school.”\textsuperscript{87} The relationships she purported to have uncovered included a consensual one with Mrs. Lewis, and a nonconsensual one with one of the Lewis maids, Margaret Andrews.

Soon after arriving in Hilo Compton claimed to have noticed “that Richmond was having a flirtation with Mrs. Lewis.” According to Compton, she had heard that “Mr. Kinney of the Hilo Tribune had warned Richmond that people were talking of the attentions paid Mrs. Lewis.”\textsuperscript{88} Compton believed that Richmond would watch Mrs. Lewis dress from his desk. She stated that “it is possible to see from the desk into Mrs. Lewis' sleeping room,” and from the desk “he could look into Mrs. Lewis' room and in a mirror could see her dressing, for she left the door open.” Furthermore, Compton stated she observed the interaction once, when she “went to Mr. Richmond's desk while he was sitting there.”\textsuperscript{89} Eventually she asked Richmond what the nature of his relationship with Lewis, and he “replied with a shrug, “There is nothing doing when Jarrett is around.””\textsuperscript{90} A relationship between a married woman and a non-married man would be scandalous according to both the Victorian and Progressive era notions of sexuality, and if proven, would definitely compromise both individuals moral reputation and their careers.

In late October, shortly before she left the Lewis home, Compton claimed to have


witnessed Richmond trying to make advances on the Lewis servant, Margaret Andrews. Compton would later recount the event in great detail:

“One evening there were callers present. Before that time I had been playing cards. I came up-stairs while the callers were still talking outside. Margaret had taken her bath and returned before I went downstairs first. When I cam up the curtains were all down in Margaret's room, and Mr. Richmond was coming down the hall, from Margaret's room, dripping with perspiration. Mr. Richmond did not deny his attempt when I told him she should be ashamed of trying to take advantage of a girl like Margaret. He grunted and said, 'Well, what are you going to do about it?' After that I told Mr. Richmond that if I saw anything more of the kind I should report him to the board. At that time he said Margaret was all right and he had not succeeded.”

Servants like Margaret, “endured even more and even worse sexual harassment than other working women, the sons and sometimes the fathers of the household treating them as wanton women.” A man of Richmond's social standing could “take advantage of a girl like Margaret” without significant concern of punishment. This interaction also highlights Compton's status in comparison to Richmond's. Richmond's response to Compton, “what are you going to do about it?” speaks to Compton's lower social standing in comparison to him. Richmond understood that it would have been difficult for her, as a single newly arrived woman, to bring action against an established man. Moreover, if Compton tried to bring his indiscretions to the public's attention she would be perceived as a troublemaker, because of Richmond's good reputation and established social connections in the community.

After the fight at the Lewis breakfast table Compton made arrangements with Richmond that evening to talk, because she “wanted to fix things up to make it pleasant, so” she “could stay the year out.” Since she was financially independent it was necessary for Compton to “stay in Hilo,” and keep her job. Richmond “proposed a walk to Rainbow Falls as soon as he got some cigars downtown.”


Editor Conness came by the home, and sat with Compton in Richmond's office reading. When Richmond returned home he “saw Mr. Conness and flew into a terrible rage,” and went downstairs onto the porch. Compton followed Richmond downstairs, and he told her he no longer wanted her to use his desk. After Richmond had “quieted down...the trip to the falls was made.” Whereas the purpose of the trip was to fix their relationship Compton professed that the excursion to Rainbow Falls took another turn entirely. Upon reaching Rainbow Falls Compton claimed Richmond made “improper suggestions” to her, and that he though she “was infatuated with him.” In response to his suggestions, Compton stated she “showed as much indignation as a woman is capable of at his actions.”

The Andrews Boardinghouse

On November 6th, one week after the fight and the ill-fated Rainbow Falls trip, Compton left the Lewis home, and moved into a boardinghouse across the street from the high school owned by Judge Andrews and his wife. Judge Lorrin A. Andrews was the son of Lahainaluna missionaries Mr. and Mrs. C.B. Andrews, and was born at Lahainaluna in 1858. After being engaged in a variety of occupations such as rancher, sheriff, and captain of police he had become a district magistrate of South Hilo. Andrews was also a member of the local Masonic organization in Hilo. The Judge had a reputation of being thorough, fearless, and vigorous in the administration of his duties which

“earned him a number of enemies.” “His ability and integrity” were above reproach, and were never even questioned by his enemies. For some time Andrews had been ill with bladder cancer, and was bed ridden.\(^98\) Given his familial background, and career the Judge must have been an influential man in Hilo.

The boardinghouse was also home to Miss Sandry who resided there without board. During her time in Hilo Compton and Sandry had befriended each other, but after Compton moved into the Andrews' boardinghouse Sandry's attitude towards her changed. According to Mrs. Andrews, “After Mrs. C- had moved to my home Miss Sandry seemed very much upset in fact angry because she was in the same home with her. And I said “Why I though you were the best of friends.” And she answered “apparently we are,” but I don't want to live in the home with her and would have told you so if I had known she planned to come here.” After that she treated Mrs. Compton in such a cruel insulting manner.”\(^99\) Compton claimed that Sandry “went to Mrs. Andrews and tried to get her to turn Mrs. Compton out of the house,”\(^100\) and soon after Compton's arrival Sandry left the Andrews home.

Confused as to why Sandry would act in such a manner Mrs. Andrews called on Mrs. Lewis to see why Compton had left the Lewis home. Mrs. Andrews opened the conversation with Lewis by saying, “I have a member of your family at my home.” To this Lewis replied, “She is not a member of my family.” Lewis stated that Compton had left her home, because she “has a very bad temper, and she does not fit in here, but she may do better at your home.” Other than a temper Lewis said that there was nothing detrimental about her character.\(^101\) However, according to the Victorian gender propriety, a temper was not a desirable attribute for a woman, and this likely reflected negatively upon Compton's moral character. More importantly, Lewis' refusal to acknowledge Compton as a “member of her family” revealed that Compton had lost that support


\(^99\) Hawai'i State Archives, Department of Education, Correspondence by Subject, Series No. 261, Box No. 261-55-5, Mrs. Andrews Letter to J.T. Moir.
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network and was being placed outside the social fabric of the White community in Hilo.

The Scandal in Hilo Society

In November, the feud between Compton and the other teachers was brought to the attention of a few individuals in Hilo's community. Whereas it is unclear as to what details of the feud became public knowledge, it appears that many in the public sided with Compton's detractors. In addition, the escalation of the feud also began to negatively impact the conditions between the staff at the school. When the controversy became public knowledge individuals whom Compton had previously enjoyed a relationship with began to socially ostracize her. This ostracism from Hilo's society was due to the fact that Compton's detractors portrayed her as a troublemaker. Moreover, her detractors were established members in society and had a long standing relationship with the White community in Hilo. In contrast, Compton was a newcomer and had only begun to familiarize herself with individuals in the community. The rumors spread by her detractors isolated Compton and damaged her reputation in Hilo.

Following Compton's expulsion from the Lewis boardinghouse the situation appeared to stabilize until mid November, and during that month the real friction started. No reason was given for the recommencement of hostilities, but a lawyer in Hilo, Carl Smith provided a possible explanation for the catalyst that reignited the altercation between Compton and Richmond. In November, Mary Compton went to the law office of Carl Smith in downtown Hilo to consult with him “upon a small matter.” When Compton's husband had died “she became possessed of certain stock in a corporation in Mexico and that this stock had been pooled and deposited with Knickerbocker Trust Company of New Work for the purpose of selling it to an English syndicate.” Compton had lost her certificate, and needed legal advice from Smith on how to reclaim it. Smith advised her on this matter, and assisted her with the necessary paperwork. After they “had executed these papers Mrs. Compton walked out. Mr. Richmond passed” Smith's office, and saw Compton walk out. Smith later learned “that he immediately retained Messrs. LeBlond & Smith, attorneys here in Hilo, for the purposes of resisting any action that might be brought against him by Mrs. Compton, saying that Mrs. Compton had
employed” Smith “for the purposes of assailing him.” Richmond's lawyer was married to Compton's friend, and Christian Science host, Mrs. W.H. Smith, and given his wife's pedigree was likely well-connected in Hilo. In addition to employing legal counsel Richmond wrote to the department about the situation. By employing a lawyer and writing to the department Richmond was already casting Compton as the problem, and himself as the victim in the feud.

Compton was unaware that Richmond had employed legal counsel against her until Thanksgiving evening of that month. That Thanksgiving there was a dance and dinner at the residence of E.N. Holmes, owner of a general store in Hilo, and father to Hilo High student Lyle Holmes. Unchaperoned, Compton attended the event, and according to Mrs. Andrews returned home later that night “in a very distressed frame of mind.” When the guests were leaving the dinner a “carriage drove up, which the host said would be sufficient for the three of them. Mr. and Mrs. Smith declined to ride in the same carriage with Mrs. Compton for the reason that Mrs. Compton had employed” a lawyer “for the purpose of bringing action against Mr. Richmond and as Mr. Smith had been employed by Richmond they did not want to have anything to do with Mrs. Compton.” After this event Mrs. Andrews reported that Compton “would come home and cry.”

The evening of the Holmes' party Mrs. Andrews thought “it did not seem possible that such a thing could have happened,” and “said very little that night” to Compton. The following morning Andrews observed that Compton had “made herself sick worrying over the event.” Shortly after Thanksgiving Mrs. W.H. Smith contacted Mrs. Andrews, and requested a visit from her. Mrs. Smith informed Mrs. Andrews that “she could not
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allow Mrs. Compton to attend Christian Science meeting at her home, as C. had formerly done.” Mrs. Andrews “asked why and she said “Well, my husband says she must not come. “A prominent man in town has retained him and I dont really know all the story but I know she has tried to make trouble for this man and he has paid “Billy” a fee and I can not have anything to do with her.”" Dismissal from the Christian Science club would have removed Compton's female support network at a time when she would have needed it, and would have placed her outside the circle of respectable women in Hilo. Furthermore, the fact that a prominent family in the community viewed Compton as a troublemaker would have damaged her reputation in Hilo's White community.

Mrs. W.H. Smith continued her social ostracism of Compton after she banished her from the club. Compton stated that Mrs. Smith “went around to all her friends and said that Billy had a big fee and that I was not fit to associate with. That the reason she was telling this was because Billy had the fee.” Since Compton was a newcomer and did not possess many social connections, the word of a well-connected old resident of Hilo, such as Smith, would have carried weight in the community. In addition, it is likely that Compton's own controversial sexual behavior would have supported Smith's claims that she was somehow “not fit to associate with.”

The Impact on the Conditions in the School

Since mid November the feud between Compton and Richmond was proclaimed to have had a major impact on the conditions at the school. Rows between Lewis, Compton, Richmond, and Sandry were frequently witnessed by the students. In addition to observing fights between their teachers many students claimed to have observed curious interactions between Richmond and Sandry at school. While the atmosphere at the school did not affect their view of Compton it did sour their opinion towards Richmond, Sandry, and Lewis.

While class was in session the students reported that it was common for Richmond to have an altercation with Compton in “the hall where they could hear but not
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understand.” These rows would put Compton “completely out of the work she was doing at the time,” and afterward “Mr. Richmond would sometimes looked very worked up, and Mrs. Compton looked sore.” Student Alexander Campbell stated that the students “all liked Mrs. Compton as a teacher and that Richmond treated her with disrespect in their presence and they didn't like that.”

The students also claimed to have seen arguments between Compton, Lewis, and Sandry. Lyle Holmes reportedly gave his parents regular updates on the conditions at the school, and allegedly observed numerous spats between the women. Lyle would “go home and say Mrs. Lewis put her piano in front of Mrs. Compton's desk so that Mrs. Compton has to stand up and talk over it; that Miss Sandry in passing Mrs. Compton takes up her dress; that Mrs. Lewis and Miss Sandry stick their noses in the air as they pass her.”

Edward Maby stated he saw Miss Sandry remove one of Mrs. Compton's students from her debate period “to provoke Mrs. Compton.”

Hilo staff members both involved in and outside of the controversy affirmed there was major tension between Compton, Richmond, Sandry, and Lewis. Richmond reported that Compton was acting insubordinately by declining to come out of her room when requested, refusing to give him an outline of her English lesson, and giving a failing student a second exam so that he could pass. He claimed to have heard Compton speaking angrily to other teachers. At staff meetings Richmond charged Compton with acting insolently, and objecting to his orders. Finally, Richmond stated that she accused him of not knowing “enough to run the place,” and had threatened to “wreck the Hilo High School.” Lewis never commented on the atmosphere in the school, but Sandry
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stated there were many instances that caused her “to believe that she discussed the teachers freely with the pupils.”

Hilo teacher, Miss Louise Deyo, sister of Hilo Union School principal, Miss Josephine Deyo, occupied a room adjacent to Compton, and stated that she “could not recall an instance which called to her attention to the fact that there was discord in the school on Mrs. Compton's account.” However, in December she claimed to have witnessed an event where Compton became angry when visiting Superintendent Pope did not come by her classroom. Deyo related that “Mrs. Compton stated at one time when Mr. Pope went into Mrs. Lewis' classroom that there was a lot of immorality in Hilo going on in the schools and known by the church people and yet they did nothing.” Although Compton did not mention any names Deyo believed that the remark applied to Mrs. Lewis “because Mrs. Lewis' name had been mentioned just previously.”

For her part, Compton stated that she was being persecuted by Richmond, and accused Richmond of trying to force her to resign. While the troubles were occurring at the school Compton said that Lewis was causing trouble for her outside of school. Compton declared that Mrs. Lewis “pursued me all over Hilo and told people all sorts of stories about me.”

In contrast to the fighting the students professed to have seen a different relationship between Miss Sandry and Principal Richmond. Alexander Campbell reported to his father that “one other teacher he has a class with invariably left the class and went out and spent fifteen or twenty minutes in the laboratory with Richmond, that is Miss Sandry, he says all the classes he is in her classes the most of the class time is taken up by her leaving the class and going in the laboratory with Richmond and coming back
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and rushing the work, he said she did that four or five times a day, he says some times he will be in the assembly hall and see her go up and stay fifteen or twenty minutes.” 119 Parent G.H. Vicars, manager of the Hilo Emporium, stated that his son told his mother that “they spoon, Richmond spoons with the female teachers during the lesson time to the neglect of the children. During one particular study the boys go to the class room and he sees them started and then goes down to one of the other rooms in the building and leaves the children to themselves instead of conducting his own class.” Vicars' son also claimed to have seen another event involving Richmond, and an unnamed female teacher. His son stated that “a woman up there has gone up to him and acted like one dog to another...I should think he meant she got up pretty close to him and wagged her rear end.” 120 Student, Miss Canario, remarked that the familiarity between Richmond and Sandry was “Rather Silly-He always brings her home, taking her by the arm up stairs. She has occasionally left her class to speak to Mr. Richmond.” 121 The worst rumor linking Richmond to Sandry was that an unnamed student “had gone after school into the dark room up there and found Mr. Richmond in sexual intercourse with a certain teacher.” 122 Sandry was later named as the unknown teacher. 123

**The Death of Judge Andrews and the Volcano Trip**

In February, two events occurred which greatly impacted Compton's life in Hilo. The first was the death of Judge Andrews who was Compton's last credible support network in the community. Andrews' death left Compton without anyone who could have vouched for her character. The second event was Compton's ill-fated trip to the Volcano. The criticism that Compton received over making this trip revealed that it was unacceptable in Hilo for a woman to be in a public place unchaperoned. As the
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controversy escalated the Volcano trip would be used by her detractors to prove that Compton was an immoral woman and to discredit her.

While the conditions in the school were in turmoil Mary Compton's life at the Andrews' boardinghouse was no better. Judge Andrews was dying of cancer, and “during much of the time the Judge had been very ill and at times delirious.” After the experience at Thanksgiving Compton told Judge Andrews in the presence of Mrs. Andrews “that Mr. Richmond was making things very unpleasant in school” for her, and “the other teachers began then ill feelings towards her.” Judge Andrews advised her to “go quietly about your business. Try not to mind the attitude of the teachers to you. If Mr. R-is the man you say he is he will not stop where he is, but will do something to bring this whole matter to a head.” Andrews further advised Compton to try and get a transfer to Honolulu from Superintendent Pope, and Mrs. Andrews wrote to a friend “to look out for a good boardinghouse for her.” During his final illness the Judge told Compton to consult with the head Mason of Hilo and Hilo High parent, W.H.C. Campbell.

Compton asserted that the Judge's illness had been a “great strain” on her, and she “wanted to get away for a few days for a change” at the Volcano. The weekend that she chose coincided with a visit from the Shriners, a male fraternal organization affiliated with the Masonic Order. The Shriner visit to the Volcano had been advertised in The Hilo Tribune on January 17th, and the paper reported that the Shriners would spend Friday, February 24th at the Volcano to conduct their ceremonies. Due to the Judge's illness Compton claimed “she was afraid of a nervous breakdown,” and after pleading health issues was excused from the school. Compton went the Volcano alone, and was seen
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by Carl Smith at the Volcano House. Smith called her behavior “regardless of
conventionality,” and stated “I believe that a woman who was extremely cautious in
regard to her reputation in the community would not go unaccompanied to the Volcano
House.” That weekend Compton was also “seen walking about the grounds together”
with a prominent Mason that she was linked to, and admitted to walking “with three
Shriners from the hotel to the crater.”

Smith's remark revealed that Compton's behavior was conflicting with acceptable
female behavior in Hilo. Prior to her arrival in Hilo, Compton had only resided in large
urban areas where Victorian sexual norms were eroding and individuals enjoyed more
sexual freedom. Based on Smith's comment it appears that women in Hilo were expected
to conform to Victorian standards of morality. In large, urban areas it was common for
young men and women “to appear in public places oriented toward pleasure and
consumption,” but in Hilo visiting a public entertainment place such as the Volcano
House was seen as “regardless of conventionality.” By rebelling against local standards
of morality Compton was damaging her moral reputation, credibility, and threatening her
position as an educator. Moreover, she provided her detractors with “proof” that she was
an immoral women, and they would later refer to this event to support their claims of
immorality against her.

On February 26th Judge Andrews succumbed to cancer. Mrs. Andrews went to
Honolulu to bury her husband on March 3rd, and took Compton's letters to Pope with
her. Besides losing a friend that she could confide in Compton was also losing her last,
credible support network. Judge Andrews was an old resident, well-connected, and could
have testified in support of Compton's character. Without the Judge, Compton was not
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intimately acquainted with any one in Hilo who could have supported her moral character.

Compton's early life in Hilo revealed much about a role that the New Woman could play in a colonial setting, female gender expectations in the city, and the consequences for a newcomer who challenged the social structure of the 'local' White community in Hilo. Based on the community's reactions towards Compton's behavior it is clear what constituted acceptable behavior for a woman in a colonial setting. Whereas the majority of Compton's behavior was acceptable, the behavior that the community found unacceptable centered around sexuality. Due to the community's negative reactions towards her liberal sexual behavior it appears that in a colonial setting women were expected to follow Victorian moral standards. Compton's position as an educator revealed that the New Woman could be an agent of colonialism in that she assisted with the Americanization of Native Hawaiian and immigrant students. Finally, her feud with established members of the community and her subsequent social ostracism showed the consequences for a newcomer who threatened the social order of the White community in Hilo. Unlike her detractors Compton did not possess a long-standing relationship with the community, and was perceived as a troublemaker by many 'old-residents' in Hilo. Compton's clash with local gender expectations and established community members damaged her reputation, and in turn, tarnished her credibility and threatened her position as an educator.
Chapter III

The Investigations of the Department of Public Instruction

“Principal Richmond bears a spotless reputation in this community and nobody knows you.”

