Henry Ford's anti-Semitism: A rhetorical analysis of the "paranoid" style

Jeffrey Brian Farrell
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/rtds

Repository Citation
https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/rtds/968

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Scholarship@UNLV. It has been accepted for inclusion in UNLV Retrospective Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@unlv.edu.
INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
HENRY FORD'S ANTI-SEMITISM:
A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF
THE "PARANOID" STYLE

by

Jeff Farrell
Bachelor of Science
Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff
1996

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of requirement for the

Master of Arts Degree
Hank Greenspun Department of Communication
Greenspun College of Urban Affairs

Graduate College
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
May 1999
The Thesis prepared by

Jeffrey Brian Farrell

Entitled

Henry Ford's Anti-Semitism:

A Rhetorical Analysis of the "Paranoid" Style

is approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in Communication Studies

Richard J. Jensen

Examination Committee Chair

Pamela Anson

Dean of the Graduate College

Hay Chapel

Examination Committee Member

David L. Howard

Examination Committee Member

Graduate College Faculty Representative
ABSTRACT

Henry Ford's Anti-Semitism: A Rhetorical Analysis of The “Paranoid” Style

by

Jeff Farrell

Dr. Richard Jensen, Examination Committee Chair
Professor of Communication
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

The life and rhetoric of Henry Ford was examined in this study in order to gain an understanding why, and how, he propagated the longest running anti-Semitic campaign in history. A synergy of two existing theories in communication, Hofstadter (1966) and Smith (1977) provided the appropriate framework for this study. Their observations of high-profile figures being labeled as politically “paranoid” were adapted to Henry Ford. This thesis labels Ford as a “paranoid” by identifying that: 1) Ford perceived a conspiracy; 2) a crusade was needed to defeat the conspiracy; 3) Ford was a militant leader; and, 4) the enemy was powerful. This thesis shows that the anti-Semitic rhetoric of Ford followed specific patterns and had far-reaching implications.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The story of Henry Ford America begins much like a Horatio Alger dime-store novel, but it ends (if it has ended) differently. This time the climax does not resemble the trademark uplifting “you can do it tale.” For Horatio Alger seemed to have left out just what happens when unimaginable success brings its owner an entirely new set of problems. Alger didn’t draw up a plan that would keep the fortunes that were amassed away from enemies that only existed in one’s mind. It makes no difference, though. For the hardworking protagonist of this story drafted his own plans. Henry Ford, the world’s first billionaire, would eventually spend millions promulgating a racist and paranoid philosophy at home and abroad in the early 1900s.

The proceeding story involves one of the most famous men in all of history. Eighteen ninety-two saw a relatively young, tenacious man tinkering day and night in his Detroit garage. He told the passers by when they gawked and guffawed that his creation would be a horseless carriage. Henry Ford, a pious, hardworking man, met with failure after failure with his contraption. The first crude design of his automobile had a two-cylinder engine with a leather strap for a transmission, and a rudder for a steering wheel. Lifting up this noisy contraption to turn it around and push it back into the garage for more tinkering became an amusing sport for the men and children on Bagley Street.
Once a problem was fixed, Ford would take his car for a spin around the block again. The neighbors wondered why “the police allowed such a thing in a respectable neighborhood,” noting that they “would hear it for a block in every direction, and would say: ‘there goes that crazy loon again. Some day he’s going to blow himself up’” (Sinclair, 1984, p.4).

Eventually, Ford’s creation didn’t have to be pushed back anymore. He was able to sell his first working automobile for $200. He could have stopped there. However, Ford’s foresight and will allowed him to resign from the local electric company, turning down a promotion to General Superintendent, in order to devote all of his time to the creation of more automobiles. There were others working on the same idea, and to stop was to lose the race.

Naturally, Ford found himself in need of capital to finance the production of his motorcars. He was 40 years old with no visible success. He was still building automobiles with his hands when in 1903 he managed to find a group of investors, including the Dodge Brothers and a store clerk named James Couzens. Together they were able to come up with $28,000 (Sinclair, 1984).

