

THE HEAD-HUNTERS; AND HULL HOUSE

EDITORIAL BY THEODORE ROOSEVELT

WHILE in Chicago recently I visited the Field Museum on one afternoon, and on one evening I went to see the Hull House Players in Galsworthy's "Justice."

Everything was interesting at the Field Museum—the zoölogical collections, the ethnological exhibits concerning our own Indians, the exhibits concerning the Philippines, the material accumulated from China and Tibet. In one hall there was a tablet to the memory of a martyr to science, a young naturalist and ethnologist named Jones, who on behalf of the Field Museum had been sent to the Philippines and there had been killed by savages. His story, as told me, doubtless with substantial though not with minute accuracy, was a story of what could have happened only in our own age, with its extraordinary juxtaposition of the highest civilization and of savagery, and the no less extraordinary suddenness with which some small part of a race of immemorial savagery in its growth becomes deflected into a part of the current of advance of an old civilized race.

Jones, who was of mixed blood, white and Indian, had studied at Hampton Institute. He then went to some New England school, I think Andover, and finally to Harvard. When he graduated from Harvard he had become a scientific man. The Field Museum sent him to the Philippines, where he penetrated into the interior of one of the wilder islands and joined a tribe of head-hunting savages, with whom he soon came to be on the most intimate and friendly terms. Head-hunting was merely one of their conventions, and was compatible with great gentleness and simplicity of life in many other matters.

Jones speedily became thoroughly identified with them. They told him all the intimate circumstances of their strange psychic and mental life, and for a year he lived with them collecting invaluable material in his notebooks. Then he told them that he must leave them.

They were greatly grieved; they hated to have him depart. Some of their number who were especially friendly accompanied him to the confines of the tribal domain. Then their feelings overcame them (at this point of the narrative readers of Frank R.

Stockton will be startlingly reminded of the possible attitude of the griffin toward the minor canon). They felt that they really could not bear to part with Jones, so they killed him and took back his head to their village. My informant, a profound student of wild ethnology, told me that he was convinced that their main feeling was friendship, that they had become devoted to Jones, that they liked him and liked to talk with him, and hated to have him go away; and so they felt at the end that, as they would otherwise lose him entirely, it would be far better to take his head back and have that permanently with them, because no doubt they would somehow or other get counsel and inspiration and friendship from it.

Wide as the poles apart from the phase of life of which I thus got a glimpse was that phase of life shown in the play produced by the Hull House Players. It was played in a delightful little theater, which I am sorry to say on the evening I was there was not as full as it ought to have been. The play was Galsworthy's "Justice," which he had given the Hull House Players special permission to play without a royalty.

The play itself is a most powerful indictment of that cruel legalism which not merely is divorced from justice but which may do the most frightful injustice. Any man or woman seeing it cannot but be intensely interested and at the same time roused to generous indignation against the forcing of the forms of law into the service of injustice—this forcing, mind you, being done, not by men who are scoundrels, but by men who have no idea that they are doing anything wrong, who, on the contrary, feel that they are upholding the cause of civilization, but who lack vision, sympathy, understanding.

The players were all men and girls from among the frequenters of Hull House. Their names showed them to be of Jewish, German, Irish, and native American origin. They played astonishingly well. How well they played is testified to, in the first place, by the fact that they appealed so much to Mr. Galsworthy that he gave them the right to play "Justice" free, and, in the second place, by the fact that they have been asked to come to Ireland by the remarkable group of men and women who within the

last few years have done so much for a national Irish stage. The "star" was a young Jew engaged in the manufacture of tobacco at \$17 or \$18 a week. What the Hull House Players were doing and the way in which it was being done showed the immense possibilities for enjoyment and usefulness open to all our people if they only have the right initiative, and the right guidance to enable them to take advantage of the opportunities.

These players one and all were hard-working young men and young women, but they had in

them the quality that enabled them to take advantage of the chance that offered itself, and fortunately there were those prepared to offer the chance. In consequence, they now represent one of the appreciably valuable assets of American life. They are rendering service and giving enjoyment to others, and as an incident doing service and getting enjoyment for themselves. A window has been opened for them into the larger life of the Nation, and they are not merely lookers-on at this life; they are doing their full part in making this life larger and better and more beautiful.



THE PRESIDENTIAL TERM

A POLL OF THE PRESS

WHEN SHALL THE TERM BEGIN?

REPRESENTATIVE HENRY announces his intention of pressing the proposed Constitutional amendment to change the date of the President's inauguration. The Henry resolution, as reintroduced at last winter's session of Congress, would make a number of important innovations. The term of President and Vice-President would be extended to the last Thursday of April, 1917; that date thereafter would be the beginning and termination of their term and the date of subsequent inaugurations; Congress would meet annually on the second Tuesday in January, and the second Tuesday in January would be the beginning and termination of the official term of Senators and Representatives; finally, the short session of Congress would be eliminated.

Thus Mr. Henry has not confined his attention to the simple problem of giving the inauguration pageant a more attractive open-air setting. But that alone, says the New York "Tribune," would be a decided gain, for the inauguration of a President is an important National ceremony. The paper continues:

It draws hundreds of thousands of people to Washington, some in the line of official or military duty and the rest as spectators. Since the present date is unsuitable and a far better date can be provided without any special embarrassment, it is only sensible to try to make the occasion one of greater comfort and added impressiveness.

In the same spirit Mr. Frederic J. Haskin, a well-known daily contributor to many newspapers, writes:

In addition to the important political considerations involved in the Henry resolution, there

is the matter of better weather for the inaugural day. Thousands of people have been stricken, some of them fatally, as a result of bad inauguration weather. The death of at least one President is attributed to such weather, and many prominent men have succumbed to attacks of pneumonia caused by it. The Henry resolution is by no means a partisan measure. The ideas incorporated in it have been advocated by the leaders of both parties. The provision for Presidential succession is identical with that passed by a Republican Senate upon two occasions. The provision for the change of the inaugural date has been widely indorsed by men of all political faiths. The provision for changing the meeting day of Congress seems to be in accord with the intentions of the framers of the Constitution.

The opinion of most newspapers seems favorable to a change in the time of inauguration. But many would not defer it. They would advance it. They are convinced that the President and Congress should enter upon their duties as soon as possible after they have received their mandates from the people. After his election in 1860 Mr. Lincoln remarked to Judge Gillespie:

I would willingly take out of my life a period in years equal to the two months which intervene between now and my inauguration, to take the office now. . . . I, who have been called upon to meet this awful responsibility, am compelled to remain here, doing nothing to avert it or lessen its force when it comes to me.

Hence the suggestion, not to defer but to advance the date, say to January 1. It has much more to commend it, claim its advocates, than has the suggestion to defer the date. As to the pageant that accompanies the induction of a President into office, the "Tacoma Tribune" says:

The inauguration ceremonies and festivities are of the side-show brand, and could be elim-