The Department of Public Instruction conducted two investigations into the conditions at Hilo High School, and neither investigation completely satisfied the Hilo general public. Moreover, the subsequent public backlash against the results of the investigations would drive the methodology, and was the reason that the second investigation was held. Negative reactions to the results of the investigations included two petitions from different factions of the Hilo community, and an organized strike from half of the student body at Hilo High School. In addition, the investigations revealed that the department did not possess a procedure to conduct an investigation, and this shortcoming was roundly criticized by many in the Hilo community. The investigators selectivity in the interview process unveiled much about the the 'local', racial and gender hierarchies that made up the social order of Hilo. Neither the Native Hawaiian and Japanese female students, nor Compton were included in the interview process. In contrast, White citizens who enjoyed pre-existing social connections within the city were interviewed by the investigators. This selectivity in the interview process highlighted whose opinion was valued in the Hilo community. Moreover, the investigators selectivity revealed that they did not intend to challenge the 'local', racial and gender hierarchies that composed the social order of Hilo by including those who were marginalized in the city's social structure. These investigations revealed a plethora of charges against Richmond and Compton that characterized them as immoral individuals, and not fulfilling the aims of the Americanization agenda. Richmond was accused of having consensual relationships with two of his staff members, making immoral advances to the Lewis' maid, sexually assaulting two of his female students, and abusing intoxicating liquor. For her part, it was alleged that Compton enjoyed a hula from her male students, had
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relationships with men, and supported the student strike. The investigations open a window to understand the social and political life in Hilo at that time. In addition, they revealed who held power in the Hilo community, and that the department intended to uphold the 'local', racial and gender hierarchies of the social order of Hilo.

**The Investigators**

The investigations were conducted by two of the most important men in the Department of Public Instruction, Inspector General Thomas H. Gibson and Superintendent Willis T. Pope. Inspector T.H. Gibson, a department “veteran whose service to education in Hawaiʻi dated back to the 1880's,”\(^\text{136}\) conducted the first investigation at the high school. Gibson would follow Pope as the Superintendent in 1913, and his tenure in the position would be described as “a laissez-faire approach to school management, believing that schools should only teach rudimentary skills to ensure a docile labor force.” Superintendent Pope had only been appointed to his position in 1910.\(^\text{137}\) His short stint as Superintendent would be characterized by a shortage of teachers, and his creation of “the Hawaiian Educational review in 1912 that quickly disseminated curriculum information to teachers.”\(^\text{138}\)

**The Criticisms Against the Department's Methodology**

During the investigations it became apparent that the department did not possess a definitive method to conduct an investigation. In the first investigation the department's lack of methodology garnished a negative public reaction, and this reaction was the reason that the second investigation was held. Whereas Superintendent Pope's investigation tried to correct some of the criticisms waged against Inspector Gibson's investigation it was ultimately unable to resolve the situation. Following both investigations the department was criticized for not possessing a procedure to conduct its' investigations according to Progressive Era governmental standards. Moreover, the failure of the investigations to resolve the situation resulted in a student strike, and two petitions composed by different factions of the Hilo community. Had the department
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adopted guidelines prior to the onset of the affair it is likely that the investigations would have resolved the situation, and that the public would not have discounted the investigations' conclusions.

In late March, at the behest of the principal and in response to a letter written by the Catholic Priest of Hilo concerning Compton's questionable behavior, Gibson commenced his investigation into the troubles at the school.\(^\text{139}\) While he was conducting his investigation Richmond presented the Inspector with a written copy of his charges against Compton. Richmond officially charged Compton with “refusal to comply with the reasonable requests of the Principal,” “insubordination in the presence of the pupils,” and repeatedly addressing “other teachers in an insulting manner.” Based on the establishment of the charges Richmond requested “her removal from the school.”\(^\text{140}\) However, none of the charges were sufficient to fire Compton, and for unknown reasons he chose not to accuse her of her alleged misconduct outside of school. Compton was also given the opportunity to formulate a written copy of her allegations against the Principal, but she did not comply with this request.\(^\text{141}\) After employing a local attorney, Carl Smith\(^\text{142}\), Compton drafted a letter to Gibson where she made no charges of her own, and denied all of the charges against her. Her letter further stated that “I deny that these charges, even if substantiated, are sufficient to warrant my discharge,” and “the preferring of charges against me at this time is malicious and unwarranted and I request that you examine into the animus, which is behind the making of these or any other charges.”\(^\text{143}\) Gibson's investigation concluded with the suspension of Mary Compton\(^\text{144}\), and instead of alleviating the situation Gibson had made it much worse.
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According to the *The Hawaiian Gazette* and *The Hilo Tribune*, the Hilo general public viewed Inspector Gibson's investigation as a “whitewash,” and immediately stated that “the effect of foolish attempts to hush up affairs like that of the high school, is excellently demonstrated by the result of the investigation of the matter which has just been conducted by School Inspector Gibson.”\(^{145}\) It was reported that “both sides are utterly dissatisfied with the turn things have taken,” and that “the adherents of Mrs. Compton...claim that the hearing was by no means a full or fair one, while...the Richmond faction contend that the investigation was too incomplete to be satisfactory.”

In *The Hilo Tribune*, Gibson was accused of not giving Compton the “opportunity to defend herself,” and not paying attention “to the charges which Mrs. Compton made touching on the conduct of the other teachers of the high school.”\(^{146}\) According to *The Hilo Tribune*, the public did not completely blame Gibson for the failure of his investigation, but also fixed blame on the Department of Education. The Department of Education did not possess efficient procedures for conducting investigations, and the press stated the public believed that “the fault lies with the system more than with the investigator.” Previous educational investigations were also accused by *The Hilo Tribune* of being “farcical,” and were composed of an investigator snooping “around, picking up a bit of gossip at this corner, a bit of information through this keyhole, and a bit of rumor at this old ladies' tea, and on such precious information the departments forms its judgments.” The department was accused of “conducting its investigations in the old spinster-like manner,” and that this methodology had “furnished most welcome food for the gossip and the scandal monger.” Since it did not have adequate procedure for investigations, *The Hilo Tribune* “hoped that the department of public instruction may, even if it is rather late to do so, learn the lesson which the other departments of the government have learned long ago, namely that in a government such as ours, no good is ever attained by attempting to cover in secrecy matters of general interest to the public.”

*The Hilo Tribune* called for an investigation that would be “conducted in a manner which
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would allow the public to know what was being done, to give those directly interested an opportunity to exercise the same rights as would be given them in court, and, on the whole, to proceed under the same rules as those which govern in the courts of law.”

The criticisms that the Hilo public leveled against the Department of Education were focused on the failure of the department to adhere to the good government reforms that emphasized municipal efficiency and honesty. Institutionalizing Progressive Era government policies in a colonial setting was an important aspect of supporting and sustaining colonialism. Adopting American government policies in Hawai‘i would support colonialism, and ensure that the government in Hawai‘i would be remade in an American image. As Hawai‘i had only recently been colonized it appears that the government had not yet adopted policies that were commonplace on the mainland. The Progressive Era saw the push for urban reform, and a call for making a ““honest, efficient, economical” government a high priority.” As early as 1894 Theodore Roosevelt “recognized early the growing importance of efficiency,” and stated in an address ““There are two gospels I always want to preach to reformers...The first is the gospel of morality; the next is the gospel of efficiency...I don't think I have to tell you to be upright, but I do think I have to tell you to be practical and efficient. The “most practical” politician was the “most honest,” he added, and practicality and efficiency were two sides of the same winning political equation.” An aspect of Progressive government reform was an emphasis on using “scientific channels of business management and toward finding standardized, scientific, and objectifiable measures for good city government.”

Progressives believed that use of scientific management would help “to manage change in an orderly manner,” and “they employed scientific methods of investigation: extensive data gathering, analysis, prognosis, and prescription.”

Considering what Americans expected from their government, and how Gibson's investigation did not meet these standards, it is not surprising that people were upset. Government efficiency had become a major priority, and Gibson's investigation was not at all efficient. The department possessed no definitive, scientific methodology for
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conducting an investigation, and instead was accused of conducting its investigations in an “old spinster-like manner.” The Hilo public wanted a more rational method for the department to deal with grievances, and use the same methods that were common in the court of law. Since Gibson's investigation was not thorough, and lacked methodology, the public placed little faith in its results. The department was further accused of being unaccountable to the public, and attempting to “whitewash” the situation. Governmental honesty was very important for many Americans during the Progressive Era, and Hilo seemed to think that the department was being dishonest. These criticisms show that the department had not completely adopted Progressive Era government reforms, and due to this failure were compromising their integrity with the public and faith in the results of the investigation.

In the beginning of April, Superintendent Pope surprised the Hilo general public when he arrived in the city to conduct a second investigation into the conditions at the high school. Whereas the investigation of Pope was more thorough and accountable than Gibson's it was not conducted according to an established procedure, and was unable to diffuse the situation. Pope's investigation tried to follow “good government” practices, and attempted to listen to many individuals' concerns and opinions in the case. Unlike Gibson, Pope was somewhat transparent about how he intended to conduct his investigation, and published his methodology in the local newspaper. Originally, Pope had hoped that his investigation would settle the affair, but he eventually decided that the matters were such that a resolution would have to come from the Commissioners of Public Instruction. Pope ended his investigation by closing the high school, and suspending Richmond pending the decision of the Commissioners of Public Instruction.150

The Hilo community believed that Pope did a better job than Gibson in conducting his investigation, but was not completely satisfied since Pope's investigation lacked definitive methodology. The press reported that Pope “well managed his investigation, and has conducted it with ability and fairness, it may be considered that,  
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through no fault of his, a large part of the community will be dissatisfied...the reason lies in the fact the the department of public instruction has no definitive method of handling such matters as these.” The community wanted some method of proceedings that would be “similar to that employed in impeachment proceedings, where charges must be of a definitive nature, where both sides be represented by counsel and may hear and cross-examine their opponent's witnesses, and where the rules of evidence may be observed.” Had the investigation been conducted under these conditions “there would had been more of a general feeling of finality and force about the action of the department than is being felt now.”

This criticism showed that the Hilo public wanted the Department of Public Instruction to modernize itself according to Progressive Era standards, and until this change was made the public would not be satisfied with that branch of the government.

The Student Strike and The Two Petitions

The failure of the investigations to alleviate the situation not only fostered criticism over the department's regulation shortcomings, but also incited action from various segments of the community. On the heels of Gibson's investigation half of the students went on strike from their school demanding a thorough investigation and the reinstatement of Mary Compton. In reaction to the student strike some of the students' parents drafted a petition calling for another investigation, and expressed their grievances concerning the situation. Following Pope's investigation the White elite in the Hilo community wrote their own petition in support of Richmond and his supporters on the Hilo High staff. Whereas it is unclear as to the degree in which these events impacted the department's final decision, it remains unlikely that the events would have occurred if the department had possessed definitive regulations to conduct an investigation. However, the petitions revealed whose voice mattered and who held power in the Hilo community, and the strike showed that some individuals who lacked power were willing to assert their own agency.

On March 30th, only two days after Compton's suspension thirty one students, half of the student body, went on strike from Hilo High School. The demographics of the

Strikers included nineteen White students, eight Native Hawaiian students, and four Japanese students. In addition, the strike included sixteen boys and fifteen girls. Following their morning prayers the students left the school together, and marched across the street to the Andrews' home where Mary Compton resided. When the students reached the Andrews' home they were directed by Compton to go back to school, but they refused her request. “At the request of several pupils,” Hilo High School student, Edward Maby, had drawn up a petition demanding Compton's reinstatement, and a fair investigation. Maby did this in the presence of fellow Hilo High student, John C. Luiz. This petition “was circulated throughout the assembly hall of the Hilo High School for signatures on the day after Mrs. Compton's suspension.” The student strike was a direct result of the failure of Inspector Gibson to efficiently, and fairly conduct his investigation. In their petition the students demanded “that a thorough and public investigation be made of the charges leading to the suspension of Mrs. M.S. Compton,” and that they “believe this is a just demand, and unless it is conceded” they declared their “intentions to withdraw from this school.” Nine reasons were included in the petition to support their demand for a new investigation into the conditions in the school. Three justifications commended Mrs. Compton as a teacher, and they professed that their “knowledge has been greatly increased under her instruction.” The students claimed that the “other teachers are not tending strictly to business,” and “were setting a bad example for those under their instruction.” Many of their grievances had to do with the manner in which Gibson conducted his investigation, and “that the charges which have led to the suspension of Mrs. Compton are trumped-up charges.”
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The strike is a fascinating event in that individuals who lacked power were willing to assert their own agency, and challenge the hierarchies that were established by colonialism. Moreover, the accusations that the students made against their “superiors” of immorality and failing to adhere to Progressive era governmental standards reversed the power hierarchies espoused by the White Man's Burden. The White Man's Burden was premised on the idea of superiority, but the students were challenging that “superiority” by calling their teachers immoral, and alleging that the government's policies were inadequate. Whereas some parents did support the students, the vast majority of Hilo townspeople and governmental officials would not, and would characterize their actions as “bad citizenship.”

The striking Hilo High School students were subject to public criticism, and their strike was viewed as a path leading to “bad citizenship.” The newspaper reported that “one phase of the high school affairs is-no matter which side the individual may select as right, or wrong-thoroughly reprehensible, and that is that the pupils have been allowed, even encouraged, to take an independent part in the matter.” The paper further elaborated that “where the kids are encouraged to take the law into their own hands and treat with contempt the legally constituted authorities an example is set for lawlessness and disrespect for proper procedure which can only tend towards bad citizenship.” The article did not specify who had encouraged the students to strike, but it would later be suggested that some of the parents and Compton were responsible for supporting the strike. The main criticism of the strike was that if students did not learn to respect authority at a young age they would not respect governmental authority in the future. The fact that the students were on strike reflected poorly against the Hilo High School's ability to teach its youth how to be “good citizens.” Due to the fact that Hawai‘i had only been recently colonized it was imperative that the youth learn how to respect governmental authority for colonialism to succeed. This negative attitude towards the student strike would stigmatize the students' intentions, and ensure that their grievances and testimony not be given full consideration.

Although the student strike was not looked upon favorably by a majority of the
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public it did bring the affair to the public's attention, and it encouraged some of the parents to take action. In response to the student strike and the rumors circulating about the high school a group of middle class, White businessmen met and formulated their own petition. Most of the parents that signed the petition were part of the emerging White middle class in Hilo. Following annexation the composition of the White population began to change, “and middle-class Caucasians began to migrate to Hawai‘i.” Most of the parents were not “old residents” of Hawai‘i, but had moved to Hilo in recent years. Whereas they were not poor they were not members of the established White elite that had historically constituted “respectable” Hilo society.

The petition stated that the “parents of children attending the Hilo High School have information respecting the conduct of Frank A. Richmond, principal of said school, that would, if true, warrant his immediate dismissal.” The parents claimed that “under his administration there exists a lack of discipline, and a feeling of disrespect-if not contempt-on the part of the pupils for their principal,” and therefore they requested that there be a “thorough investigation made bearing on these matters.” Furthermore, the parents believed that “there is no doubt that the bad example set, and the indecorous atmosphere existing at the school is having a demoralizing influence on the characters of our children.” They also expressed their “appreciation of the good and efficient work of Mrs. Compton,” and that they hoped “that the discipline of your department will permit of her being reinstated.” It is unknown how the department officials considered their concerns, but their petition did result in Pope launching his own investigation. Moreover, this petition showed that the emerging White middle class community in Hilo held some power in the community.

Following Pope's investigation, in the days leading up to the hearing, a petition in support of Richmond, Sandry, Lewis, and Allen was “being circulated for signatures”
with the intention of being “sent to the board of education.” 164 The petition stated that “we have known for several years Frank A. Richmond, Principal of the Hilo High School, and Mrs. J.T. Lewis, Miss Jennie Allen, and Miss Etta Sandry...and that we have never hitherto heard rumors or statements derogatory to their fitness to occupy the positions which they hold. We wish to further express our confidence in the ability, moral integrity, and general qualifications of these teachers and our belief that the rumored charges against them are utterly without foundation.” This petition was signed by many individuals who would have occupied the middle or upper class in Hilo, and one Hilo High School student. 165 The most important signatures that were on the petition belonged to F.S. Lyman, and Luther and Lucinda Severance who had historically belonged to the planter, missionary elite, that had historically dominated the Hawai‘i political landscape. 166

Considering the important socioeconomic position that Lyman and Severance had historically occupied it is likely that their word carried some weight, or had some degree of influence with the Department of Public Instruction. Both families were connected with the government, and belonged to the planter missionary elite that occupied the upper tier of Hawai‘i society. While there is no evidence to show that they influenced the case it is unlikely that their involvement had zero impact, and it remains likely that their support boded well for Richmond. In addition, their petition revealed that the White upper class still held power into the twentieth century, and were still willing to assert their agency.

The Interviews

The demographics of the individuals whom Pope and Gibson chose to include or exclude from the interview process highlighted what groups held power in the Hilo community. By excluding Compton, the striking students, and non-White residents it was clear that these individuals were not considered powerful enough to influence the
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social structure. In contrast, individuals who had historically occupied a position of prominence in the elite 'local' White community were interviewed, despite the fact that they had not been intimately involved in the initial feud. This selectivity revealed that the department did not intend to challenge the 'local', racial, and gender hierarchies that composed the social order of Hilo and sustained colonialism. By only interviewing White individuals both Pope and Gibson reinforced the racial status quo, and ensured that the racial groups who were disenfranchised in the colonial power structure did not have a voice in the investigation. While Mary Compton was denied the right by both Pope and Gibson to relate her story, the local elite and individuals who were familiar with the investigators were interviewed. This selectivity underscored that the investigators did not intend to infringe upon the gender status quo and 'local' social structure, and by only interviewing individuals connected with this structure they helped to maintain it. The investigators were criticized by some of Compton's supporters for their exclusion during the interview process. However, they did not rectify this shortcoming, and Compton and the female students would not be given an opportunity to tell their story until the hearing.

Mary Compton's exclusion from the interview process, and the socioeconomic position of the individuals who were interviewed revealed that the investigators did not intend to challenge the 'local' social structure and gender status quo of Hilo. Whereas both Pope and Gibson interviewed Richmond and the other staff members neither investigator expressed any interest in hearing Compton's story about the affair. When Gibson was investigating the conditions in the school he approached Compton about Richmond's charges against her, and allegedly stated, “What have you to say in regard to these matters?” Compton supposedly replied that she had nothing to say. Gibson was reported to have stated, “Have you any charges to make against Richmond? Then he went on to say before she could answer: Principal Richmond bears a spotless reputation in this community and nobody knows you.” Compton allegedly retorted, “Very well, if that is the situation I cannot make charges against him, but if you are here for the purpose of making an investigation I will give you the names of the persons who can...I will send a high school girl who can give you some facts which I think the Department of
Education should know.”

This exchange highlighted that Gibson placed a higher value upon the opinion of individuals who had pre-existing relationships in the community. Richmond had resided in Hilo for several years, had maintained a good reputation, and could be vouched for by individuals in the community. In contrast, Compton was a female newcomer, did not possess any support networks, and her own behavior had tarnished her reputation. If Gibson were to give her accusations any consideration he would be upsetting the social order of Hilo by allowing a female newcomer to charge an established male community member of immoral actions.

Like Gibson, Pope did not express any interest to listen to Compton's story, and at the end of his investigation he announced that the interviews were finished. It was not entirely Pope's fault that he was initially unable to meet with Compton, because she was on Maui when he was conducting his investigation. Carl Smith informed Pope during his investigation that Compton had gone to Maui at his bidding “for the purpose of getting evidence of certain parties who” resided on Maui. However, he expressed no desire to obtain her testimony at a later date, and with regards to her suspension wanted to solely rely upon Inspector Gibson's report. In a letter, Carl Smith quickly addressed Pope's indifference to interviewing Compton, and stated “there is a statement in quotations in which you are quoted as saying that the case of Mrs. Compton will come up on the report of Mr. Gibson before the Commissioners for ultimate decision. Will you please inform me so that I may convey that information to Mrs. Compton, whether the investigation, so far is her case is concerned, has been closed and that no further opportunity will be given to her to explain the charges or refute them as she stands now ready and willing to do so.” Pope allegedly replied to Smith “that he was too busy at
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this time to enter into a discussion of this matter.”172 The Superintendent's refusal to interview Compton revealed that the department did not intend to upset the gender status quo and social order of Hilo by allowing a female newcomer to testify against a connected, established male resident.