Henry Ford’s first factory was cumbersome, requiring workers to bring parts to a location in order to assemble the finished product. Henry Ford, on the verge of spawning the assembly line, soon realized that it would be more efficient to bring the parts to the worker instead of the other way around. He had begun his rise to fortune with the production of models A, B, C, F, N, R, and K cars. However, when Ford set his sights on a 60 acre piece of land in a small town just about ten miles outside of Detroit called Highland Park, one of his true vision would soon be realized. This vision would be the
mass production of one single, affordable car—the model T. Everything was meticulously planned. Even the color scheme was set: “any customer can have any car of any color that he wants provided it is black” (Sinclair, 1984 p. 22).

The infamous assembly line was operating full force in 1913. While the surrounding world seemed to be in the midst of a financial crisis, the Ford factory was producing and selling thousands of cars a day. Henry Ford had millions in personal wealth just one decade into the twentieth century.

Almost twenty years later, the world was a much different place. On March 8, 1932, the New York Times reported on the front page, “Four killed in riot at main Ford plant as 3,000 idle fight.” The subtext of the headlines reported that “fifty are injured in Dearborn Battle when police fire on unemployed marchers.” The following day, the New York Times ran a follow up story that claimed in the headline that “Reds are sought in fatal Ford riot.” A statement released by the union at the time in the text of the story claimed that “Responsibility for the tragedy obviously rests squarely upon the shoulders of Henry Ford” (1932, p. A1).

Ford had become a powerful force in a short period of time. And the handling of such power lends credence to the study that follows. On the subject of Ford’s acquisition of power, Sinclair (1984) states:

Henry was more than any feudal lord had been, because he had not merely the power of the purse, but those of the press and the radio; he could make himself omnipresent to his vassals, he was master not merely of their bread and butter but of their thoughts and ideals. (1984, p. 73-4)
Ford did indeed have the power of the press, for in 1919 he bought his own small Michigan newspaper, the Dearborn Independent. The paper was to be free of any advertisements, subsidized entirely by the Ford Motor Company. The initial intent of the publication was to be an opinionated outlet for Henry Ford. Instead of a forum for discussion, though, what resulted were by far the most widely distributed and widely read attacks on the Jewish community that this country had ever seen. The collection of the long running articles was eventually entitled The International Jew, the world’s foremost problem. Where is the connection—the common ground? The fact that Ford was a rabid anti-Semite seems incongruous with contemporary America’s opinion of the man. What Americans know of this man is limited at best. People tend to believe the myth that Ford created the car, created the assembly line, created industry. While his contribution to industry cannot be denied, it is time that the other side of his life is examined. If what people know of Ford is that invented the car, where does the rhetoric that publicly disparages Jews come into play?

Being anti-Jewish was, or is nothing new. Seventy-five years ago, however, it was more acceptable than it is now. This essay will make the point that Ford was more than just anti-Jewish. He was a rabid anti-Semite. In helping define the distinction, Richard Levy, in a personal correspondence, states:

There is much speculation on all aspects of Ford’s antisemitism. ... Nasty comments about Jews, social snobbery, and such ought not qualify. Ford was preaching a world Jewish conspiracy of enormous and all-embracing evil; he wanted people to take action against Jews—or at least one could be forgiven for thinking that this was the purpose of the DI and the International Jew. For me, antisemitism...
must go beyond inherited prejudices; it ought to have a political component and be action-oriented, not merely a matter of sentiment and personal grudges. (1997, November, Email)

Henry Ford was unique in many ways. So too was the rhetoric produced as his success increased. It is through his rhetoric that this study will explore Ford as a "paranoid." Hofstadter (1966), in his book The Paranoid Style in American Politics, attempts to use political rhetoric to get at, understand, and analyze political pathology. In 1977 Smith reexamines Hofstadter's hypothesis as it relates to the nature of evidence in "paranoid" discourse. Both theories (and theorists) will be used to explain Ford as being a political "paranoid." Smith (1977) defines "paranoia" by stating:

The term "paranoid" is used in a special sense throughout this paper to refer to the inclination to believe in sociopolitical conspiracies, and *not* to clinical paranoia. "Political paranoia" and "clinical paranoia" are regarded as discrete patterns of behavior, in accordance with Hofstadter's definition. (p. 274)

This definition is provided in order to explain that further use of the term "paranoid" will not be used in an entirely pejorative context, rather the term will place Ford, the man, in a specific rhetorical category as first defined by Hofstadter.