Although Compton was excluded from the interviews both investigators did interview individuals who were established in the community, as well as the White elite who had not been involved in the events leading up to the controversy. Even though Gibson did not interview the community concerning the events in the high school he did talk to Richmond, and had Richmond's charges corroborated by Hilo High teachers Allen, Sandry, and Deyo.173 Without discussing the situation with Compton, and on the strength of the corroborated charges Gibson decided to suspend Compton.174 All of the teachers whom Gibson interviewed had been employed at the school for a length of time, and likely enjoyed social connections in the community.

Pope did interview more people than Gibson, but like the inspector all of the people whom he interviewed were part of the social fabric of the 'local' White community in Hilo. The parents who signed the petition were the first people to be called, because their petition “was the immediate cause of the investigation.” These parents were not old residents of Hilo, but they were still connected to the Hilo social structure and most occupied “positions of some prominence in the community.” Prior to his arrival in Hilo, Pope had also prepared a list of people who did not sign the petition, but whom he wished to interview. His list included “E.E. Richards, Miss Josephine Deyo, Miss Etta Sandry, Miss Allen, Mr. and Mrs. Jarrett T. Lewis, Mr. and Mrs. Levi Lyman, Mrs. Judge Andrews, Father Aloysius, Wm. McClusky, Miss Severance, Luther Severance, W.Weight, W.H. Smith, Miss Pomeroy, Mr. Richmond and several others.”175 These individuals were composed of members of the Hilo High staff, the Catholic priest, and prominent members of the White community. Since the members of the elite White
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community did not have any connections to the scandal it is certain that Pope interviewed them due to their dominant socioeconomic position in the community, and that due to this position the authorities held their opinion in high esteem. Moreover, by including this group in the interview process Pope ensured that the social order of the 'local' White community in Hilo was maintained.

Since the investigators only interviewed individuals who were White it is clear that they did not intend to disrupt the racial hierarchy that colonialism was premised upon. Their exclusion of non-White individuals from the interviews ensured that these groups did not have a voice in the investigation, and that the racial power structure in Hilo was upheld. Nowhere was the racial exclusion more blatant than an event that supposedly occurred during Gibson's investigation. After Gibson had refused to hear Compton's version of the events she directed him to interview one of the female students at the school. Gibson initially agreed to meet with the student, but when the inspector discovered she was Japanese he refused to listen to her testimony.

The female student with whom Gibson was supposed to meet was Machiyo Arakawa. Machiyo was part of the Nisei generation who were “the children of Japanese immigrants.” She was the daughter of some of “the most respected of the Japanese residents” in the Hilo community. Her parents had a reputation in the community for “being honest, intelligent and high-minded” individuals, and her father operated a successful business on Front St. that was so successful it enabled “him to retire for a number of years.” Her older brother Futoshi had recently graduated from Hilo High School at the top of his class, had worked for Carl Smith as a clerk in his law office, and was currently attending Stanford University. Her older sister Masayo was a stenographer in the office of Carl Smith. Smith believed that the Arakawa children represented “a high type of intellectual and moral standards.”

In comparison to the majority of the Japanese population at the time, the Arakawa family was exceptional. Whereas the Japanese enjoyed later socioeconomic success, during this period they, along with other non-White people, occupied “the bottom of the
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It was not until 1920 that “the period of the Japanese-as-plantation-laborer had ended. That is, they were no longer overrepresented as plantation laborers but had moved into other occupations in sufficient numbers to achieve proportional representation in the plantation work force.” Plantation work did not offer upward mobility nor decent wages, and did not allow the Japanese to enjoy an American standard of living. Poverty made it difficult for most Japanese students in the first three decades of the twentieth century to continue schooling, because “most Nisei youths had to help their families make ends meet.” The Japanese laborers routinely “left the plantations for opportunities elsewhere,” and in doing so “met resentment and discrimination from Caucasians who felt their own livelihoods and social positions threatened.” While the plantation owners wanted the Japanese to remain on the plantations as a cheap, stable labor force, the Japanese did not agree with this future and instead worked to achieve upward mobility.

Machiyo had information about Richmond's alleged immoral misconduct towards her, but never specified why she chose to report the event after Compton's suspension other than “she wanted to see the matter threshed out.” However, although she decided to report the event at this time she did tell some of her classmates and Compton shortly before she was suspended. Hilo High student Evelyn Vannatta heard of the attack from Machiyo “some weeks before the final trouble started.” Vannatta believed Machiyo's story, because she “had been through all the grades and knew her very well,” and that nothing she “personally have ever seen would lend color to that charge.” Although Vannatta believed Machiyo she stated that she “paid no special bother about it,” and did not view the occurrence “as of any great import until the final trouble started.” While Compton was supposedly aware of the attack prior to her suspension she chose not to report it also. Compton claimed that she was hesitant in reporting the attack, because “she was aware of the feeling that existed among some of the other teachers against her
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and she did not know how to act.”

On the day of Compton's suspension Machiyo went with her sister to the Hilo Hotel to meet with Inspector Gibson, and to report Richmond's alleged attack on her. When the Arakawa sisters arrived at the hotel “the bell boy came and they said they wanted to see Mr. Gibson and they were told that Mr. Gibson had gone out.” Although she had kept her appointment Machiyo was never able to relate her story to Gibson. Gibson's failure to keep his appointment with Machiyo was later investigated by Carl Smith. After his investigation Smith accused Gibson of purposely missing his appointment with Machiyo. According to Smith, Gibson “was in his room and had declined to see the girl after finding out that she was a Japanese.” Compton stated that she approached Gibson about the matter on March 30th, and in front of witnesses Gibson supposedly replied “well, I don't want to take a Japanese girl's word upon a question as important as that.”

If this allegation against Gibson were true it reveals that the department would not give Machiyo's testimony serious consideration, because she was Japanese. It seems that if Machiyo were White, Gibson would have been willing to listen to her allegations against Richmond, and at least consider them. However, for Gibson to allow a Japanese student to give evidence against the character of an established and well-connected White man would have upset the racial power relations that the education system was trying to maintain. In addition, this alleged exchange revealed the relative powerlessness, and vulnerability that the Japanese experienced when bringing interacting with the authorities. By refusing to hear her testimony Gibson was ensuring that the racial status quo was upheld.

Like Gibson, Pope also chose to reinforce the racial power structure by only including White individuals in his interview process, and denying the two female students the right to tell their story. Whereas Pope's interviews were more thorough than Gibson's all of the individuals whom he interviewed were White. None of the Japanese
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or Native Hawaiian students who were involved in the strike, nor their parents were invited by Pope to relate their story. In contrast, many of the White students, their parents, and the White elite, who were not involved in the controversy, were interviewed. This exclusion on racial grounds highlighted that Pope intended to uphold the racial hierarchy that supported colonialism, and did not intend to challenge it by giving the Japanese and Native Hawaiian residents a voice in his investigation.

Moreover, neither of the two female students, whose testimony was the only official evidence in the case, were interviewed. Their exclusion from the interview process underscored their lack of power as students, and showed that the officials intended to uphold the racial hierarchy established by colonialism. Carl Smith provided Pope with two sworn affidavits from two female Hilo High pupils who alleged Richmond had made immoral propositions to them.\textsuperscript{183} The students who gave sworn testimony with regards to Richmond's alleged immoral conduct were Machiyo Arakawa, and a second student, Julia Nathaniel. Both of the students were not White, and were upsetting the race power hierarchy by accusing an established White man of immoral actions against them. In addition, they were challenging the student teacher power structure by accusing their principal of assault. Pope thought these affidavits provided sufficient information concerning the female students' allegations against Richmond, and did not want to interview them in person.\textsuperscript{184} Since Pope denied them the right to tell their story in person he was reinforcing the racial power hierarchy that colonialism was based upon, and their exclusion highlighted the lack of power that students had in the social structure.

In addition, Pope reasserted the racial status quo when he denied the accusation that Gibson would not see Machiyo, because she was Japanese. Machiyo and her supporters had previously challenged the racial power structure by condemning Gibson's alleged action against Machiyo. The Superintendent addressed the accusation that Gibson would not see Machiyo, and vehemently denied that such a thing occurred. Pope reported that Gibson refuted the allegation, and Gibson allegedly stated “in the presence of the attorney general, that he was not at the hotel at the time when this girl called, as he
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had been delayed on the street, on his way to the hotel, by citizens who wished to talk with him about the school matter.” Pope also stated that Gibson “did not refuse to see her, for when he came to the hotel, ten or twenty minutes late, the girl had gone, nor had she left any address.” Even though Pope must have thought that Gibson's denial in the presence of the attorney general must have given the Inspector's word some validity, this meant little because Gibson was not under oath. Pope blamed Machiyo for not meeting Gibson, alleged that she left before the inspector returned, and did not leave a forwarding address. By refuting the claim that Gibson would not meet with Machiyo Pope was casting doubt on the allegations that Gibson's investigation was not fair, and supporting the racial power structure by denying that such an event ever occurred.

**The Accusations Against Richmond and Compton**

Pope's investigation uncovered the majority of the allegations against Compton and Richmond which mainly touched upon matters of morality, and their ability to Americanize their students. Richmond was accused of improper familiarity with two female pupils and the Lewis maid, abusing intoxicating liquor, and having sexual intercourse with two Hilo High teachers. Richmond had previously given a copy of his written allegations to Gibson where he charged Compton with matters pertaining to her schoolwork and conduct in school. In addition, Gibson's investigation had uncovered rumors that she may have enjoyed a hula, and had sung Native Hawaiian songs with some of her students. During Pope's investigation additional charges were made against Compton which included allegations that she kept company with men, incited the student strike, and the Catholic priest affirmed that she had enjoyed a hula from her male students. Following Pope's investigation, *The Advertiser* affirmed that Compton had watched her students perform the hula, and hinted that there was some degree of sexual interaction in that event. The majority of the allegations that this paper discusses were derived from the testimony of only some of the people that were interviewed. The statements of Josephine Deyo, Etta Sandry, Jennie Allen, Mr. and Mrs. Lewis, Mr. and Mrs. Levi Lyman, Wm. McClusky, Miss Severance, Luther Severance, W. Weight, and Mr. Richmond were missing from the archival records, and therefore any additional
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allegations that these individuals made are not included in this paper. If any of the allegations waged against the teachers were proven to be true it would have likely resulted in their immediate removal from the school, because they would no longer be viewed as the proper individual to Americanize by example.

The most damning charge against Principal Richmond was that he had sexually assaulted two of his female students, Machiyo Arakawa and Julia Nathaniel. Machiyo was the first student to accuse Richmond of sexual misconduct during Gibson's investigation, and Julia brought forth her own accusation against Richmond after Compton was suspended.\textsuperscript{186} Neither student was given the opportunity to relate their story to either investigator, and their testimony was derived from affidavits that Carl Smith had them swear before the notary public in Hilo. Carl Smith gave their affidavits to Pope when he was conducting his investigation.

Machiyo was a senior at Hilo High School who claimed that during the year of 1910 Principal Richmond had “shown marked attention” to her. She stated that “it was his habit frequently to come close to” her, and to “touch her in such a way that he became offensive” to her. In the Fall of 1910 Machiyo alleged that Richmond spoke to her “on the subject of marriage asking her whether it was her intention to marry white man.”\textsuperscript{187} It was rare for the Nisei to intermarry with other ethnic groups, “because of parental and social pressures, as well as belief in cultural compatibility.”\textsuperscript{188}

Following Richmond's initial advances towards Machiyo the harassment escalated on an unknown date in September of 1910. On that day Machiyo was approached by Richmond while she “was at her work in the afternoon and she was instructed by Richmond to remain after school was over.” Machiyo inquired why she was to stay after school, because “she had done nothing to warrant punishment.” Richmond replied that he wanted to show Machiyo a physics experiment, which confused her because “she was not studying physics.”\textsuperscript{189} After school Richmond instructed her “to follow him to the
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room which he used as a laboratory” and his office, and “could be shut off from the rest of the building.” Machiyo was alone with Richmond in this room, with “the rest of the building being practically deserted.” Richmond performed the experiment for her, and while she was watching the experiment “Richmond put his arm around” her, and “attempted to kiss” her. In response to his affront “she put her hands up and prevented him from kissing her; he said: This is all right, don’t you love me?” Machiyo “replied that she respected him as a teacher but this was all.” At this point Richmond was alleged to have asked her “if she did not wish to become a teacher and suggested to her that he would see that she was sent through the Normal School in Honolulu, and that he would provide her with the necessary money if she would consent to take a course.” In addition, Richmond told Machiyo “that she should work for him for $20.00 a month, but did not state what she should do for that compensation.” Machiyo stated she “became frightened at the attentions and suggestions” of Richmond “and believed that his purposes were immoral.” Richmond continued his attempts “to fondle and kiss her,” and “as soon as she could get away from him she left and came downstairs and came home.” Upon reaching her home Machiyo “told the occurrence to her sister, Masayo Arakawa,” and “remained away from school for the period of one week and two days.” She “told her mother and upon her mother's advice returned to” school, but “left all of the classes instructed by” Richmond.

When the alleged attack occurred Machiyo never reported it to the authorities, because she was Japanese and afraid of retribution from Richmond. The vulnerability of
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the Japanese in Hawai‘i is highlighted by the fact that Machiyo and her family were afraid to report the attack due to racial reasons. Her mother advised her not to report the attack, because she thought that “it would be unfortunate for her to make any exposure of this for the reasons that she was a Japanese and the haole would believe the haole, saying inasmuch as he was high in his own circles it was no use her making a complaint, what she should do would be at all times to keep away from him and give him no opportunities.” Machiyo also related that her family was “afraid to act; that Japanese friends advised them that if they tried to do anything the principal might make things hard for her in her graduation or something of that nature.” This comment showed that the Japanese who had previously attempted to upset the power structure may have been punished, and that it was feared if Machiyo accused Richmond of a crime she would punished as well.

The Arakawa's fear of discrimination in the legal system was justified, and if Machiyo had reported the attack to the authorities it is unlikely she would have seen justice. The Japanese were subject to national discrimination, and on the mainland were “criticized as unassimilable, unclean, immoral drivers-down of White people's wages.” American racism against the Japanese resulted in President Roosevelt signing the Gentlemen's Agreement in 1907 which halted Japanese immigration to the United States. Under the Gentlemen's Agreement “Japan promised to tighten up its emigration policy, halting the migration abroad of working men,” and became “only one of the many acts of discrimination against the Japanese instituted at the national and local levels.” Since they occupied the lowest rung of the socioeconomic ladder, along with other non-White groups in the Territory of Hawai‘i, the Japanese were not strangers to discrimination in that legal system as well. The discrimination that the Japanese faced in the territorial legal system made the Japanese community realize that “American realities fell short of American ideals of equal justice.”

historically controlled by established Whites and some Christianized Hawaiians. In order for a case to be successful in the Hilo legal system the defendant had to produce compelling evidence. Compelling evidence entailed “calling upon witnesses with credibility in the community, and the haole and Native Hawaiian elites clearly have more credibility than impoverished Asian newcomers.” In addition, “cases that challenge power relations, when brought by strangers, fare poorly in the absence of compelling evidence.”

While the Arakawa's were not poor, they were still Japanese, and due to the pervasive racism against the Japanese they could not have brought suit against Richmond. In addition, Machiyo's social position as a woman and a student would have made it difficult to charge her male principal of a crime. Machiyo's mother's comment highlighted that the fact that Richmond was clearly well-connected in the White community, and would have been able to call forward “credible” witnesses to support his character. Had the Arakawa's brought suit against Richmond they would have been contesting the established race power relations that the legal system upheld, and challenging the student teacher power structure in the school. These factors, coupled with lack of compelling evidence, would have ensured that Richmond would not see prosecution. Besides knowing they could not bring suit against Richmond the Arakawa's were afraid of possible retribution in the form of blocking her graduation if they did. The Japanese placed a high emphasis on education, because they saw it as the path to upward social mobility. For the Arakawa family, to risk Machiyo's education on a case they knew they could not win did not appear to be an option.

Shortly after Compton's suspension a second Hilo High student approached her, and informed her that Richmond had allegedly made improper suggestions to her that were almost identical to those alleged by Machiyo Arakawa. The affidavit of this student's account was sworn before the Notary Public of the Fourth Judicial court in Hilo on the first of April, and submitted to Superintendent Pope by Carl Smith during Pope's
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investigation. The second student to accuse Richmond of misconduct was a Native Hawaiian girl by the name of Julia Nathaniel. Julia was seventeen years old “born of Hawaiian parents at Olaa,” and in addition to her role as a student had worked for Mrs. Lewis as a maid during the year of 1910. Her mother was dead, and she had “resided and been under the care of her father at Olaa.” She reported that her “father is a man of limited means who supports himself and family by following his trade as a blacksmith at Olaa.” Her father was anxious that Julia “should receive the benefits of the education provided by the Territory of Hawaii,” and arranged for her to attend Hilo High School. In order to support Julia's attendance at the school Julia “applied for and obtained employment from the said Mrs. Lewis, and by the terms of the agreement of employment” Julia “undertook and actually did perform the services as a household servant and second girl in the boardinghouse of the said Mrs. Lewis during the first half of the year 1910, that is, between the months of January and July.” Julia's position consisted of “performing various household duties, such as making beds, attending to the room work of the occupants of the house and waiting at the table.”

During her time as a maid in the Lewis household Principal Richmond “occupied a sleeping room upon the second floor and in the front portion of the house facing on Waianuenue Street,” and also “occupied a portion of the hallway immediately adjoining and connected with his said room upon the second floor, where he kept a writing desk, book case and other furniture, and which he maintained as an office.” Julia stated that she also lived on the second floor, and shared a room with the other servant, Margaret Andrews.

Julia alleged “at some time during the latter part of the month of March or at some time during the month of April, a more particular description of which time” she was unable to give, but which she “fixes with relation to the appearance of Haley's Comet in the year 1910.” That evening at “about 5 P.M. or 5:30 P.M.” Julia “went to the second floor of the said house for the purpose of arranging beds in the various sleeping apartments for the night.” On this particular night Julia stated Richmond “was sitting in
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his said office adjoining his sleeping apartment.” The other servant, Andrews, was
“occupied in preparation of the evening meal, and that no persons other than the said
Richmond, the said Margaret Andrews” and Julia “was in or about the house at that
time.”\footnote{Ibid.}

Julia stated she “attempted to enter the sleeping apartment of the said Richmond
trough the office which was the only means of entrance into the said apartment for the
purpose of arranging the bed for the said Richmond, and in doing so passed the
Richmond in his said office.” When she passed Richmond he supposedly engaged her in a
conversation, and asked her “what she intended to do upon leaving High School
suggesting that she ought to become a teacher, and that he, the said Richmond, would
financially assist” her “in maintaining herself while at the Normal School at Honolulu.”
Julia allegedly “replied that she did not wish to become a teacher and that if she did her
father would provide for her support at said Normal School.” After her refusal Julia
alleged that “Richmond then arose and stood in such a manner that it was impossible for
a person to leave the office and return to the lower floor. She purported that he laid his
hand upon” her, “embracing” her “and improperly placing his hands upon various
portions” of her “person in a lewd and lascivious manner at the same time handling and
fondling the breasts of” her. Due to Richmond's alleged actions Julia claimed she
“became frightened and attempted to escape.” However, Julia stated “the only avenue of
escape was through the open door of the sleeping apartment of the said Richmond,
where” she “went followed by the said Richmond.” She stated that “he then embraced”
her “and pulled her down into his lap and attempted to kiss” her “and otherwise fondle
her.” At this point, Julia claimed “he then said that he wanted” her “to kiss him and
wanted her to love him.” Again Julia alleged that she “struggled to get free from the
embraces of the said Richmond and succeeded, after which the said Richmond again
captured” her and forced her “on to his bed where he said to” her, “Please let me have a
chance at you,” from which” she “understood that the said Richmond wished to have
sexual intercourse with” her. She stated that she “refused the proposals of the said

\footnote{Ibid.}
Richmond and finally threatened to make outcry unless she was released. Supposedly, Richmond “then pleaded with” her “not to tell the said Mrs. Lewis,” and “attempted to persuade her he was only fooling with her...that it was all right.” After this Julia claimed she “made her escape and went to the kitchen and remained with the said Margaret Andrews until the return of Mrs. Lewis.” Julia stated she immediately related this event to Margaret Andrews who told her that Richmond “had made similar improper lewd and lascivious advances and proposals to” her as well.

Following Richmond's alleged attack on Julia she claimed that “during the time while” she “was employed at the home of said Mrs. Lewis” she “at all times entered the rooms of the said Richmond only during his absence and this for the reason that she feared further attacks from the said Richmond.” After Richmond's supposed attack Julia claimed that he “frequently went to the room of” her and Andrews “and attempted to engage them in conversation.” A few months after the alleged attack occurred, “some time after the close of the school year, to-wit, in the month of June, 1910, the said Richmond being about to make a trip to the Mainland” allegedly came to Julia, and gave her “the sum of $5.00 in gold telling” her “that she had been a good girl and that he wanted to make her a present.” Julia stated that she “had never performed any services for the said Richmond other than she is so employed to perform by the said Mrs. Lewis as a part of her duty as a servant and that” she “believes that this money so paid to” her “is for the purpose of keeping” her “from disclosing the facts above set forth.”

Like Machiyo, it would have been very difficult for Julia to charge Richmond with assault due to lack of evidence, her social position as a student and a maid, her gender, and racism against Native Hawaiians. There were no witnesses that could have corroborated Julia's claim. Although Margaret Andrews, under oath, supported Julia's claim that Richmond “made an indecent proposal to her” she did not witness the
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alleged attack. Andrews was also a maid, and since she occupied a low socioeconomic position would not have been a compelling witness. Julia's low socioeconomic position in comparison to Richmond's would also have discredited her testimony. She was from a poor family, was a student, a woman, a maid, and it was unlikely that her testimony would be given serious consideration against a prominent White man like Richmond. Moreover, given the prevailing racist attitudes that Whites held for Native Hawaiians, and their position in the racial hierarchy that colonialism established, would have also negatively impacted Julia's allegation. Starting in the nineteenth century Native Hawaiians were deemed by the White population to be “childlike but benign, lazy, irresponsible with money, and friendly, although too sensuous.” In addition, they were also viewed as “followers rather than leaders...inclined to be untruthful, speaking lies as soon as they are born.” As late as 1908, “the routine denigration of Hawaiians as childlike, indolent, and sensual was so well entrenched...that a minister...objected to the phrase “just like a Hawaiian,” which was commonly used as a term of disparagement.”

Had Julia reported the attack to the authorities her testimony likely would not have garnished serious consideration due to racial attitudes, the officials unwillingness to upset the racial hierarchy which supported the colonial system, her social position as a student and a maid, her gender, and lack of corroborating evidence.

If Richmond's supposed attack on Machiyo and Julia were proven to be true it would have destroyed his credibility, rendered him unfit to teach school, and been an embarrassment to the Americanization program and Department of Education. A blemish of this magnitude on Richmond's moral standing would have immediately removed him from the school, and compromised any accusations that he made against Compton. More importantly it would have been a disgrace to the Department of Public Instruction, and the goals of the Americanization program. An aspect of colonialism and Americanization was the belief that White individuals were morally superior compared to other racial groups, and the fact that Richmond was charged with this action disrupted the attitude that White people were morally superior. As the principal of a school, one of

261-55-6, Affidavit of Mrs. Margaret Anderson: Notary Public, Second Judicial Circuit. April 8, 1911.  
213Merry, Colonizing Hawa'i, 128-130.
Richmond's main responsibilities was to ensure that his students learned proper American values and morals. Instead of teaching strong moral values Richmond was accused of actively trying to compromise the morality of his students, and therefore, was not fulfilling the goals of the Americanization program.

Pope also uncovered reports that Richmond was allegedly sexually involved with two of his female teachers, Mrs. Lewis and Miss Sandry. These accusations would have further portrayed Richmond as an immoral individual, and not the correct person to impart morality through personal example. Many individuals told Pope that they had heard that some students had caught Richmond having sexual intercourse with a teacher, later named Miss Sandry, in the school dark room.214 However, none of the individuals were able to provide Pope with any names of the students who allegedly caught Sandry and Richmond having immoral relations, and no students came forward to support this claim.

With regards to the rumor that Richmond and Lewis were having an affair the only direct witnesses were the Lewis' maids Julia Nathaniel and Margaret Andrews, now Mrs. Margaret Anderson. Compton's lawyer, Carl Smith, also stated that prior to the affair, “for some years there has been a very persistent rumor that Mr. Richmond and Mrs. Lewis have sustained illicit relations with each other.”215 Margaret Anderson claimed that Mrs. Lewis seemed to “care considerably more for Mr. Richmond than she did for her husband and was very jealous if he paid any attention whatever to any lady other than herself. More especially was this true if he paid attention to Mrs. Compton.”216 Julia stated that she and Anderson had personally witnessed a sexual interaction between Mrs. Lewis and Mr. Richmond. Julia alleged “that upon a certain night during the time when the said Comet was visible in the year 1910” she and “Margaret Andrews at about the hour of 1 A.M. Had arisen from their bed to view the Comet.” While they were watching the comet they “heard someone moving in the direction of the room of the said
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Richmond and upon looking found the said Richmond leaving his said room in a kimono going downstairs and quietly entered the room of the said Mrs. Lewis.” She reported that Mr. Lewis was away at the time, and “Richmond remained in the room which was then occupied by the said Mrs. Lewis for the period of about one hour, when he returned to his own sleeping apartment.” After she observed this interaction Julia stated that she “entered into conversation with the said Margaret Andrews upon the subject and was told by the said Margaret Andrews that the said Richmond frequently visited the sleeping apartment of Mrs. Lewis while she was there and during the absence of her husband, and she believed that this was for immoral purposes.” Julia claimed that Anderson told her that “she frequently used to spy upon the said Richmond and frequently saw him go to the sleeping apartments of the said Mrs. Lewis.”

For her part, Margaret Anderson did not mention any of these events in her own affidavit. Since the only individuals who alleged that they had witnessed Richmond and Lewis’ affair were maids their testimony would not likely be above reproach.

The final accusation against Richmond's moral character was that he was in the habit of abusing intoxicating liquor, and this charge was made by Julia Nathaniel, Mrs. Margaret Anderson, Carl Smith, and Mary Compton. The Progressive Era saw one of the most zealous campaigns to ban liquor, and prohibitionists eventually succeeded in banning liquor in 1919. In the Territory of Hawai‘i the prohibition movement was a hotly debated issue with one supporter claiming that “the majority will, in time, find out that the saloon is hell, and drink damnation,” but “three to one in H.T. favor damnation.”

Despite the controversy in the territory on June 30, 1911 Kau became the first district on the island of Hawai‘i to become “a totally dry district.” While individuals could still consume liquor on a majority of the island of Hawai‘i in 1911 it was still considered an undesirable habit, and men who abused liquor had a national reputation in the 19th century for being “a wife beater, child abuser, and sodden, irresponsible nonprovider.”

---

217Hawai‘i State Archives, Department of Education, Correspondence by Subject, Series No. 261, Box No. 261-55-5, Affidavit of Julia Nathaniel: Territory of Hawaii Fourth Judicial Circuit, April 1, 1911.
219“A Prohibition Experiment,” The Hilo Tribune, July 4, 1911.
In the 20th century prohibitionists “argued that liquor interests demoralized and corrupted American politics and that alcoholism impeded workers, ruined increasing numbers of families, and filled taxpayer-supported poorhouses and prisons with its victims.” By claiming Richmond was abusing liquor they were questioning his ability to teach proper morals, and painting him as the antithesis of acceptable middle class masculinity which emphasized moral self discipline.\textsuperscript{221}

During their stay at the Lewis household Compton, Anderson, and Julia all claimed to have witnessed Richmond abuse liquor. Anderson stated she had “seen Mr. Richmond intoxicated on numerous occasions,” and that she believed he used “coffee to disguise the fact that he had been drinking.” According to Anderson, Richmond “constantly kept liquors in his room, and that, because of his intoxicated condition, he very frequently retired to his room, remaining there for hours at a time.” Anderson also reported that Mrs. Lewis was aware of his drinking problem, and that Lewis had complained to her about Richmond drinking to heavily on more than one occasion. During November of 1910, Anderson alleged that Lewis “served notice on Mr. Richmond that he must either stop drinking or leave her house.”\textsuperscript{222} Through her duties as a maid Julia stated she “saw wine and beer in quantities in the said room and frequently saw the said Richmond drink quantities of both wine and beer.” Julia also observed “that on several occasions after returning from school the said Richmond would drink wine and beer in such quantities that he would become intoxicated.”\textsuperscript{223} Since Compton was not present when Pope was in Hilo Carl Smith related her stories concerning Richmond’s alleged liquor abuse to the Superintendent. Compton alleged that she had “seen him drunk at the house and on one occasion kept him in the house when he was so under the influence of liquor that he would have made a spectacle of himself had he gone up the street.” Furthermore, Compton stated that two teachers had taken him home drunk, and that she “got her information from Richmond himself.” Smith stated that he knew Richmond was “in the habit of going to public drinking places,” but that if Richmond was
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“in the habit of abusing intoxicating liquor he has done it very quietly for the reason that very few people ever saw him under the influence of liquor.”\textsuperscript{224} None of the other individuals interviewed by Pope had ever seen or heard rumor of Richmond abusing intoxicating liquor.

The worst charges against Compton was that she was encouraging Native Hawaiian cultural practices in that she sung Hawaiian songs, and enjoyed a hula from some of her students. As a teacher in the territorial school system Compton was charged with discouraging her students from retaining their native culture. Since she was accused of encouraging their cultural practices she would have been viewed as the antithesis of the Americanization program, and therefore, the inappropriate person to teach in a territorial school.

During his investigation Gibson had uncovered rumors that Compton may have enjoyed a hula from her male pupils, and that she had sung Hawaiian songs with them. Gibson stated that he “heard various stories of various kinds, as, for instance, that some high school pupils had danced the hula for Mrs. Compton at her residence.” To ascertain the truth of this allegation Gibson stated he “asked the father of the boy who was particularly named in this connection (Mr. Gibson named this lad), and I was assured that all there was to the affair was the singing of some Hawaiian airs.”\textsuperscript{225}

Although Gibson cleared Compton of the hula charges he still affirmed that she had sung Hawaiian songs with her pupils. Singing Hawaiian songs seems innocent, but to the Americanizers this would have been viewed as trying to subvert the goals of assimilation. The Department of Education was teaching its Native Hawaiian students “that “thinking Hawaiian” was an inferior way,” and that “working hard and speaking English would be the Native road to civilization.” Native Hawaiian students “were often sharply punished, ridiculed, and embarrassed if they were caught speaking their native tongue.”\textsuperscript{226} As a teacher Compton was supposed to discourage her Native Hawaiian students from speaking or even thinking in Hawaiian. In this context singing Hawaiian songs in an educational setting could be seen as promoting the native Hawaiian culture, which was against the Americanization program.
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songs with her students would have been viewed as encouraging Native Hawaiian culture, sabotaging Americanization, and this behavior could result in her dismissal from school.

Although Gibson's investigation cleared Compton of the hula charges, Pope's investigation uncovered a source that affirmed that she did in fact enjoy a hula from her male students. The charge that the students had danced the hula at the Andrews' boardinghouse was made by Father Aloysius, but it was unclear where he had originally heard the rumor. Aloysius' claimed that “Judge Andrews' body had been taken to Honolulu and while that house was still in grief this woman had those children up there at 10 o'clock at night giving a serenade; I don't know what they played; I know two of them Frank Kainui and Peter Parala...That was the first time; the second time they went over I called Frank to my house and said: You rascally boy how dare you go to that house and dance the hula, you know it is prohibited by law...you children would not do that unless you were told to do so by her. He never answered me on that.”

Compton's lawyer addressed the hula rumors, and told Pope that the alleged incident occurred “after she had presented a Shakespeare play at the school Mrs. Compton invited the players to come to her house and after they got there she sat down at the piano and played and sang. I have heard rumor on the street, also in my office Father Aloysius said Mrs. Compton asked her boys there and forced the boys to dance the hula.” Smith stated he investigated the rumor, talked to the students, and the students “denied anything such ever taking place.”

While the hula was not illegal in the twentieth century based on the reactions of the White community it is obvious the hula was not held in high regard. The first ban on the hula occurred after the powerful ali‘i, Ka‘ahumanu, converted to Christianity. The missionaries who arrived in 1820 were likely “shocked by the Kanaka Maoli's (Native Hawaiians') unabashed expressions of sexuality...it is reasonable to suppose that the missionaries sought to silence this rather obvious public demonstration of sexuality of the
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grounds that it was vulgar, savage, and a violation of their Christian morals.” In 1830 Kaʻahumana “forbade its performance in public,” but upon her death in 1832 “the edict was ignored by chiefs and commoners alike.” By 1836 the “formal hula concert was again recorded as “state entertainment.”” Since the hula could not be completely wiped out by the missionaries, laws were instead passed by the authorities which “sought to curb performance by regulation.” The first such law was passed in 1851 which “empowered the Minister of the Interior to license all “public shows...to which admission is obtainable on payment of money.”” In 1859 an additional law was passed that even further restricted the hula, and stated that licenses to perform would only be granted for Lahaina or Honolulu. By 1870 amendments were passed which lowered the entry fee for hula performances, and lifted the section which had stated the hula could only be performed in Lahaina or Honolulu. The “hula gained its widest acceptance in over fifty years” during the reign of King Kalākaua (1874-1891). However, following the King's death and the illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy in 1893 “little is heard of the hula,” and “it certainly ceased as a form of official entertainment.” The hula “came into public prominence again after the first decade or so of the 20th century, this time under the stimulus of business-the entertainment business.” With the revival of the hula for the tourist industry “again the cries of “lasciviousness and “indecency” were raised.”

By accusing Compton of watching a hula performed by her male students Aloysius was alleging that she was trying to subvert the goals of Americanization, and hinted there was some degree of sexual interaction with her students. While this alleged incident occurred a decade before the hula was used to support the tourist industry this accusation reveals that the hula was not considered appropriate by Americans, and was likely still seen to be sexual. As an agent of Americanization, Mary Compton was supposed to discourage any Native Hawaiian cultural practices, and alleging she “forced” her students to dance the hula meant that she was in fact doing the opposite. Since the hula had historically been viewed by the White community as sexual, claiming she
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watched her students dance the hula hints there was some degree of sexual interaction between Compton and her students. Stating that the students even knew how to dance the hula would have reflected negatively on them as well. It is unclear how Pope considered this allegation, but the accusation did come from a credible source and depicted Compton as subverting the aims of Americanization. However, regardless of whether the event happened or how Pope considered it, the discussion and outcry surrounding this allegation is very revealing. The reaction from the White community showed that they did not view the hula as a desirable cultural practice, nor did they see it as compatible with the aims of the Americanization agenda. In addition, the accusation that Compton watched the hula with “delectation” revealed that the White community still saw the hula as sexual, and not in sync with American standards of morality. By the 1920's the hula would be used by the tourist industry to support tourism, but at this point in time the hula was not held in high regard by the White community in Hawai‘i.

In the weeks leading up to the Commissioners of Public Instruction's hearing an article was printed in The Advertiser that affirmed that Compton had enjoyed a hula from her male pupils. Compton would later sue The Advertiser for the libelous comments that the newspaper printed about her. Although the hula allegation was not substantiated by Pope's investigation the article made it appear that the event could have happened, and also elaborated upon it. The article claimed “it was stated that while she in Judge Andrews' home immediately after his death, when Mrs. Andrews was in Honolulu attending his funeral, Mrs. Compton gathered some of her young men pupils together at the house and had a party, at which it was alleged the boys for her delectation danced the hula and played the ukulele.” Whereas it is unclear who told the press about this event the publication of this charge was meant to discredit Compton, and depict her as the improper person to Americanize her students.

Richmond's lawyer, W.H. Smith, related a story to Pope that depicted Compton as the instigator behind the student strike, and challenging the education authorities power.

---
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Smith alleged that the father of a former Hilo High School student, William Weight, related a story to Smith's law partner about Compton's behavior. When Weight's son was in Hilo on vacation from school in Honolulu, he was supposedly approached by Compton, on April 1st. Compton allegedly approached Weight's son in the street and asked him, "'How would you like to mob principal Richmond.'" Weight's son supposedly stated, "'I don't know; I have nothing against him.'" Compton reportedly replied, "'Well, if we can get Principal Richmond suspended and I get to be superintendent of the schools here, you could come back to school.'" This alleged event supports Richmond's accusation that Compton was attempting to "assail" him. Even though the alleged event occurred after the student strike it depicts Compton as actively trying to recruit students to "mob" the principal, and in turn casts her as the instigator in the student strike. Moreover, this event portrayed Compton as challenging the establishment by attempting to wrest power from the superintendent himself. It is unclear how Pope considered this event, but the story portrayed Compton as the problem and a threat to the authorities power.

During her time in Hilo, Mary Compton's affiliation with different men showed that she took advantage of the new sexual freedom enjoyed by many New Women. Based on the reactions of some of Hilo's townspeople it did not appear that this sexual freedom had become socially acceptable yet for women in Hilo. Pope's investigation revealed rumors that linked her with a Mason named Keys, Hilo High father W.H.C. Campbell, and several Shriners. Her familiarity with this many men would have cast her as an immoral individual, and an improper person to teach morality to Hilo's youth. With her moral reputation tainted, any allegations that she were to make against Richmond would be viewed as questionable by authorities. By not following local standards of female gender propriety Compton was challenging the gender status quo in Hilo, inviting criticism from the community, and threatening her position as an educator.

Father Aloysius was the most vocal critic against Compton's morality, and since he was a priest it is likely he would have been viewed as a credible source of information.

---
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Aloysius believed that Compton was an immoral women, and told Pope “here is a woman who has been here only a couple of months and she knows every man in town.” Although he only saw Compton twice during her stay in Hilo he refused to take “his hat off to her,” because he did not want to be implicated with a person of her character. He told Pope that “she is the pet of a few gentlemen in this town who have not the best of morality back of them who are at the bottom of this affair.” Besides hearing rumors the priest also claimed to have personally witnessed Compton embracing Hilo High father and head Mason, W.H.C. Campbell. Aloysius stated when he went to visit the ailing Judge Andrews he saw Mr. Campbell and Mrs. Compton “in a position they should not have. I saw Mr. Campbell and Mrs. Compton; I cannot exactly recall the time it was because the thing disgusted and shocked me so and I got so angry I was ready to take up a piece of dirt and throw on him; and these are the men who want to fling mud against Mr. Richmond...why are these things come up now? Because their pet has been discharged.”