The situation of Henry Ford provides an excellent resource of implications. The anti-Semitic diatribes produced and distributed by Ford ran unchecked for years. The collected articles, The International Jew, allow for an in depth investigation into, how Ford changed, why he changed, why he attacked the Jews, and why he bought the Dearborn Independent.
Purpose

The purpose of this essay is not to show that Ford was a bigot, or a cruel and maniacal boss, but rather to understand how the progression from industrialist to racist happened and to shed light on an issue that has long since been lying dormant. This essay will attempt to prove that certain chains of events occurred at the beginning of the twentieth century that laid the groundwork for the propagating of the hateful and disparaging rhetoric that ensued. And even though Ford’s attacks on the Jews remain almost unequalled in history, except for Mein Kamph, this essay will not set out to disparage, or criticize. For if that is all that is done then the researcher, the research, and the reader all lose. Burke set precedent for this type of analysis when he examined Hitler’s Mein Kamph. He states:

There are other ways of burning books than on the pyre . . . . If the reviewer but knocks off a few adverse attitudinizings and calls it a day, with a guaranty in advance that his article will have a favorable reception among the decent members of our population, he is contributing more to our gratification than to our enlightenment. (1967, p. 191)

Burke’s groundbreaking work in his “Rhetoric of Hitler’s ‘Battle’” is significant in the fact that not only was it way ahead of his time, telling people to wake up and pay attention to Hitler even before the Holocaust occurred, it deals with similar issues as this study. The rhetoric from both Ford and Hitler identify to some extent the same “conspiracy.” They both raise idea of the “Jewish Question,” a question that was harshly answered in Nazi Germany.
Throughout this essay, an actual relationship, the strength of which still remains in question, between Adolph Hitler and Henry Ford will be examined. If both men were vehemently preaching anti-Semitic tirades, aside from the obvious, why do people despise Hitler, while still look upon Ford with reverence and regard? The answer to that question is essential in discussing the purpose of this study. The two were obviously different men. Their situations and rise to the top were exceedingly different. Hitler struggled for years to be a power broker. And when it was handed over to him, he was ready to proceed. For Ford, though, power was a byproduct of his money and success. It came unexpectedly and quickly. He believed that the Jews were there waiting to take everything away from him.

The believability of a worldwide Jewish conspiracy existing at any time has yet to be, or never will be proven for the sheer fact that it doesn’t exist. The key word in this observation is “conspiracy.” Ford was not, nor will he be the last to fall victim to conspiracy theory. Regardless, the fact that a conspiracy may not exist has never been a deterrent to a rhetorical response; quite the opposite holds true. According to Smith (1977), the very definition of paranoid stems from the falsity of its existence. He states:

We must remember that politically “paranoid” movements are paranoid only to the extent to which their target conspiracies do not exist. If Communists, Catholics, Blacks, Railroads, or whatever are in fact threatening control of our society, then it is the “non-paranoids” who deserve our attention. (p. 288)

Ford took it upon himself, against all commonsense guidelines, to produce a wealth of anti-Semitic propaganda. And although “The source of Ford’s animus remains obscure” (Ribuffo, 1980, p. 203), it existed and was propagated at great personal expense.
Ford’s wife, Clara, voiced her anti-Jewish sentiments to her husband. She “suggested” that Henry fire various employees with Jewish ties and was disgusted at Jewish membership in the country club to which she “belonged”. However, it was not Clara’s influence that led to eventual worldwide circulation of the Dearborn Independent. Many people of the time were anti-Jewish; however, it was Ford alone who perceived the existence of a pressing exigence. It is the goal of this study to find out why.

Justification

Not only did Hitler specifically praise Henry Ford in Mein Kamph, but many of Hitler’s ideas were also a direct reflection of Ford’s racist philosophy. There is a great similarity between The International Jew and Hitler’s Mein Kamph, and some passages are so identical that it has been said Hitler copied directly from Ford’s publication.

—James Pool & Suzanne Pool, Who Financed Hitler

The influence of Ford’s rhetoric on Nazi Germany cannot be overlooked. The International Jew was first published in 1920, four years before Hitler had even begun to write Mein Kamph (Pool & Pool, 1978). Henry Ford, the only American to be mentioned by name in Mein Kamph, was awarded on July 30, 1938, his seventy-fifth birthday, the Supreme Order of the German Eagle, the Nazi government’s highest honor for a non-German. Hitler’s congratulations accompanied the award. The International Jew “became a stock item of Nazi propaganda; every schoolchild in Germany came into contact with it many times during his education” (Pool & Pool, 1978, p. 90). One of Hitler’s “closest associates, Dietrich Eckart, specifically mentioned . . . The International Jew as sources of inspiration for the Nazi leader” (p. 91). Oxfeld (1997) states that “Isaac Charchat, a Swedish Jew who infiltrated Nazi Party headquarters in 1925 to spy for
German Zionists discovered that ‘The International Jew’ was a key text for Nazi indoctrination” (p. 2).

In “The Rhetoric of Hitler’s ‘Battle,’” Burke (1967) tells his readers to be aware, and to “know, with greater accuracy, exactly what to guard against, if we are to forestall the concocting of similar medicine in America” (p. 191). This statement by Burke was without a doubt a major part of his justification for delving into the Hitler’s mind. However, as relative as this truism might have been, he apparently overlooked just where part of the “recipe” for such “medicine” was “concocted.” It came from the heart of the booming automobile industry in Dearborn, Michigan—U.S.A. No one can realistically fault Ford for the Holocaust, and this study is not trying to. However, the influence that Ford’s rhetoric had over Hitler and the Nazi Party should not be overlooked any more.

The International Jew is difficult to find today. The reasoning for mentioning the availability of Ford’s writings is a partial justification for this study. The documents used for research in this study can be obtained with effort, searching various libraries, or they can be obtained through cites such as Alpha, one of the larger White Power sites on the Internet. Preceding the catalog for books, their site claims, “In our efforts to spread the word of White Power, we have begun this . . . archive of the great written works dealing with the issues of race” (1998). The books offered, in order are: Mein Kamph by Adolph Hitler; White Power by George Lincoln Rockwell; The Turner Diaries by Andrew Macdonald, and; The International Jew, The World’s Foremost Problem by Henry Ford. American Dissident Voices (ADV), another White Power organization, states that “today this book is almost impossible to find . . . If it were not for a few courageous Americans
keeping it in print and available to you, you would not be able to find it at all” (Book Catalogue, 1997).

This study is not looking at dusty old rhetoric that had an impact once upon a time. The words or doctrine of Henry Ford are making a comeback in immense proportions. Hart (1971), in a study exploring the rhetoric of true believers argues that the rhetoric produced by such believers can be classified as “doctrine.” The reasoning for studying doctrine can be identified in the following passage by Hart (1971):

Eric Hoffer sees extremism as an especially potent force. “All mass movements,” he argues, “... irrespective of the doctrine they preach and the program they project, breed fanaticism, enthusiasm, fervent hope, hatred and intolerance; all of them are capable of releasing a powerful flow of activity in certain departments of life; all of them demand blind faith and singlehearted allegiance.” (p. 249)

The ADV look upon Ford as “an outstanding figure in the story of modern America, and central to the struggle of American patriots to take our country back...” (1997). The resurgence in the popularity of the International Jew could be justification alone for an in depth analysis of Ford’s rhetoric. In addition, the uniqueness of its inception, the volume of its circulation, and the impact that the rhetoric had on the world nearly 80 years ago even further justify the proceeding study.

Review of Literature

Four different types of literature will be used for this study. They will be identified as: 1) documents as historic; 2) documents offering interpretations of history; 3) polarized views of history; and 4) articles in the field of communication.
Analyses into the subject of Ford and his anti-Semitism require a broad base of research. There are conflicting views over the extent, effect, and meaning of Ford’s rhetoric. Sources dealing with the modern day Ford Motor Corporation are either evasive, or downplay their founder’s anti-Semitism to such an extent as to even claim that they weren’t even aware of it. Sources dealing with the Jewish community at times can be so charged with emotion that the validity and accuracy of their information and arguments have to be questioned. Furthermore, admittedly, dealing with White Power interpretations of Ford’s work provides the researcher with a difficulty of interpretation as well. Regardless of the difficulties, documents which supports two polar opposites are crucial in understanding the relevance of this study.