Pope had taken Aloysius’ previous letter concerning Compton's behavior seriously, and likely gave the priest's latest charges against Compton serious consideration as well. By alleging that Compton was involved with her student's father the priest was discrediting not only Compton, but the motivations behind the parent's petition and any allegation that Campbell were to make against Richmond. The most damning aspect of Aloysuis' accusation was that Compton was involved with a married man. The Progressive Era saw divorce rates rise and birth rates fall, and these trends were seen as disturbing by many Americans. Many blamed these trends on the “changing status of women as well as on increased prostitution and venereal disease.” If Compton was having an affair with a married man this behavior would play into the prevailing societal fear over the rising divorce rates, and paint Compton as one of the perpetrators behind the divorce crisis.

Compton's own lawyer, Carl Smith, volunteered information about Compton's

---
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impropriety that he had personally observed. He told Pope that he saw Compton at the Volcano House alone, and believed “that a woman who was extremely cautious in regard to her reputation in the community would not go unaccompanied to the Volcano House.” During that visit Smith had also heard rumors that Compton was “seen walking about the grounds together” with a Mason named Keys. Smith stated he had “heard a number of rumors directed towards Mrs. Compton attempting to show that if she was not an immoral person she was an improper person to be in school; I heard only innuendos no direct charges whatsoever that I have been able to trace...I made an investigation and found that there was nothing immoral against Mrs. Compton. I found much to make me think that she was unwise and tactless.”

Although Smith did not think Compton was an immoral person it is clear that he did not consider her behavior above reproach.

The final person to inform Pope of Compton's alleged immorality was Richmond's lawyer, W.H. Smith. Smith stated that “Mrs. Compton is undoubtedly a powerful woman....don't know whether she has this power with men or not; have heard that she was out at night with chauffeurs.” He also reported that Compton “went to the Volcano with the Shriners...one of the Shriners spoke to a lady here about meeting Mrs. Compton up there and having a seven or eight mile walk with her.”

The comments about Compton's behavior revealed that her actions were clashing with acceptable female gender behavior in Hilo, and this likely hurt her credibility and ability to teach local standards of morality to her students. Compton was raised in an urban city that was one of the leaders of the Progressive movement, and she would have been exposed to a more liberal attitude regarding sexuality. The breakdown of Victorian sexual norms occurred first in urban areas. Based on the negative reactions towards Compton's behavior it appears that women in Hilo were expected to adhere to stricter Victorian sexual morals. As an educator Compton was supposed to be teaching morality according to local standards of appropriate sexual behavior. It appears that Compton's behavior was contrasting with acceptable morality in Hilo, and due to this fact she was
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likely not the proper person to teach morality. Finally, since Compton was seen as an immoral woman her own accusations of immorality against the other teachers lacked credibility. Had she conformed to Hilo's gender expectations for women her moral reputation likely would have remained intact, and her accusations may have possessed some validity.

The two investigations into the conditions at Hilo High School were unable to diffuse the situation, and Pope decided that the ultimate decision would have to come from the Commissioners of Public Instruction. Gibson and Pope's investigations revealed that the department did not possess a definitive method to conduct an investigation, and this shortcoming was used by the public to push back against the results of the investigations. The selectivity in the interview process showed which groups held power in the community, and that the department intended to maintain the 'local', gender, and racial power hierarchies that composed the social order of Hilo. By refusing to interview Compton, the female students, and non-White individuals the department sustained the racial and gender status quo in the Hilo community. Furthermore, by interviewing White individuals who were well-connected residents the department upheld the social structure of the 'local' White community in Hilo. The nature of the charges waged against Richmond and Compton characterized them as immoral individuals, and the improper persons to Americanize the youth of Hilo. Richmond was accused of enjoying consensual sexual relationships with two of his staff members, sexually assaulting two of his female students, and abusing intoxicating liquor. Compton was also accused of immoral actions with the opposite sex, and sabotaging the Americanization agenda by encouraging the student strike and the hula. Pope and Gibson's investigations highlighted who held power in Hilo, and that the department intended to uphold the 'local', racial and gender power hierarchies that made up the social fabric of the city.
Chapter IV
The Hearing Before the Commissioners of Public Instruction

“It seemed a case of a woman being much brainier than a man, for Mrs. Compton in the few questions she asked Richmond went directly to the point, while Richmond floundered around in his answers to the commissioners and to Mrs. Compton.”

The conclusion reached by the Commissioners of Public Instruction showed that the department needed a better method to dismiss its teachers, and the decision revealed that the hearing upheld the various power hierarchies that composed the social structure in Hilo. The hearing was conducted in an efficient and scientific manner, where all parties were able to express their grievances and cross examine each other. However, the legal trappings meant little as none of the witnesses were under oath, and the only offense that was sustained was not a fireable one. In the days leading up to the hearing the department published a memo which revealed prejudice against Compton, and disdain over the students' attempt to assert their agency in the controversy. This memo showed that even before the hearing started the department was prejudiced against these individuals. During the hearing it was reported that a majority of Richmond's charges did not withstand questioning, whereas the charges made by Compton and her adherents did. Despite this fact Richmond was acquitted, and Compton was found guilty of insubordination, a non-fireable offense. The decision of the commissioners revealed that the department needed to clarify its dismissal regulations, and more importantly that the department upheld the power hierarchies that made up the social structure in Hawaiʻi.

Judge Stanley

The week before the Board of Commissioners of the Department of Public Instruction's hearing in Honolulu, education commissioner Judge Stanley was in Hilo on legal business. During his visit to Hilo, Stanley showed some interest in the high school affair, and informed people that the matter would be taken up in a meeting on April 22nd in Honolulu. Previously, the department officials were unsure whether the hearing was

---

going to be in Hilo or Honolulu, but Stanley did not clarify why they had decided to hold the hearing in Honolulu. The judge could not definitively state, “what would be the method of procedure to be followed, but he fancied that either side would be given an opportunity to produce such witnesses as it would want to have heard by the commissioners.” Moreover, Stanley did not believe “that the commissioners had any legal right to call witnesses,” but that it “might invite individuals to give statements should this appear desirable.” The Board of Commissioners did have “full power to appoint teachers and to discipline them,” and Stanley related it “would without a doubt do as it thought best.” Stanley reported that “he considered it beyond question that whatever action the commissioners should take in the matter, such action would be final and would not be subject to any appeal or review before any other tribunal.” While he was in Hilo, Stanley also met with interested parties who wanted to express their views on the case, but stated that there was nothing “formal about it.”

Mauna Kea

On Friday morning March 21st, two hours before the Mauna Kea departed for Honolulu, letters from the Department of Public Instruction dated March 17th arrived for Compton and Richmond. These letters formally requested that they both had to appear at a hearing before the commissioners on the following morning at 9:30 A.M.. Compton's letter also included a new set of charges against her that were allegedly made by Richmond. The latest charges against Compton now included:

1. Insubordination-refusal to comply with reasonable requests of principal.
2. Interference with the work of other teachers, especially the commercial teacher (Miss Sandry).
3. Efforts to prejudice the pupils against other teachers of the school.
4. Statements discreditable to the good name of certain teachers of the school.
5. Uncontrollable blasts of temper.
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The latest charges against Compton only pertained to her conduct in school, and none referred to her morality. Due to the short notice, Carl Smith did not have time to accompany her to Honolulu. In a press interview, Smith also remarked that Compton was given very late notice concerning the latest charges, and this “had made it impossible for Mrs. Compton to prepare herself to meet them.”

When W.H. Smith was boarding the Mauna Kea he was asked about the newest charges, and he denied that Richmond had made them. Smith stated “that these must have been made by the educational authorities themselves on their own initiative, possibly basing such on evidence which had been collected by Pope and Commissioner Stanley.” Before the departure, Smith also remarked that “he could not say under what rules the investigation would be conducted, but he would make a request that the cross-examination of witnesses be allowed.”

On Friday, April 21st, Richmond, Compton, and the other individuals involved in the fray departed on the Mauna Kea for the hearing in Honolulu. Prior to their departure, requests were made that the list of passengers involved in the Hilo affair were not to be given out, but it was reported that both attorneys “made no secret of the names of those included in the exodus.” Richmond was reportedly accompanied by Mr. and Mrs. Lewis, Miss Sandry, Miss Allen and his lawyer. Compton was accompanied by Julia, Machiyo, and Edward. It is unknown why these students were allowed to testify in light of the fact that the department had previously not wanted them to. Miss Deyo and Mrs. Campbell also went to Honolulu, but their names were not reported in the press.

“The Hilo High School Difficulty to Date”

Two days before the meeting took place, the department wrote a private report on “The Hilo High School Difficulty to Date” where it made some of its views on the case clear. The report stated that Compton had not been getting along for some time, and mentioned that Richmond had been complaining about her. The report also hinted that Compton was not a moral person, and stated it had received word that she “was not
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conducting herself as a teacher should.” Gibson's investigation was briefly summarized, and the report stated that the investigation had culminated in Compton's suspension. When the report discussed the students' strike it stated that the students consulted with Compton and her attorney, and then related that the pupils prepared a petition. The department remarked that the petition and strike were “a rather bold and serious stand for pupils to take against territorial school authorities.” The report ended with a brief overview of Pope's investigation, and stated that a meeting was set for the 22nd of April.249

This memorandum shows that the department believed that Compton was the problem, and was responsible for the student strike and petition. In addition, it revealed that the department viewed the students' attempt to assert their agency as challenging the government's authority. By only discussing the allegations against Compton the department made it clear that they saw Compton as the problem, and likely did not believe the charges against the other teachers. None of the allegations against the other teachers were mentioned, but the report remarked on Compton's behavior both inside and outside of school. Although the report did not directly state that Compton was responsible for the student strike and petition, it hinted that she may have been responsible for both. It stated that the students left the school following Compton's suspension, and “were sometime in consultation with Mrs. Compton and her attorney, Mr. Carl Smith.”250 After the report mentioned the “consultation” it stated that the students prepared a petition. The manner in which the report sequenced these events highlights that the department likely thought the students drafted the petition after the strike and the “consultation” with Compton and Smith. The reality was that the students never consulted with Compton after the strike, and had prepared the petition beforehand. Smith did talk with the students, but only after Mrs. Andrews called him to help with the situation. The authorities did not approve of the students' actions, because they saw it as a challenge to the territorial officials' authority. The schools were supposed to produce “good citizens,” but challenging the territorial officials' authority was not seen as “good citizenship” behavior. Due to the fact that the department disapproved of the students'
behavior it is unlikely that they were willing to give their testimony and demands serious consideration. Furthermore, if the department approved of the student strike they would have been reinforcing the belief that it was acceptable to challenge governmental authority. This was not the type of behavior that the department wanted to encourage in a colonial setting. This report shows that going into the hearing the department was prejudiced against both Compton and her only witnesses, the students, and this would likely not allow them to receive a fair hearing.

The Hearing

The hearing before the Board of Commissioners of the Department of Public Instruction was held over a period of the three days at the department's office in Honolulu. The methodology that the department employed to conduct their hearing would allow Compton and Richmond to call forth witnesses, state their charges, reply to the opposition's charges, and cross examine the witnesses. The hearing did try to employ some of the characteristics that were used by a court of law. However, the hearing was missing one important attribute. None of the individuals were under oath, and therefore, they were not compelled to tell the truth. Attorneys were not allowed to cross examine the witnesses, but were allowed to be present, take notes, and give their client advice during the hearing. Richmond was accompanied by his lawyer, but due to the late notice, Compton arrived alone without her attorney. During the trial Compton would be on her own while W.H. Smith took notes for Richmond and advised him. Hilo educators Miss Allen, Miss Sandry, Miss Josephine Deyo, and Mrs. Lewis would testify in support of Richmond as his witnesses. All of Richmond's witnesses were adults, and were part of the social fabric that made up the 'local' White community in Hilo. In contrast, Compton had brought only Machiyo Arakawa, Edward Maby, and Julia Nathaniel as her witnesses. Unlike Richmond's witnesses, her witnesses lacked power in that they were underage, students, and were not members of the 'local' White community in Hilo. The hearing was closely followed by Hawai‘i's newspapers who provided a detailed account of the event in the press. In addition to detailing the charges in the affair, the press also focused on how the charges withstood questioning, and described the behavior of Richmond, Compton, and their witnesses during the hearing. The manner in which these individuals
conducted themselves, and the inability of many charges to hold up under questioning may reveal what really happened at Hilo High School. During the hearing three of Richmond's charges were reported to have “fallen flat” under questioning, one of his statements contradicted itself, and at points in the hearing Richmond had a difficult time answering questions. The press also reported that Mrs. Lewis had a difficult time answering questions that would have been in favor of Mrs. Compton, but did not find it difficult to answer questions that would not have been in favor of Compton. Nothing negative was reported about the testimony of Richmond's other witnesses, Sandry, Allen, and Deyo. In contrast, the press revealed that Compton and her witnesses conducted themselves very well during the hearing. The majority of Compton's charges appeared to have held up under questioning, but during the hearing Compton decided to drop the charges of immorality against Sandry and she lied about Mrs. Campbell chaperoning her trip to the volcano. After three days of listening to the testimony from both parties, and a day of deliberation, the commissioners found that some of Compton's actions bordered upon insubordination, but that in the main no one was guilty in the school affair. However, the inability of some of the charges to withstand scrutiny, the manner in which people answered questions at the hearing may point to a different verdict, and that the decision was intended to uphold the power hierarchies that supported colonialism in Hawai‘i.

On April 22nd, the commissioners' meeting commenced in Honolulu at 9 A.M., and Pope opened the meeting by stating that it was not “a special one but...the regular April meeting.” The “Hilo High School difficulty” was the first order of business listed on the program for the commissioners, because the department was paying for the expenses of the teachers and witnesses to be in Honolulu. The board first read the official report of Inspector Gibson, and some letters that were presumably related to the affair. After Gibson's report was read the board conferred and decided that Compton and Richmond could be present during the hearing, and since the hearing was public their attorneys could attend as well. After this decision was made, Mrs. Compton entered the room with Mrs. Campbell, Richmond entered with his attorney, and several other people entered “amongst whom were some of the legislators.” Almost immediately it was
reported that “Mrs. Compton objected to the presence of Mr. Smith and was informed that this was a public hearing and Mr. Smith could not be barred though he would not be allowed to question or cross examine.” The commissioners decided to first take up the charges against Mary Compton, and the charges against her and Gibson's report were read. Judge Stanley, who was “asked to conduct the hearing,” requested that “Mr. Richmond to give the Board full particulars regarding his complaints.”

Stanley wanted each of Richmond's charges to be taken up in turn, and Richmond's original charges against Compton of failure to obey orders, direct insubordination, and insults to other teachers were cross examined by the commissioners and Compton. It is unknown why the commissioners decided not to examine the latest charges made against Compton, and decided to stick to the original three made by Richmond during Gibson's investigation.

During the cross examination of Richmond the press stated that Richmond's charges did not hold up under scrutiny, and the press also remarked upon Richmond and Compton's behavior. The press stated that during the cross examination “it seemed a case of a woman being much brainier than a man, for Mrs. Compton in the few questions she asked Richmond went directly to the point, while Richmond floundered around in his answers to the commissioners and to Mrs. Compton.”

In addition, it was declared that “in comparison with Richmond, who blundered through everything he said, the lady loomed up like a skilled attorney or a person who had been well coached.”

When Compton questioned Richmond in regards to the charge of “failure to obey orders” it was stated that “she tied him up in several knots, making him admit, in regard to the first charge, that she already had an outline of her own. Also that the book mentioned to be outlined was not used in the ninth grade.”

---
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question, Moir asked Richmond “what was the necessity of outlining this work if the book was not used and might not be used next year.” In response to Moir's question it was stated that Richmond “gave rather evasive answers and said that the outline was of use only to the teacher.”

Richmond stated that Compton was insubordinate when she refused to give him her corrected English papers, gave a failing student an exam, and went to the volcano. Little was reported about Compton's refusal to give Richmond her English papers, except that Richmond stated “the reason he asked for the papers was that he thought they were not corrected soon enough.” It is unknown how the commissioners considered this part of the insubordination charge. In regards to the volcano charge it was reported that “pinned down by Stanley, Richmond admitted that this act was not insubordinate.” Moreover, Richmond was asked “if Mrs. Compton's illness had anything to do with her work in nursing the late Judge Andrews during his illness.” Richmond replied that “he did not know.” The charge that Compton was insubordinate when she gave a failing student an exam apparently “fell flat under searching questions by Stanley.” Stanley also “made Richmond admit that Mrs. Compton did nothing when she asked permission to change the boy’s work as a result of this examination. Hence there was no insubordination.”

Richmond's final charge that Compton had insulted other teachers garnished mixed reactions from the commissioners. The commissioners dismissed the majority of the charge, and asked for additional verification on only one aspect of it. This charge included claims that Compton had spoken angrily to other teachers, demanded control of all of the music from Lewis, questioned Richmond's authority at a meeting, and threatened to wreck the Hilo High School. After Richmond discussed the staff meeting, “Stanley made Richmond admit that this was the only meeting at which Mrs. Compton was angry. At other meetings she had objected to things.” Commissioner Wilcox asked
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Richmond if “these faculty meetings were for mutual help and a teacher has a right to criticize or object?” Richmond replied this was true. Commissioner Aiken stated “this charge is that she addressed other teachers in an insulting manner before the pupils. This has not been substantiated.” Stanley remarked “it seems that Mr. Richmond is the only one to be insulted by Mrs. Compton, and that at faculty meeting.” Richmond was asked if there were any other instances, and the principal provided two different stories in regards to her behavior in front of the pupils. However, Richmond later admitted that “in regards to insulting other teachers...this has been reported to him by others, but he had seen little of it.” There is no documentation to show how the commissioners regarded the other instance of Compton's alleged misconduct in front of the pupils. However, the commissioners did ask Richmond to provide witnesses to corroborate Compton's alleged statement that she would wreck the Hilo High School. Richmond said that this statement could be corroborated by Lewis and Deyo.258

That afternoon Allen, and Sandry “verified the charges preferred by Mr. Richmond against Mrs. Compton.”259 Lewis confirmed that she heard, in the presence of Miss Allen, that Compton had threatened to ruin Richmond and wreck the Hilo High School. During Lewis' examination it was reported that “it was remarked how well her memory served her on facts connected with Mrs. Compton, especially in calling to mind the statement alleged to have been made by Mrs. Compton when leaving the Lewis home of “I'll fix you.””260 Deyo did not corroborate the charges that Compton refused Richmond's request, and had threatened to wreck the Hilo High School. She also told the commissioners that she “could not recall an instance which called in her attention the fact that there was discord in the school on Mrs. Compton's account.” Allen corroborated Richmond's charges and elaborated upon the problems at the boardinghouse, and there was nothing irregular reported about her testimony. However, when Richmond was examining Allen the press described Richmond's questions as “carefully put.”261 Nothing
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was reported about Sandry's testimony in the press, but the department records state that she corroborated his charges.

After Richmond's witnesses testified, the board allowed Compton to reply to the charges, and to bring forth her own charges against Richmond. Before she began, Compton asked “Mr. Pope if his attitude was the same as that of Inspector Gibson toward her, the latter having said in Hilo that he had known the other teachers for years and she was a stranger to him so that their word would go farther than would her own.” Pope was not given the opportunity to reply, because Stanley said “that her word was just as good as Richmond's or any other teacher and that the commissioners did not know any of them personally.” Following Stanley's remark, Compton was asked by Commissioner Aiken “to tell why and how she came to Hawai‘i.” Compton reportedly “told her story in a straightforward manner without any hesitancy or dramatics, and she went from point to point with the sure perception of a well-trained mind, making a good impression on her auditors.” Her story included her version of the events that had occurred which had led up to the Hilo High controversy. However, there was one facet of her story that it is likely she was untruthful about. In regards to her volcano trip she told the commissioners that Mrs. Campbell was her chaperone. This claim is contradicted by the statement of W.H.C. Campbell who related that he and his wife saw her at the volcano and she rode in the same machine with them, but he did not report that his wife was her chaperone. Moreover, Campbell stated that Compton did not return in the same machine as he and his wife did when they departed the volcano. If Mrs. Campbell was Compton's chaperone it is likely that W.H.C. Campbell would have told Pope, and Compton would have left the volcano with them. It is unclear why Compton may have lied about this part of her story, but it is possible that she changed her story following the disapproval she received after she visited to the volcano alone. Compton also “denied all the statements made by the other witnesses and offered to produce many papers and letters of

---
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recommendation that she” had “in her possession.” For the first time, since the affair began, Compton was allowed to inform the authorities of her charges against Richmond, and her charges included:

“1. Insobriety
2. Immoral relations with some teachers.
3. Improper familiarity with school girls.
4. Assaulting Julia Nathaniel and Margaret.
5. Indecent proposal to herself at Rainbow Falls.”