Documents As Historic

At certain points in time, a document has such an impact on society that it, in and of itself, can be looked upon as an historic occurrence. The first artifact that warrants such a classification is the document that this study is based upon. The International Jew is a collection of articles that originally appeared in the periodical published by the Ford Motor Co. entitled the Dearborn Independent. The impact of the rhetoric can be examined as a whole, however, for reasons to be addressed at a later time in this study, various chapters have their own significance—as the next document to be examined had a tremendous effect on the Dearborn Independent’s content. The International Jew, first of a four volume set, is a collection of sixteen individual chapters. They are as follows: chapter 1, “Jewish History in the United States;” chapter 2, “Angles of Jewish Influence;” chapter 3, Victims, or Persecutors?;” chapter 4, “Are the Jews a Nation?;” chapter 5,

Henry Ford did not pen the articles himself. In fact, when confronted years after the start, he claimed ignorance in regards to the Dearborn Independent’s content. One of the principal authors of this document was William J. Cameron, who Ford had hired away from the Detroit News. However any argument of whose words belong to whom does not make a great deal of difference in this study. For just as an orator assumes credit, and responsibility for an oration originally written by a ghostwriter, so does Henry Ford.

The second artifact to be labeled “as historic” is The Protocols of the Meeting of the Learned Elders of Zion. The fact that this document has no factual foundation has a large bearing on this study. The Protocols are a thorough Czarist Russian forgery. While their creation remains shrouded in mystery, their effect on the world is real. The Protocols are “supposedly” a lengthy collection of minutes from secret meetings. At such meetings, Zionists revealed their plot to dominate the world. A copy of the Protocols found its way into the Ford’s hands after he had already begun publishing the Dearborn Independent. The importance of the Protocols stem from the fact that they provided Ford with validation and support for his work.
The last artifact to be examined in this study as historic is Hitler’s Mein Kamph. This document will not be examining as thoroughly as the examination into the Dearborn Independent. Already mentioned was the fact that Hitler’s words closely follow Ford’s words in certain passages. Much of Ford and Hitler’s ideologies run parallel in nature. For this reason, various references to this document will be made.

Interpretations of History

This grouping of text is a collection of books and articles written about the time and situation being examined. They are observations, from which interpretations can and will be drawn.

The Flivver King originally written by Upton Sinclair in 1937 is a hyperbole, looking into the life of Henry Ford and fictional autoworker Abner Shutt. This book can be technically classified as fiction. However, the insights and information provided in this 120 page book are invaluable, without which this study would be a lot more difficult—if not impossible. The use of The Flivver King to document occurrences is fully justified. Steven Meyer, Assistant Professor of History at Illinois Institute of Technology, and author of another text to later be examined, The Five Dollar Day: Labor Management and Social Control in the Ford Motor Company, says that Sinclair’s work is a “dramatic blend of fact and fiction” (1984, p. i). Furthermore, he states:

One the one hand, Sinclair’s depiction of Ford’s life is quite factual, based on Ford’s ghost-written autobiographies, company publications and newspaper accounts . . ..

On the other hand, his description of the Shutt family is purely fictional, but reflects
an acute awareness of the character of working class life and culture of the period.

(p. v)
The Flivver King was used as a tool by the newly born United Auto Workers in the late 1930s in order to initiate change in the very anti-union Ford Motor Co. Again, while some accounts in this book are fictional, it provides a wealth of information relevant to this study.

James Pool and Suzanne Pool’s 1978 book, Who Financed Hitler: The Secret Funding of Hitler’s Rise to Power 1919-1933, is responsible for providing shocking historical connections between this study’s protagonist and Hitler. Their book covers many aspects of Hitler’s rise to power. In Ford and Hitler, Pool and Pool graphically illustrate the influence that Ford and the Dearborn Independent had on Nazi Germany.

Harry Bennett, Ford’s notorious henchman, produced an autobiography in 1951 that will be incorporated into this study. Bennett’s book, We Never Called Him Henry, is saturated with biased interpretations of various events that occurred. This book will be primarily used as a reference source.

In 1990, Walter Hayes wrote a biography on the life of Henry Ford’s son, Henry. Hayes’ book, Henry, A Life of Henry Ford II, will be looked at less to interpret a second generation Ford’s actions, and more for historical relevance regarding Ford’s auto factories in Germany and his relationship with Hitler.