Compton provided the commissioners with a detailed account of the charges, and important events in relation to the affair. The only charge that she would not initially elaborate upon was the “Margaret Episode.” When Judge Stanley first asked her to described this alleged episode, Compton stated, “Do you want me to tell you in public?...It is extremely embarrassing to tell here before all these people. I'd much prefer to tell you in private.” The hearing adjourned before Compton could elaborate upon all of her charges, and when it resumed the following Monday Compton was given the opportunity to continue her story.

On April 24th, the hearing continued with more questions concerning the alleged “wreck Hilo High School comment,” further testimony from both side's witnesses, and a continuation of Compton's charges against Richmond and her version of important events in the controversy. The meeting opened with Richmond having to deny a report “published in the morning paper that there was a rumor he had married Miss Sandry before coming to Honolulu last week.” Following Richmond's denial that the event had occurred, the commissioners grilled him about not reporting Compton's alleged remark that she would wreck the school. Richmond claimed that he did not report the event,
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because he did not think she was capable of wrecking the school. However, Moir told him “that he should have reported the whole matter to the board when Mrs. Compton made the alleged remark.”

Compton questioned Richmond as to what time she had asked for control of the music for the entire school, but she was unable to get a definite answer from him. Since she could not get a definite answer from him she appealed to the board. Richmond was then questioned by Aiken and Stanley about the alleged request, and Richmond stated “that Mrs. Compton asked for entire charge of the music in the literary society.” However, the press reported that Richmond's statement “did not tally with that of Saturday, when he gave the impression, if not the exact words, that Mrs. Compton had asked for entire charge of the music in the high school.”

There is no evidence to show how the commissioners reacted to this inconsistency in Richmond's story.

Edward, Julia, and Machiyo were Compton's only witnesses to support her charges against Richmond, and their responses corroborated Compton's allegations. They did not confirm Richmond's charge that Compton acted insubordinate in their presence. Edward denied that there was a hula, and declared that Compton knew nothing about the strike or petition. The press did not comment on the manner in which the girls answered the questions, but it stated that “under questioning by Richmond, Edward replied in the same tenor as he had to the other questions.”

Mrs. Lewis and Miss Sandry were given the opportunity to relate their opinion concerning the events in the controversy. Lewis reportedly gave “her testimony in a positive and empathetic manner while being questioned by members of the board.” However, when Lewis was “taken up by Mrs. Compton for cross-examination her memory was considerably at fault on any incidents that were in favor of the questioner.
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and her answers to these questions gave the Board no information, being generally, “I
don't remember,” or “I didn't hear that.””\textsuperscript{272} Sandry was given the opportunity to describe
“her differences with Mrs. Compton regarding work of some pupils.”\textsuperscript{273} When she
answered the board's questions Sandry “was deliberate in her remarks and talked in a low
voice.” In comparison, when Sandry was cross examined by Compton it was stated that
she “never once looked at her questioner but gazed in blue-eyed wonder out of the
window while she slowly made her answers.” After Sandry and Lewis had finished their
testimony one of the commissioners remarked, “How those three women love each
other.”\textsuperscript{274}

Following the afternoon recess Pope announced “that the statements which he and
Judge Stanley had made to them at Hilo would be read. He warned those present that
there would be some things brought up which were delicate subjects and suggested that if
anyone present did not want to be shocked they had better leave.” Despite Pope's
warning “no one moved.” After the matter was finished another recess was taken until 8
P.M., and at that time “the charges of Mrs. Compton against Richmond for drunkenness
and immorality” were considered.\textsuperscript{275}

Compton was asked to continue her charges against Richmond, and she related
her stories about his alleged drinking, relationship with Lewis, relationship with Sandry,
and the assaults on Margaret, Machiyo and Julia.\textsuperscript{276} When Compton presented her
charges it was stated that “she was absolutely alone...while Richmond sat with Smith, his
attorney in the corner, the lawyer taking copious notes of the proceedings.” In contrast,
Compton “had taken her own notes and asked her own questions during the examination,
and she was alone as far as any friendly advice went, yet she held her own from start to
finish.” The press reported that Stanley “conducted the examination of Mrs. Compton
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and he hounded her from start to finish pinning her down to the most direct statements of what she had herself seen, and not once in the more than sixty minutes on the stand did she falter before the rapid fire of the legal mind." Compton was extensively questioned by Stanley in regards to Richmond's drinking, and even when “pinned down to exact facts as regards to Richmond's drinking, Mrs. Compton still stuck to her statement that Richmond was a “drunk.”” When the charge against Sandry was take up Stanley warned Compton “of the seriousness of the charges,” and she “was asked if she wanted to press the case against Miss Sandry.” It was reported Compton hesitated, and only stated she knew Richmond and Sandry traveled together on trains. Stanley asked Compton “if she meant to insinuate anything immoral in the fact that the pair had traveled on the same train and steamer,” and reminded Compton that she and Richmond were on the same boat together. Compton “then declared that she would drop the charges against Miss Sandry.”

With regards to the alleged relationship between Richmond and Lewis it was reported that this “was pressed to the limit by Mrs. Compton.” Compton refused to elaborate upon Richmond's alleged immoral proposals to her at Rainbow Falls, and stated “he made indecent proposals to me; I think that explains the situation without going into details.” Stanley asked Compton why she did not report Richmond's immorality to the board at the time. She replied “‘If I had known there was a member of the board near Hilo I would have gone to him...I know very little about the way things are done in these Islands and I was standing all alone with everybody against me.’”

When Richmond was given the opportunity to cross examine the charges that Compton had made against him he refused to do so at that time. It was reported that “Richmond did not want to question Compton until morning.” The press stated it was

“apparently being put up to him by W.H. Smith, the two having their heads together, at the conclusion of which Richmond begged off on account of poor light and eyesight.” Moir wanted “the examination to go on with Richmond,” and Richmond's attorney asked “if the board would allow him to cross-examine, as he had taken the notes for Richmond, it would be all right.” It is unclear how the commissioners reacted to these requests, but Smith was not given the opportunity to cross examine Compton. Instead the commissioners decided to “examine the girls who made the affidavits of Richmond's proposals to them.”

Julia Nathaniel was the first girl called, and she related her story about the events that occurred in the boardinghouse. Little was reported of Julia's testimony in the press except that Richmond had tried to fondle her, made a proposal to her, had kissed Margaret, and drank. Julia remarked, “that a man should not drink who taught school.”

Nothing was said about the manner in which Julia gave her testimony.

At 9 A.M., on April 25th, the third day of the hearing commenced with the testimony of Machiyo Arakawa concerning Richmond's familiarity towards her. It was reported that Machiyo “declared that she at first did not know what Richmond meant. “It was my first experience with a man,” she modestly remarked.”

The press stated that “Richmond took the witness in hand but could not shake her testimony and she was excused.”

After Machiyo's testimony was completed, Richmond was given the opportunity to cross examine Compton in regards to the charges she made against him. When Richmond started to read the first question Compton objected to answering it. The press reported that Richmond and his lawyer had arrived at the hearing that morning “primed to
put Mrs. Compton out of commission.” Richmond's questions “were written on Young Hotel stationary and many of them were typewritten, showing much work after the meeting was adjourned at 11 last night.” Compton argued that “Richmond had been coached by an attorney...and that she had no legal advice since the investigation started. She was not to be cross-examined by a lawyer without legal counsel herself.”\textsuperscript{286} The commissioners re-informed Compton that “attorneys might be present; that the Board could see no objection to their offering assistance; further that it would not permit any unfair procedure against her.” The commissioners granted Compton from 10 A.M. until 1 P.M. to secure an attorney.\textsuperscript{287}

Julia Nathaniel was then called and questioned regarding her affidavit.\textsuperscript{288} She was cross examined by Richmond, and it was stated “her evidence could not be shaken in the slightest degree, and she retold the story of Richmond's alleged attempt to assault her.”\textsuperscript{289} Nothing further was reported about her testimony. After her testimony the hearing was suspended, and the board took up their regular business while Compton hunted for an attorney.\textsuperscript{290}

Compton was unable to secure an attorney in Honolulu, and was advised by a Honolulu attorney to send for Carl Smith in Hilo. The commissioners informed her that “they did not feel justified in delaying the hearing until the arrival of her attorney,” and was given permission to consult with the local attorney by phone. After a phone consultation Compton “returned and expressed her willingness to be examined.”\textsuperscript{291}

Little was reported in the press about Richmond's cross examination of Compton. It was stated that Richmond questioned her about the drunkenness charge, the arrangement of the Lewis home, and the Rainbow Falls incident. The only irregular

aspect of this cross examination was Compton's refusal to go into details about Richmond's alleged immoral proposals to her at Rainbow Falls.  

Allen, Sandry, and Lewis were called to testify regarding Compton's charges against Richmond. All the women stated that the charges were false, and that they had never seen him drunk. Nothing was said about the manner in which Sandry and Allen made their statements, but it was reported that “Mrs. Lewis was cool and collected and made her statement very clearly.”

Richmond was given the opportunity to reply to the charges made against him, and he was questioned by the commissioners and Compton. Richmond denied all of the charges that were made against him, and stated that everything was false. The press reported that “the general denial of the parties against whom Mrs. Compton brought charges was rather expected by the board, as no one was under oath and the board had no authority to put anyone under oath for testimony.” When the commissioners were questioning Richmond it was reported “he evaded questions and put statements which the commissioner had to question him closely about in order to get at the real facts.”

However, it was also reported that “Stanley got a very decided “No” to his question as to whether Richmond had made any indecent proposals to Mrs. Compton while at the falls.”

Under Compton's cross examination Richmond denied all the charges that she had made against him, and it was stated “when answering Mrs. Compton Richmond looked steadily away and would not meet her gaze when he answered.” Following the cross examination of Richmond the hearing of the Board of Commissioners was
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The Decision

On April 26th, the commissioners went into a closed, executive session to discuss the “Compton-Richmond matter.” During the afternoon break, Moir publicly stated that “We are taking up every point brought out in the testimony and in the written evidence presented to us and are discussing each in turn...We are going into the subject thoroughly for we do not want to give any snap judgement, and when we do arrive at our conclusion we shall forward a copy of the decision to each of the parties in the controversy.” That day the board finished its deliberations, and unanimously came to a decision regarding the affair.

On April 27th, Richmond, Compton, and the press were notified about the findings of the Board of Commissioners. The press reported that “Richmond was found in his room and given his copy, but Mrs. Compton was away from the hotel and no one knew where she could be found.” At 1:55 P.M. the copy “of the findings was sent to her by messenger,” and “then the reporters had their chance at the story.”

The board found that the charges against Richmond's moral conduct could not be substantiated. However, the board found, “from the statements made before it, as to the conduct of the school and the discipline maintained thereat under his administration, that the efficiency of the Department of Public Instruction will be promoted by transferring Mr. Richmond to another school, and such transfer will accordingly be made.”

The charges against Compton “in the main failed of proof.” However, the board believed that “several acts bordering upon insubordination on her part...been established to the satisfaction of the board, and during the present school year there has been amongst

---
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the teachers at the school a lack of harmony for which Mrs. Compton was a large extent responsible.” Due to the lack of harmony “the discipline of the school has been seriously impaired.” The board stated that it found “that the efficiency of the Department of Public Instruction will be promoted by transferring Mrs. Compton to another school, and such transfer will accordingly be made.”

The Board of Commissioners never elaborated as to why nor how they arrived at their final decision. It is unclear how the board considered the evidence and the testimony brought before them, but Gibson and Pope's investigations had shown that the department had initially intended to uphold the 'local', racial, and gender hierarchies that made up Hilo's social fabric. However, based on their finding it is certain that the evidence against Richmond was not “compelling” enough to convince the board that he had acted inappropriately, and only that there was a lack of discipline under his administration. Moreover, despite the fact that Richmond's testimony was inconsistent, the board believed that the evidence against Compton was sufficient enough to conclude that she was mainly responsible for the lack of harmony at the school and was insubordinate. The board did not explain why they retained an insubordinate teacher, but it was due to the fact that it was not listed as a fireable offense. For reasons unknown, the department thought it was best to transfer the two teachers with whom they had both found fault with to different schools.

The General Public's Reactions to the Decision

The conclusion of the Board of Commissioners hearing surprised and upset the Hawai‘i general public. The day that the results were made public it was reported that “the findings of the board were rather unexpected, in a way, as the talk on the street for the past two days has been that something definite should be done, but the final decision is in the form of a whitewash for both parties.” Editor Lantana of the Honolulu newspaper, *Evening Bulletin*, published an editorial where he expressed his disdain with regards to the findings. Lantana stated he wanted to express his views “and they seem to be the views of about everyone else on the “findings.”” He described the findings as,
“Now, children, if you can't play quietly together you must go into different rooms and stay there.” In addition, he stated that the guilty parties should be fired and prosecuted, and the non guilty ones be allowed to go back to Hilo. Lantana criticized the board, and requested that “if the investigating committee was not capable of placing the guilt, it would seem that it is about time that somebody brought in some “findings” on the committee.” The editorial ended with Lantana’s remark that “left in a state of uncertainty as to the guilty party, I am positive that no child of mine should attend the school where either of these two guilty people was placed.”

The verdict of the Commissioners of Public Instruction revealed that the hearing upheld the 'local', racial, and gender power hierarchies that composed Hilo's social structure. Richmond was acquitted on a clean bill despite the fact that the testimony against him could not be shaken at all by the commissioners. Had the commissioners sustained the evidence against Richmond they would have been giving power to those who were marginalized in the territory, and this would have threatened the power structure that colonialism was supported upon. Instead, Compton was found guilty of insubordination although the majority of the evidence against her was disproven. The verdict ensured that the social order of Hilo was maintained. Whereas the verdict seemed to be an attempt by the department to “whitewash” the situation the controversy was not over. For weeks the affair had been a hot topic in the press, but it had culminated in a non-climatic conclusion where neither party was really guilty. The outcry over this conclusion would result in the affair being brought before the Federal Grand Jury for an ultimate decision.

Chapter V

The Federal Grand Jury Investigation

“We do not think the evidence would justify a verdict of guilty of a violation of the United States statutes, yet we are of the opinion, from the evidence elicited by us that Mr. Richmond had conducted himself in a very questionable and immoral manner, which renders him, in our opinion, unfit to act as a teacher of children.”

The Federal Grand Jury investigation is the least documented event in the entire affair, but revealed dissatisfaction with the decision of the Department of Public Instruction, gender prejudice against Compton, and that Richmond may have been guilty. The affair likely went before the Federal Grand Jury because of the Department of Public Instruction's inability to place the blame on either party during the hearing. The public was not satisfied with the results, and was happy that the affair was to be reviewed by a real legal body. In addition, both the parents and the teachers at the schools where Compton and Richmond were to be transferred were incensed at the department's decision. They refused to accept the fact that Compton and Richmond would retain their jobs, and protested this decision. One of the grand jurors wrote and published a poem during the investigation that reflected his gender prejudice against Compton, and revealed that he thought Compton's challenge to the gender power structure in Hawai‘i was a cause of the affair. The investigation also showed attempts by an unknown party to show that Compton had behaved in an immoral fashion by writing a love letter to a man which revealed that even in an urban city like Honolulu it was not acceptable for a New Woman to keep company with a man. Finally, while the investigation was still in session, the Department of Public Instruction was allegedly claiming that Compton would be dismissed if her evidence was not sustained against Richmond. While no reason was to provided to explain the department's decision it is likely that the department was still trying to sustain the social structure in Hilo. Although the Federal Grand Jury would not convict anyone of a crime its final report would reveal a high possibility that Richmond was guilty of immoral conduct, and that Compton may have been telling the truth.

However, the Federal Grand Jury's decision not to indict showed that this legal body also upheld the power hierarchies in Hilo, and did not intend to challenge them by allowing those at the bottom to prevail against those at the top.

**The Subpoenas**

On the morning of April 29th, Frank Richmond and his lawyer, W.H. Smith, were waiting on the wharf in Honolulu to sail on the Claudine back to Hilo. Just before the steamer was going to sail Richmond was “subpoena'ed to appear before the federal grand jury on Saturday morning, so he and Smith did not go after all.” Commissioner Moir witnessed Richmond being served the subpoena, and stated that it “was a complete surprise to me.” Moir also reported that the other parties were booked on the same steamer, but they did not arrive.307 That morning found both Richmond and Compton at the Judiciary Building in Honolulu, and they “were placed upon the witness stand by the Federal Inquisitors.” Richmond reportedly waited “in the corridors of the Judiciary building adjoining the offices of the United States District Attorney,” and Compton “remained on the back lanai of the Judiciary building awaiting her call to appear before the grand jury.” The press reported that the “jury plans a thorough investigation into the Hilo High School case and will also summon the girls who gave testimony.”308

**The Protests in Honolulu's Schools**

In the meantime, on May 4th, Compton and Richmond's assignments to Honolulu's Central Grammar School and the Normal School respectively were withdrawn amidst protests from teachers and parents at those schools. Principal Edgar Wood, of the Normal School, wrote a letter to Pope stating “that the members of the teaching staff are opposed to Richmond coming to the institution,” and they are “of the firm and abiding opinion that the assignment of Richmond to the school would have a disastrous effect upon the general standard of school discipline.”309 Wood also reported that the parents had filed

---

protests with him, and “that there are signs of insubordination on the part of his pupils.” Pope independently received telephone messages “to the effect that children have been kept away from the Central Grammar School because their parents learned that Mrs. Compton was to be assigned there.” Moreover, the press reported that “an organized movement has been commenced amongst a majority of the teachers in Honolulu for the purpose of protesting by intimation, or by arms, their dislike at the action of the department of public instruction in “settling” the business.” The protest was allegedly over “the failure of the commissioners to take a definite stand on the charges...but carries a threat that if the department insists upon giving the two persons named positions in local schools the teachers here will go on strike.”

It is hardly surprising that the teachers and parents reacted this strongly to the department's decision to relocate Compton and Richmond to new schools. For weeks the affair had been reported in the press, and the public had been provided with some of the most disparaging and intimate details of the affair. The affair had ended somewhat anti-climactically with neither teacher being found guilty of any of the major offenses that they were charged with. While neither teacher was found “guilty” of any offense the department still believed that they were not good for the discipline of the school, but still decided to retain them. Two teachers, whom the department had found some issue with, were going to be relocated to new schools, and it is likely people thought that they would disrupt the harmony at the other schools. The outcry over the department's decision was effective, and both Richmond and Compton's assignments were withdrawn.

Hilo High School Under Mr. McClusky

Meanwhile, Hilo High School re-opened on May 8th under the temporary supervision of Mr. McClusky, an education department official, who for the past year had

“been busy systematizing the work of public schools to Kalapana to Waipio.” In an address to both students and staff, McClusky stated that the school was to going to come under the same regulations that governed his other schools, and “the common law of society was the established rule.” McClusky notified everyone that he would be keeping a record of each individual that included academic achievements, conduct at school, personal appearance, attitude, and any other important events. It appears that McClusky was attempting to make the school adhere to Progressive ideals of efficiency and scientific management, and was taking no chances that another interpersonal scandal would effect the school.

The Federal Grand Jury Investigation

The Federal Grand Jury investigation was held over a period of two weeks in Honolulu, and did not result in an indictment for either Compton or Richmond. The jury reported that the evidence was not sufficient to indict Richmond, but did not specify what faults they found with the evidence. Whereas the jury decided not to indict either party, it made its report public knowledge even though it was supposed to be kept secret, and in that report it printed very disparaging comments about Richmond. The report was published, because of the “public demand for somebody to take some action, make some report on the person accused.”

It is unclear why the affair went before the grand jury, but it is highly likely it was due to the public disdain over the “findings” of the Department of Public Instruction. Newspaper articles that were printed following the release of the board's findings, and an article printed during the grand jury investigation revealed that the public was dissatisfied with the results of the Commissioners' hearing. During the Federal Grand Jury investigation the press stated that “mighty few would ever be satisfied if the whole affair were not thoroughly sifted by a duly authorized body whose special purpose is to do which the Commissioners of Public Instruction found themselves incapable.”

The names of the Federal Grand Jurors were not published, there is almost no
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information about them, but the press stated that they were “busy men and leading citizens.” During the investigation one juror did reveal a gender prejudice against Compton when he re-wrote the “Mary Had a Little Lamb” poem to fit the specificities of the case, and published it in the newspaper. Other than this bias, little is known about the jurors' opinion except that “a few jury's own number were very much incensed at the accused and at the dilatory, indecisive attitude of the Board of Education, and were imbued with the urgency of the case, the necessity for action, the danger to the school children.”

The jurors did subpoena a number of witnesses to testify who included Hilo High student Evelyn Vannatta, W.H.C. Campbell, a former Lewis maid named Mina, Editor Conness, Stephen Desha, unnamed Hilo High teachers, and Margaret Anderson. There are no articles stating that the Machiyo and Julia were subpoena'ed, but the press reported that the jury intended to have them testify. The other people that testified before the jurors was the proprietor of the Maui Hotel who had information concerning Compton's alleged conduct, Superintendent Pope, and a stenographer for W.H. Smith. There is no information clarifying why the proprietor testified, and it is unknown if they were subpoena'ed or not.

Besides a handful of newspaper articles there are no other archival sources available that fully tell this portion of the affair. Seven newspaper articles were printed during the investigation, and four of these articles more or less reflected negatively on Compton, but almost nothing was reported about the testimony against Richmond. While

the Federal Grand Jury would be the last official body to consider the affair its report
would not completely satisfy the public. Moreover, the report would result in Richmond
bringing suit against the jury for making the proceedings public when no indictment was
returned, and Richmond requesting that the jury strike certain disparaging remarks about
him from the record.

Following the initial examination of Richmond and Compton on Saturday, April 29th, the jury recommenced the investigation on Monday, May 1st, with the testimony of
Superintendent Pope and the reading of Kipling's poetry. It is unclear why the jurors took
an interest in the Kipling poetry, but the press reported that the teachers and principal
have been subpoena'ed “to explain certain passages in these modern English classics.”

Nothing was reported about the proceedings for several days, but on May 5th a
poem was printed in the press that was written by one of the grand jurors on May 4th. The
press reported that “one of the grand jurors took his pen in hand...and expressed himself
as follows on the subject of Mary, thus adding a new line of poetry to that which has
figured in the Compton Richmond case, including Conness and his Kiplingese.” The
poem was written under the pseudonym, Elderly Horse, and is as follows:

“Mary had a harem skirt,
For suffragettes you know.
And everywhere that Mary went
That skirt did make a show.

She wore it to the school one day,
Which didn't look just right;
The teachers tried to put her out,
And then there was a fight.

The Board they tried to settle it
By making Mary hike;
But then the kids took up the quarrel,
And they began to strike.

So Mary then fixed up her skirt
And left without a frown,

320“Hilo School Row Goes to Grand Jury,” The Hawaiian Gazette, May 2, 1911, from the Library of
Congress, Chronicling America: Historic American Newspapers site,
To teach us Honolulu folk
   As in the Rainy Town.

   The teachers tried to bar her way.
      They “disapproved her work”;
   But the truth is this—I tell you what,
      They hate the harem skirt.”

This poem revealed that Compton had challenged the local gender power structure, how the New Woman was perceived in the territory, and that one juror believed that gender conflict was the cause of the affair. Dress reform was one of the many changes brought about by the New Woman, and “the popularity of the bicycle liberated her from her corset, shortened her skirts or clad her in bloomers, and made her mobile.”

The harem skirt, which looked similar to the nineteenth century freedom dress also known as bloomers, was one of the first pants for women, and in 1911 French designers “daringly presented the harem skirt (or jupe culotte) as fashionable attire.” It has been noted that the ““notorious jupe culotte (or harem trouser-skirt) of 1911” caused a scandal, in part, because it indicated the legs.”

There is no evidence to suggest that Compton wore a harem skirt, but the author may have chosen this recent controversial aspect of the New Woman to underscore Compton's clash with acceptable gender behavior in Hawai‘i. In this poem it is clear that the author did not see the harem skirt as appropriate clothing for women, and equivocated it with the female suffrage movement which he also does not approve of. Elderly Horse's passage, “everywhere that Mary went that skirt did make a show,” shows that the Compton's behavior conflicted with local notions of female gender propriety in the territory of Hawai‘i. Since Compton was a New Woman, and her behavior was seen as controversial, it is unlikely that the New Woman had gained significant acceptance in Hawai‘i. He paints Compton as a suffragist, by stating that she is trying to teach both Honolulu and Hilo her views. This portion underscores the
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possibility that female suffrage was not popular in Hilo nor Honolulu. His comment about the other teachers disliking her harem skirt reveals the possibility that the other teachers were not as liberal as Compton, and that this was a possible reason they did not get along. This grand juror believed that the affair was caused by a New Woman challenging the female gender expectations in the territory. It is unknown how this mindset impacted the grand jury's view of Compton, but it is unlikely that it would have helped her case. However, what this poem does show is that Compton's behavior had challenged the gender expectations for women in the territory of Hawai‘i.

On May 5th, the witnesses that the jury subpoena'ed went to Honolulu to testify, and it was reported that they “preserved an air of mystery by failing to book at the steamship office.” A stenographer employed by the firm LeBlond and Smith, whom the press did not state was subpoena'ed, also went to Honolulu to testify. After the affair had been brought before the federal grand jury “an exhaustive investigation of the geography of the Lewis house” was made, and it was claimed that “it has been proved that the statements which have been quoted as Mrs. Compton's before the board of education investigation, described a state of alleged facts which were, as a matter of fact, impossible.” It was reported that “it is thus impossible for a person sitting at the Richmond desk to see Mrs. Lewis' room, and even when one approaches the railing of the hall, one can see only the veriest segment of the room, and the story of the mirror, if quoted correctly is absurd, as from no part of the hallway occupied by richmond can the bureau be seen.” The stenographer was sent to Honolulu to testify about these findings, but it is unknown how the grand jury considered these facts.

The Federal Grand Jury began to interview the witnesses that were subpoena'ed on May 6th, and also interviewed William Field, the proprietor of the Maui Hotel, where Compton had previously stayed. Although Conness, Campbell, Vannatta and “a Japanese girl” were interviewed that day the only details that were reported about this session was Field's testimony. It is unknown if Field was subpoena'ed, but he was present to testify in support of an incident where Compton had allegedly written a letter to a man while staying at his hotel. Field stated that “he saw the letter said to have been written by
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Mrs. Compton in which she is alleged to have referred to some “Tom” in particularly endearing terms...he remembered something of the letter incident but that his recollection as to what was contained in the missive was not at all clear.” Field alleged that “Mrs. Compton had started to write the letter and had then left it on the hotel writing table, forgetting to take it with her.” The press did not specify when this event was alleged to have occurred. As there is no mention of this event previous to the Federal Grand Jury investigation it is possible that it may have occurred when Compton was in Maui during Pope's investigation.

It is unclear who chose Field to testify, but it is certain that his testimony was meant to cast doubt upon Compton's morality. Moreover, his testimony revealed that it was also unacceptable for women in Hawaiʻi to discard their Victorian sexual morals. Throughout the affair concerted efforts were made by many individuals to prove that Compton behaved in an immoral manner. Many of the charges against Compton's morality were proven to be false, and she was never officially accused of immoral behavior during the board's hearing. However, Field was present to testify that she did enjoy a sexual relationship with someone when she was employed at Hilo High School. If her adversaries had provided sold evidence that she had ignored local female sexual gender expectations this would have cast doubt upon the validity of her charges. There is no evidence to show how the grand jury considered this latest accusation, and how it held up under questioning.

**The “Findings” of the Federal Grand Jury**

After May 6th nothing was reported about the Federal Grand Jury investigation until May 11th. On May 11th, and article titled, “Mrs. Compton Slated For Dismissal Unless Grand Jury Supports Charges” was printed in the *Evening Bulletin*. The article stated that the investigation was finished, and that people were waiting for the report. It was reported that “unless the United States Grand Jury...reports an indictment against someone or at least recommendations that bear out in some degree the allegations made by Mrs. Mary Compton, it is understood that she will be dismissed from the Department.

---

of Public Instruction.” The paper stated, “this is the ultimatum that has gone forth from the department's headquarters and will undoubtedly carried out unless it is shown by the report of the Grand Jury that some basis is found for Mrs. Compton's charges.” Furthermore, it was related that “the Department of Public Instruction takes the view that the grand jury investigation has carried the case so far that someone's head will have to fall and Mrs. Compton is picked out for the subject if the Grand Jury inquiry results in a vindication for Principal Richmond.”

This article does not directly quote any department official, but if this statement were true it underscored that the department was still attempting to uphold the power hierarchies that made up the social structure in Hawai‘i. The affair had likely reached the point where the public wanted something definite to be done, and it seems that Compton was elected to take the fall if the grand jury did not find someone guilty. Whereas nothing would happen to Richmond if his evidence did not withstand scrutiny, if Compton's charges were not upheld she would be dismissed from the Department. If this statement were true it revealed that the department was still trying to sustain the social power structure in Hilo.

The following day, May 12th, it was reported that people were still awaiting the possible release of the Federal Grand Jury report. The previous day the jurors were allegedly in closed conference, and were “cleaning up everything now before them.” Gossip was being printed in the press on the subject, but nothing had “been given out to any persons not connected with the judicial department.” It was stated “the secrets of the grand jury room have been well guarded.”

On May 16th, an article in The Hilo Tribune reported that Richmond was in Hilo, and had left Hilo on the 15th for Honolulu. Richmond was quoted saying, “his plans were rather indefinite. He did not believe that he would return to Hilo. He was probably going to Honolulu, and would probably continue on his way to the Coast, though he might stay

---

in the capital or return there after he visited the mainland.” The article maintained that it was “quite certain that the federal grand jury would find no indictment in the high school case.” Based on Richmond's actions and the fact that he did not appear to be preparing himself for a trial it seemed that he was confident he would not be indicted. At the end of the article the press reported, “since the above was written, a report has been received stating that the federal grand jury reported yesterday, finding no bill in the high school case, but stating that Richmond was not a proper person to teacher school.”

Although the grand jury decided not to indict Richmond it did not keep its report secret, and the public was allowed to see the contents of the report. It is unclear if the entire report was published in the press, because only one article exists that printed only a portion of the grand jury's report. The Hilo Tribune published two portions of the report that revealed how the jury considered Compton and Richmond's testimony. There is no record to show how they considered the testimony of the other witnesses that appeared before them during their investigation. With regards to Richmond the Federal Grand Jury stated the following in its report:

“The conduct and actions of Mr. F. A. Richmond, the principal of the Hilo High School, were investigated by us. When considerable testimony had been received relative thereto, we felt that in fairness to Mr. Richmond he should, if he wished, be give ample opportunity to explain what might, without explanation, appear to us to have been incriminating evidence. He was brought before us, with his attorney, and it was stated to him that his conduct was being investigated, that certain witnesses had testified concerning that conduct; and that if he desired, we would be glad to hear anything he might have to say, which would tend to explain what the witnesses had testified to. After consultation with his attorney, Richmond stated that he did not desire to testify or make any statement whatsoever. We were therefore left, as to his conduct, with the uncontradicted statements of several witnesses relative to his actions. While we are loath to say it, and while we do not think the evidence would justify a verdict of guilty of a violation of the United States statutes, yet we are of the opinion, from the evidence elicited by us that Mr. Richmond has conducted himself in a very questionable

---
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and immoral manner, which renders him, in our opinion, un­fit to act as a teacher of children.”

No explanation was ever provided as to why Richmond refused to defend himself and why the evidence was insufficient to convict him, but there are a variety of possible reasons. At the board's hearing Richmond was willing to condemn all the charges against him, but he was not under oath at that time. Unlike the Board, the grand jury was an actual legal body, and it is almost certain that Richmond was under oath when he was asked to explain his actions. It seems, that under oath, Richmond was not willing to defend the charges against him, and deny that the allegations had taken place. The jury never explained why they believed that the evidence was insufficient, and which specific allegation they would have prosecuted Richmond for. Liquor abuse was frowned upon, but was not actually illegal so it is unlikely that he could have been prosecuted for this alleged indiscretion. The attacks on the women were prosecutable offenses, but there were no witnesses to corroborate the women's charges that they had been attacked. However, had the grand jury indicted Richmond and allowed the women to testify it would have been challenging the 'local', racial, and gender power hierarchies that composed the social fabric in Hilo. Although the jury was not going to prosecute Richmond it clearly did not find his morality above reproach, and Richmond criminalized himself by refusing to deny the allegations or defend himself. Whether it was the Federal Grand Jury's intention or not, their decision supported the power hierarchies in Hawai‘i.

Compton fared much better than Richmond in the jurors' eyes, and with regards to her testimony the Federal Grand Jury stated that, “The conduct of Mrs. Mary Compton was also investigated by us, in connection with the matter and we are of the opinion that the testimony given by this witness was in no way shaken or shown in the slightest degree to be untruthful.” After listening to her testimony, without the advice of a lawyer, the jurors could find nothing wrong about Compton's testimony. This same comment had been given to her testimony during this commissioners' hearing, and it appears that Compton, unlike Richmond, never wavered from her story. Whereas this
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does not prove that Compton's allegations were true based on the jurors opinion it certainly seems that she may have been telling the truth. Although the jurors found nothing wrong about her testimony it appears that her word was still not sufficient to convict Richmond of a crime.

Richmond's Resignation and Lawsuit Against the Federal Grand Jury

Richmond had given an undated letter of resignation to Superintendent Pope on May 9th, with the instructions to “date it May 9 if no indictment is returned,” “or to hold these here if a wireless to that affect is rec'd.” Richmond's “resignation was tendered on the understanding that should the federal grand jury return an indictment it would not be taken up, as the acceptance of it might prejudice Richmond's case before the courts.”

His resignation was announced to the public on May 16th.

On May 20th Richmond left Hawai‘i for San Francisco with plans to never return. Although Richmond was leaving Hawai‘i he left “legal proceedings behind him in the form of a motion to strike from the grand jury report the portion which refers to him as having conducted himself in a “very questionable and immoral manner,” and also that portion which says that Mrs. Compton's testimony was not shaken or whom to be untruthful.”

Richmond was approached on the deck of the Mongolia the morning that he was to leave Hawai‘i by a representative of The Evening Bulletin. The press reported that “he had taken himself to a secluded part of the deck, away from the crowd of people saying farewell, and it was with some reluctance that he talked of the matter at all.”

Richmond told the press representative that “I am going away from Hawaii, and I have no idea when I shall return, if ever...I have no plans for the future. I am going to San Francisco, but have no idea what I shall do then.” He refused to discuss his pending lawsuit, but admitted “that the information was correct...and he believes it is only justice to himself that his own record is cleared on the points indicated.” The representative stated that Richmond's parting words were, “As far as I know, I shall not return here.”
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On May 19th, Richmond's attorneys, LeBlond and Smith, filed a motion to “expunge from the records of the court the parts of the grand jury report which speaks unfavorably of Richmond.” However, Richmond would be represented by Lorrin Andrews, the same attorney who was representing The Hawaiian Gazette Co. to fight Compton's lawsuit. The motion was filed on the grounds that the jury “violated the charge of the judge, namely that no mention must be made of cases wherein no indictment was returned, and that the proceedings of the grand jury, where no indictments were returned, should be secret.” The attorney wanted to remove the sections where it stated Richmond would not testify, had conducted himself in a questionable and immoral manner, was unfit to teach children, and that Compton's testimony could not be shaken.  

Richmond's motion was stated to be “peculiar in that there is no respondent,” and the District Attorney stated that “he could not do anything with it because he is not the grand jury.” Local lawyers were unsure “as to whether the grand jury can be ordered to change its report in any way...it is a question of law whether a federal judge can instruct a grand jury to strike out any part of its report.” It was stated that nothing could be done with the case until the jurors re-convened in July.

There are no records about Richmond's motion until the end of July when a newspaper article revealed that the motion had been brought before Judge Clemons. It is unknown who or what type of judge Clemons was, but it is likely that he was a federal judge. Clemons gave the jury a lengthly lecture on the law with regards to the case, and was of the opinion “that the jury would either have to bring an indictment or keep the matter secret.” The judge did sympathize with the jurors actions, because there was a public demand for action and also “there was a demand that you as a jury should make such report.” However, following Richmond's motion he had studied the matter, and “found that the jury had exceeded their powers, though in perfect good faith in a good
cause, with a worthy end in view, with actual good results, in the interests of the public, and also at the behest of the public.” Believing that the jury had acted in good faith, Clemons still told them that “they were wrong legally.” To mollify the jury Clemons stated that “what you have said will remain, and nothing I can say or anyone can say will remove it from the mind of the public of Hawaii...it will remain as a good influence to deter from wrong those who we entrusted with the moral teaching of children.” He informed the jury that “you are taking back nothing, and I do not ask you to do that, and I can not do so under the law. You are not called upon to change any opinion or any statement or to admit anything you said to be untrue, but only to take it out of court record, where it has no place under the law which you are sworn to support.” Finally, Clemons “gave the matter back into their hands to report on again.” On August 8th, the press reported that the jury “expurgated from its report the portion relating to Principal Richmond of the Hilo high school,” but it did not state that it removed the portion about Compton.

Compton's Transfer and Lawsuit Against The Hawaiian Gazette Co.

In light of the report Mary Compton fared slightly better than Frank Richmond, but she also still had continuing legal troubles of her own. Compton was offered a position by Superintendent Pope to teach at either Waipahu or Waialua, because there were “girls teaching there without licenses until their places can be filled with certified instructors.” On May 17th, Compton phoned Pope and informed him “that she was ready to take up work as assigned at Waialua school.” The principal accepted Compton as a teacher there without any uproar from the parents or staff. Since the teachers at Waialua were not certified it is likely that this position was a step below the one she had
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held at Hilo High School. While Compton was allowed to keep her job her lawsuit against The Hawaiian Gazette Co. was not faring well. During the Federal Grand Jury investigation Attorney Lorrin Andrews filed a demurrer against her lawsuit on the following grounds:

“That the complaint does not set forth sufficient facts to constitute a cause of action in
“A. That there is no libel alleged to have been published by the defendant of and concerning the plaintiff;
“B. That there is no allegation of special damage and no special injury is shown;
“C. Because said publication on its face is a privileged one.”

Nothing further would be reported about the lawsuit until summer.

The Hilo Public's Reactions to the Federal Grand Jury's Decision

While the Hilo public was relieved that the affair was over they were not satisfied with the contents of the Federal Grand Jury report. It was stated that people were upset that the jury condemned without indicting, and that “this feature of the affair has been condemned here by all who expect to see fair play.” The people allegedly did “not expect to see a grand jury prostituting its office just because it gets a hysterical fit.” However, it remains likely that people were exhausted with the affair as no major public outcry was reported beyond a few newspaper articles.