Carol Gelderman’s (1981) biography, Henry Ford, The Wayward Capitalist, provides an in depth look into Ford’s life. Gelderman’s book, which touches upon controversial topics needed to complete this study, makes a variety of observations such as, “It is possible that Ford wanted to blame Jews for a situation for which he himself felt
vaguely guilty" (p. 242). This study will not take everything that Gelderman writes as gospel, however, her wealth of factual data and intriguing observations make a welcome contribution to this study.

Ford R. Bryan’s 1997 revised edition of Beyond the Model T: The other venture of Henry Ford, is a meticulous, factual look into the progression of the automobile. Bryan’s study offers only passing mention, comparatively, to the Dearborn Independent. This text is valuable, aside from factual data, to realize that while historical interpretations are by definition biased in some aspect or another, the issues surrounding Ford’s rhetoric are shrouded in opinionated offerings. Bryan severely underestimates the importance and impact of the Dearborn Independent. By his own admission, Bryan (1997) tells his readers, regarding the publication of the Dearborn Independent, “the general population seems not to have been greatly disturbed” (p. 105). This book will be used as a factual reference and an identifier of biases surrounding Ford’s rhetoric.

Leo P. Ribuffo, in a 1997 chapter in a collection of essays entitled The American Jewish Experience, offers up a useful contribution to this study with his essay, Henry Ford and The International Jew. While previously mentioned texts do give mention of the Dearborn Independent sporadically at times, Ribuffo’s essay draws a continuous and direct connection between Ford and his rhetoric. The information provided to the reader by Ribuffo, while more than just a little biased at times, will help to narrow and focus the research of this study.

David L. Lewis, in his 1976 book, The Public Image of Henry Ford, provides, perhaps, one of the most thorough looks into the life and ideas of Henry Ford. Lewis pays special attention to Ford’s anti-Semitism and the creation of the Dearborn
Independent. The information provided in this text will be referenced quite frequently in this study.


The last text to be mentioned in this section is Ashley Montagu’s 1997 book, *Man’s Most Dangerous Myth: the fallacy of race*. This book will be valuable in discussing the controversy over the existence of Jews as a race and not a religion. This text will help expand upon, and or refute various “Biological and Social Factors” expressed in Ford’s rhetoric.

Many texts exist which document “Ford America.” To exhaust them all would be prohibitive. The books mentioned here which “interpret” history will provide this study with a more than adequate foundation for this study.

**Polarized Views**

While the indifference, and or ignorance of the issues surrounding Ford’s rhetoric does in fact exist in vast proportions today, there are certain arenas in which a hotbed of debate thrives. On one side of the debate are White Power organizations such as Stormfront, Alpha and American Dissident Voices. They have taken it upon themselves to reproduce and distribute the *International Jew* using their own presses and the Internet. Articles obtained primarily through the Internet, such as but not limited to “The Wisdom of Henry Ford,” and “What World Famous Men Have Said About Jews,” provide a forum, free from outside influence, to propagate their message of racial superiority.
On the other side of the spectrum, and on the Internet as well, are organizations such as Virtual Jerusalem, who, like ADV, are free to distribute their message of the outrage of indifference. In an anonymous article entitled “Ford, anti-Semitism & Big Business,” the Jewish community decries long standing racism: “Ford’s anti-Semitism was no anomaly! His views regarding the Jewish community, rather than being an aberration, were representative of countless others in the business community” (1997, p. 1).

There exists today a variety of opinions on both sides. The Internet can a valuable tool for research into the longstanding effects that Ford’s rhetoric has had on the world. While both sides do their best to provide well-researched, professional articles, the value in examining their arguments comes not from factual data—but rather from their emotionally charged opinions.

Articles in the Communication Field

Numerous articles in the field of communication offer significant insights into the events surrounding the inception, publication, distribution, and interpretation of the Dearborn Independent. First of all, as previously mentioned, Burke (1967) set precedent into this type of study with his “Rhetoric of Hitler’s ‘Battle.’” Hart’s 1971 article, “The Rhetoric of the True Believer,” is crucial in identifying the personality of Henry Ford. Again, as previously mentioned, this study will strongly contend that Ford believed wholeheartedly in the content of the Dearborn Independent, regardless of claims of indifference and ignorance toward the content.

with a basis for examination of the content of the **Dearborn Independent**. Hasian claims that the **Dearborn Independent**'s "interpretation of *The Protocols* conspiracy was persuasive because its form and content seemed to have been tailored to fit the local exigencies of Ford's audiences" (p. 205). Furthermore, Hasian shows that, in part, the anti-Semitic rhetoric of the **Dearborn Independent** was a "response" to a specific "conspiratorial" artifact—the Protocols.