The Federal Grand Jury investigation resulted in no indictment, but although Richmond was not convicted the jury still believed that he was guilty of something. Even though the jury did not consider Richmond innocent of any wrongdoing it decided, for unknown reasons, not to indict him. It is unclear if the 'local', gender, and racial power hierarchies played a role in this decision, but it is certain that this sustained the social power structure of Hilo. Although Richmond was able to leave Hawai‘i a free man and the jury's record was revised, the comments of the Federal Grand Jury could not be stricken from the mind of Hawai‘i's population.
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Chapter VI
The Summer of 1911

“That the executive officers of the department of public instruction deliberately had the records of the Hilo High school altered in order that they might have revenge on a pupil of that institution, who was a witness in the famous high school case, is the statement of that pupil and her friends. The pupil in question is Machiyo Arakawa.”

While the Hilo High controversy was for the most part at an end, the following summer revealed that the affair may have changed the Department of Public Instruction, and continued to impact the lives of those who had been involved. The department revealed that it passed a series of new regulations that directly addressed the dismissal of teachers, and that in the future it would prefer to only hire married teachers. The teaching staff at Hilo High would completely be replaced, and a new principal and teachers would be hired for the school. Compton's libel case would still be in the courts, but there is no record to show what the final decision on her suit was. However, the person whom the affair would have the most impact on that summer was not Compton, or the teachers, but Machiyo Arakawa. When it was time to graduate, the school record showed that Machiyo did not possess enough units to graduate from high school, and in turn, she accused Inspector Gibson of altering her record out of revenge. There is no record to show what happened to Machiyo, but it is unlikely that she was allowed to graduate high school. If Machiyo's allegations were true it showed that the authorities were punishing her for challenging the racial hierarchy, and hindering her chances at achieving upward mobility.

The Department of Public Instruction's New Regulations

In early June, the Governor approved a series of new rules and regulations that were passed by the Commissioners of Public Instruction. In light of the Hilo High scandal it is interesting to note that some of the new regulations dealt with the dismissal of teachers. While there is no proof that these regulations were a result of the Hilo High scandal they were, coincidentally, passed after the affair. The new regulations provided
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the department with a definitive method for dismissing its teachers, and listed the various
digressions that could result in a teachers dismissal. Going forward it was stated that “a
teacher may be dismissed from the service “for cause,” after hearing of the case before
the department or an authorized agent.” Hawai‘i teachers could be dismissed for a
variety of reasons that included “immoral conduct, insubordination, inefficiency,
conviction of a penal offense, incurable disease...may also be dismissed whenever, after a
hearing, it shall appear to the department that such dismissal will be for the benefit of the
department.”345 Some of the transgressions that the department listed as a fireable offense
bear a striking resemblance to the charges brought forth in the Hilo High affair. With
these new regulations in place the department had rectified the criticism that it did not
possess a definitive method for dismissing its staff. Had the department possessed these
regulations when the affair occurred it is likely that the controversy would not have
reached the level of infamy that it did.

The Changes at Hilo High School

That summer, Hilo High School would also experience many changes in that it
would receive a new principal and staff for the school, and at least four of the students
would be removed from the school by their parents. Due to the turmoil at Hilo High the
press stated that “four of the best families in this city...it is said leave for the Coast this
summer to place their children in California schools having too much experience with the
local schools to care to keep up the experiment.”346 It was not revealed who these
students were, but a passenger listing that summer shows that Alexander Campbell left
for San Francisco that summer with his mother.347 The Campbell family was intimately
involved in the affair with Mrs. Campbell accompanying Compton to Honolulu for the
hearing, and Mr. Campbell testifying at the Federal Grand Jury investigation and being
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accused of having an affair with Compton.

During the June meeting of the Commissioners of Public Instruction, Moir recommended that “all Hilo High teachers removed or transferred,” and Commissioner Paris “recommended the transfer of Miss Louise Deyo of the Grammar Department.” After the discussion it “was decided that the three grade teachers,” this included Deyo, “be left alone but that the new teachers be secured for the high school proper.” The department never clarified why it decided to dismiss the entire staff. It is unknown if they thought the staff members may have been guilty of some offense in the affair, or that they simply wanted a clean sweep and thought that a new staff was the best way to accomplish this.

In early July, a new principal was secured for Hilo High School who had previously been employed as an educator in a United States colony, the Philippines. The press reported that Prescott F. Jernegan, “who on account of his long experience with the savages in the Philippines, has been selected to take charge of the Hilo high school as its principal.” Jernegan was a Brown University graduate, had taught in the Philippines for almost a decade, and had authored several texts which were in use in the Philippines. Unlike Richmond, the new principal was engaged, and planned to marry his fiance shortly after her arrival in Hilo. It was related that “those who know him state that there would never be a Richmond story in his case in any event.” Apparently, after the Hilo High affair single teachers were less desirable, and that married teachers, like Jernegan, were “at a premium in Hawaii now, and in the future they will be looked for still more to fill vacancies which occur than has ever been the case in the past.” Pope was quoted in an article about married teachers stating that “the experience he had in the trouble between members of the fair sex teaching there and Richmond will be enough to last him for a long time.”

The new principal of Hilo High School would fulfill some of the qualities that

348Hawai‘i State Archives, Department of Education, Minutes, Board of Education, Series No. 235, Box No. 235 vol. 10, Minutes from the June Meeting, June 5, 1911, pg. 146.
349“Brevities,” The Hilo Tribune, September 5, 1911.
350“Jernegan's Record An Excellent One,” The Hilo Tribune, July 18, 1911.
Richmond lacked in that he had experience Americanizing colonized peoples, and it was unlikely that there would be a sex scandal. An aspect of American colonialism was the belief that the native populations, like the Filipinos and likely, Hawaiians, were “half-naked savages incapable of acquiring the manners of White civilization.” The United States government followed a similar policy in the Philippines as it did in Hawai‘i in that it would use “benevolent assimilation” where the “racialized underclass was to “assimilate,” to become like White Americans.”[^352] This mindset was reflected in the Americanization program that was a cornerstone of the schools in the Territory of Hawai‘i. The new principal had years of experience in ensuring that the Filipino's were successfully “assimilated” or Americanized, and based on this experience the officials could be assured that Americanization would be certain at Hilo High. The fact that Pope only wanted to hire married teachers reveals the possibility that he may have believed that some sort of immoral actions had taken place at the school. By only hiring married teachers in the future it seems that Pope was making every effort not to repeat the type of scandal that he experienced at Hilo High. Principal Jernegan was the perfect fit for the school in that he had experience Americanizing other colonized peoples, and his marital status would ensure that he would not become sexually involved with his students or staff.

**The Hilo Public's Reactions to the Changes at the Hilo High School**

When the Department of Public Instruction published its teaching assignments for the following year it allegedly created a brief uproar amongst the individuals who supported Richmond. The public was notified that Lewis and Sandry were no longer employed, and that Allen was transferred to the Hilo Union School. As a result of these changes the press stated that “the adherents of Richmond in this city are up in arms and are threatening to have the entire Board of Education removed and sundry other severe punishments.” However, there is no evidence to show that Richmond's supporters actually carried out these threats. Instead of taking action against the department a reception was planned for “one of the deposed teachers and the greatest care is being taken to separate the sheep from the goats.” Only women were invited, and a “kamaaina

of Hilo” allegedly stated that an “edict has gone forth that only those who attend will have their names printed in the next Hilo Blue Book.” The Hawaiian word kamaʻāina in this context means native born, and in this passage it is likely referring to the “old” White population. By calling the “old” White population “kamaʻāina” it is being eluded that Native Hawaiians do not have a special claim to the land as the indigenous people, and that the “old” White population has the same claim to the land as Native Hawaiians. This passage also reveals that this “kamaʻāina” was willing to socially ostracize women in the 'local' White community who challenged the social structure by not attending her event.

Whereas Richmond's supporters were dismayed at the staff change many in the Hilo community were not. Allegedly, “the general sentiment of the community is that the action of the Board is one which might well have taken effect when the trouble first came up.” Furthermore, it was stated that “the bringing in of new teachers throughout is looked upon as the best way to clear the atmosphere.”

Mary Compton's Lawsuit

Mary Compton's libel suit continued that summer even after her employment ended, and she departed from Hawaiʻi at the end of June. In early June the demurrer that Lorrin Andrews filed against Compton’s suit during the grand jury hearing was sustained on only one ground. The judge sustained one point of the demurrer on the grounds that “in the complaint it was not stated that the readers of the publication generally connected the name of Mrs. Compton with the characterization of a “scheming woman.”” On June 28th, the suit was taken up by the circuit court in Hilo, and the press only reported upon the judge's decision concerning The Hawaiian Gazette Co.'s demurrer. The judge decided to overrule the demurrer, and give the defendant “ten days within which to plead or answer to the declaration.”
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in *The Hawaiian Gazette* on July 18th. It was reported that Compton's attorney, Carl Smith, submitted another complaint against The Hawaiian Gazette Co.. The attorney for the company filed a demurrer in response to the complaint. It is unknown what happened with the case.  

**Machiyo Arakawa**

In late June Hilo High School closed for the summer break, and graduated only two students, both of whom were Japanese. Not listed amongst Hilo's graduating class was Machiyo Arakawa, who was supposed to graduate that summer. Principal McClusky stated that the record at the high school did not show that she had sufficient units to graduate. McClusky reported that she only possessed 11 ½ units, and that a student needed 15 units to graduate. However, this claim was refuted by Machiyo and her friends who asserted that she should have had sufficient units to graduate. Moreover, Machiyo supported her claim that the record was false with a letter from Richmond which listed her units, and showed that she had more units than the record stated. Finally, Machiyo accused Inspector Gibson of altering her records so that she could not graduate.

Machiyo and her supporters claimed that she had sufficient units to graduate, and she possessed a letter that showed that she had more units than her official record at the school did. In October of 1911, Richmond had allegedly written a letter to the principal of the Normal School, which listed her units, and gave her a total of 12 ½ units for her previous three years of high school. Machiyo stated that at the beginning of her fourth year, “Mr. Richmond told me to take work which would give me two and a half points more, so as to make up the fifteen points which I would need to be allowed to graduate.” She stated that she took the work, “and then before the close of the term, I found that, with the two and a half points which I had gained, the record would give me only eleven and a half points, that is less than I had in September.” Overall, Machiyo reported that “for four years work they have given me just 11 ½ points.” To support her story Machiyo
had the letter from Richmond printed in the newspaper, along with her interview about her allegation. Principal McClusky could not do anything with her letter, and had to go by the official record at the school. McClusky stated that her letter was “either a forgery or it contains a misstatement of fact.” Both aside he went “by the official record as a matter of course.” McClusky did ask Gibson what to do about the situation, and “received positive orders from Gibson not to allow the girl to graduate.”

Machiyo claimed that the record was incorrect, and that it had been altered by Gibson. In a statement to the press Machiyo and her friends alleged that, “the executive officers of the department of public instruction deliberately had the records of the Hilo High altered in order that they might have revenge on a pupil of that institution, who was a witness in the famous high school case.” Furthermore, it was alleged “that Inspector Gibson expressly ordered Supervising Principal McClusky...not to allow the girl to graduate.” Carl Smith reported that he investigated the matter, “in the hope that he might be able to do something for the girl, but he had found that he was powerless to remedy the wrong which had been done.” Smith believed that McClusky was not to blame for the matter, and had followed the official record as he had found it. Whereas Smith believed that the record was altered he did not state who he thought was responsible for the offense. He related “who did the actual alteration is a matter of surmise...it is certain, however, that reputable and competent witnesses are ready to testify that they saw the record before it was altered, and that it gave the girl more points for her credit before her return from Honolulu, than it does now.” The lawyer did not disclose who his “competent and reputable” witnesses were.

If Machiyo's claim were true it would reveal that Gibson was purposely punishing her for upsetting the racial power structure when she had accused Gibson of refusing to see her, and she had testified against Richmond. Machiyo and Gibson had a rocky history during the affair, and Machiyo had previously publicly accused Gibson of refusing to see her, because she was Japanese. This claim was one of the things that had cast doubt upon Gibson's investigation, and had led to Gibson having to publicly deny
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this allegation. Machiyo had also testified against Richmond, an established White man in the community, and stated that he was an immoral individual. If Gibson was trying to punish Machiyo, not allowing her to graduate would have been a very effective punishment. Education was extremely important to the Japanese community, and was one of the avenues that they used to achieve upward mobility. If Gibson did alter the record he was hindering her chances of achieving upward mobility in that she would not have a high school degree. There is no evidence to support Machiyo's claim that Gibson altered her record, and it remained unproven that her record had been altered at all. However, if her claims were true it revealed that those in power were re-asserting the racial status quo by punishing her for challenging it.

Gibson publicly denied that he had altered her record, nor had he ordered McClusky not to allow her to graduate. The Inspector stated that “nobody here interferes with the principal of any high school as to who shall graduate.” In regards to her units Gibson stated that he knew nothing about it, but supposed that” Richmond “either exaggerated in order to give her a good standing at the Normal School or he simply estimated her standing and made a mistake.” At the hearing, Gibson alleged that Richmond even “testified that he told the girl she would not be able to graduate. He advised her to leave the high school and come to the Normal School here and he gave her a letter showing what she was supposed to have that time.” Furthermore, Gibson reported that Machiyo had “left considerably before the graduation at the school and he could not tell what she would have if she remained to the end of the term, which she did not.” Finally, Gibson denied that “the record was altered as changed, and it certainly was not altered on instructions from this office.” 362 Following Gibson's interview there are no other records to show what happened with Machiyo's charge, but based on Smith's comment it was unlikely she was allowed to graduate high school.

The summer following the affair revealed how the affair likely changed the Department of Public Instruction, and had affected the lives of those who were involved. New regulations were passed that would give the department a method for dismissing its

teachers, and would clarify what was a dismissible offense. Had any of these regulations been in place when the affair took place it is unlikely that it would have ever gained the level of infamy that it did. For reasons unknown the department decided to dismiss or transfer the entire Hilo High staff, and hire a completely new staff who were not connected to the controversy. The new principal of the school had experience assimilating colonized people in the Philippines, and under his administration the department could be confident that Hilo's youth would be “properly” Americanized. Whereas it is unclear that Gibson really did alter Machiyo's record out of revenge it remains certain that not allowing her to graduate stifled her chances of achieving upward mobility, and if her claims were true it revealed the authorities were punishing her to re-assert the racial power hierarchy.
Conclusion

Contested Morality: The Hilo High Affair is an original piece of research that examines an event previously unknown in the academic community. The affair sheds light upon the gender dynamics of the New Woman in Hawai‘i, the importance of teachers, the colonial racial power structure, the shortcomings of the Department of Public Instruction, and the social structure of the 'local' White community in Hilo. This paper showed who held power in the colonial world of Hilo, and that those in power intended to maintain the 'local', racial, and gender power hierarchies that composed the social fabric of the community.

Previous research done on the New Woman has only examined her life in the continental United States, but has ignored the dynamics surrounding the New Woman in Hawai‘i. Mary Compton's life in Hilo revealed much about female gender expectations in Hawai‘i, and what was considered acceptable behavior for women in a colonial setting. In Hilo, women were similar to their mainland counterparts in that they could be educated, economically independent, join clubs, assume the role of a public housekeeper, and stay attractive. Her behavior that the community found issue with centered around Compton's less constrained sexual morals, which showed she took advantage of the new sexual opportunities being afforded to New Woman on the mainland. However, the community's disdain towards her sexual behavior showed that women who adopted this freedom faced an environment in Hilo that forced them to conform to conservative local gender expectations, or confront social ostracism. Compton's less constricted sexual behavior was a topic of public criticism, and when the scandal escalated her sexual behavior was used against her to discredit her moral reputation. In addition, Compton's social position as a teacher showed that the New Woman could be an agent of colonialism. Through her role as an educator Compton was intimately linked with the Americanization project and the cultural colonialism of Native Hawaiian and immigrant youth. Whereas women in Hawai‘i enjoyed freedoms that were similar to the New Woman on the mainland, women in Hawai‘i were still expected to adhere to the more constricted Victorian sexual morals.

The charges against Richmond and Compton highlighted the importance of
teachers in maintaining a strong moral character and their role in the Americanization project. Compton and Richmond were both charged with behaving in an immoral fashion. Had any of the immorality charges been sustained they would have been dismissed, because they would have removed themselves as an appropriate person to teach morality by example. Claims that Compton had encouraged the student strike and the hula depicted her as the antithesis of the Americanization movement, and as sabotaging the goals of the Americanization agenda by encouraging Native Hawaiian cultural practices. Moreover, the claims that Richmond had attempted to sexually assault his female students was an embarrassment to the Americanization program. As an educator he was responsible for teaching American morals and values, but he was accused of attempting to compromise the morality of his students. These charges highlighted how important it was for a teacher to maintain a strong moral character, and how important their role was in ensuring the Americanization program succeeded.

The investigations and the verdicts showed that individuals who challenged the racial power structure were not successful, and that the officials intended to uphold the racial hierarchy that supported colonialism. By accusing their White principal of immoral acts the Native Hawaiian and Japanese female students were challenging the colonial racial power structure. However, the investigators unwillingness to interview them, and the verdicts of both the Commissioners of Public Instruction and the Federal Grand Jury showed that the officials intended to uphold the racial power structure. Moreover, Machiyo's ineligibility to graduate revealed the possibility that education officials may have been punishing her for testifying against her White principal. Although it is likely that the female students were victims of a crime the racial power structure ensured that they would not see justice, because convicting Richmond would have challenged the racial power structure that upheld colonialism.

The shortcomings of the investigations uncovered that the Department of Public Instruction did not have an established procedure to conduct an investigation, and this was used by the public to push back against the results of the investigation. During the Progressive Era individuals expected their government institutions to be administered in a scientific efficient manner, and the procedure used by the investigators did not live up to
these standards. This failure resulted in a student strike and two petitions from different factions of the White community. That summer, the department did rectify this problem when it passed a series of regulations that instituted procedures to conduct investigations and dismiss its teachers. Had the department possessed these regulations at the outset of the controversy it is unlikely that the affair would have reached the level of infamy that it did.

Compton's experience revealed the consequences for a newcomer who became involved in a feud with established and well-connected members of the 'local' White community in Hilo. Less than two months after she arrived in Hilo Compton was already fighting with established members of the community. She was a newcomer and the individuals that she was charging with immoral acts were well-connected members of the community who had resided in Hilo for years. In contrast, Compton did not possess any social networks nor had she enjoyed a long term relationship with the community. Her newcomer status led many in the community to side with her detractors and led to her social ostracism from the social structure of the White community in Hilo. Moreover, her newcomer status played a role in the department's investigations. The investigators did not want to interview Compton, because they did not intend to challenge the social order of the White community in Hilo. It is unclear if her newcomer status played a role in the department's hearing, but the verdict also upheld this power hierarchy. This affair highlighted that social connections were important in the Hilo community, and that newcomers who challenged the social structure of the 'local' White community did not fare well.

By analyzing the issues surrounding the Hilo High affair one can gain a better understanding of the social structure of the White community in Hilo, the importance of teachers, the Department of Public Instruction, the racial power structure, and the dynamics of the New Woman in a colonial setting. The affair also revealed that White residents who had resided in Hilo for a number of years held the most power in the social structure of the Hilo community. In contrast, newcomers, women, Japanese, Native Hawaiians, and students possessed very little power in the city and territory's social fabric. The affair's conclusion showed who held power in Hilo, and that the officials
sustained the 'local', racial, and gender hierarchies that were a part of the social fabric of the community.
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