All of the previously mentioned materials are essential to this study. One more category, though, has to be examined—the category of race. Expert on the subject, and in the field, McPhail (1994) identifies a major contribution to the existence of racism in his article, "The Politics of Complicity: Second Thoughts about the Social Construction of Racial Equality." McPhail identifies that tolerance or "the gulf between principle and practice" (p.343) identifies complicity as a basis for tolerance. This differentiation has major implications for the extended publication of the **Dearborn Independent**. Even more recent was his 1998 article, "Passionate Intensity: Louis Farrakhan and the Fallacies of Racial Reasoning." This article is valuable in examining the larger issues surrounding racism, claiming in his conclusion regarding the conditions that racism is allowed to flourish:

> Until they are addressed, I fear, they will continue to bring us closer to an apocalyptic abyss of our own making: a socially constructed hell on earth into which antagonists on both sides of the color line will inevitably fall, victims of a fire this time that if not extinguished soon, may very well consume us all. (p. 426)
Methodology

Hofstadter (1966) tells his readers, in regards to racial tensions, "a further concern... is the history of our ethnic animosities, which in America have been at times almost a substitute for the class struggle and... have always affected its character" (p. xii).

Hofstadter's book, The Paranoid Style in American Politics, begins to identify a type of rhetorical reaction to ethnic and political bogeymen. As a child growing up, the bogeyman was used to instill fear into naïve and innocent minds—creating irrational responses and reactions to events and occurrences that simply did not exist. Hofstadter (1966) labels this type of reaction as "paranoid", "simply because no other word adequately evokes the qualities of heated exaggeration, suspiciousness, and conspiratorial fantasy that I have in mind" (p. 3). Everyone has some type of irrational fears. However, when this person is a charismatic leader or in a powerbroker position, irrational responses can be dangerous. For the political paranoid feels that s/he is in the right, and will try to convince others to subscribe to his or her ideology. Hofstadter (1966) states that "his sense that his political passions are unselfish and patriotic, in fact, goes far to intensify his feelings of righteousness and his moral indignation" (p. 4).

Conspiracies and their rhetorical responses have existed in this country for quite some time. If a person needs to be refreshed on the dangers of seductive, unchecked rhetoric, all they have to is think back to the McCarthy era when he asked, "How can we account for our present situation unless we believe that men high in this government areconcerting to deliver us to disaster" (Hofstadter, 1966, p. 7). Hofstadter has done an effective job of identifying various traits and tendencies of political paranoids. He even identifies the situation to be examined in this study when he stated:
Notions about an all-embracing conspiracy on the part of Jesuits or Freemasons, international capitalists, international Jews, or communists are familiar phenomena in many countries throughout modern history. (Hofstadter, 1966, p. 6)

In 1977, Craig Allen Smith expanded on Hofstadter’s 1966 theory with his “The Hofstadter Hypothesis Revisited: The Nature of Evidence in Politically ‘Paranoid’ Discourse.” Smith states that Hofstadter identified three “prominent” paranoid movements in American history. They were the anti-Masonic movement, the Populist movement, and the McCarthy era (Smith, 1977, p. 274). Smith asks the question in his essay of how can critics determine the accuracy of paranoid discourse, refuting the “convenient retort” that “paranoid discourse is grounded in misinformation and distortion” (Smith, 1977, p. 276).

These two studies will be combined for the following examination into Ford’s rhetoric. While many historical accounts and interpretations will be used in examining Ford’s response to a perceived Jewish conspiracy, Hofstadter’s original hypothesis will be the basis on which the methodology will be founded.

Upon dissecting the original paranoid hypothesis, Smith (1977) observes that “In Hofstadter’s analysis the ‘paranoid style’ is marked by four major characteristics” (p. 275). The four characteristics are as follows:

1. It perceives “a vast and sinister conspiracy to undermine and destroy a way of life . . . as the motive force in historical events. History is a conspiracy.”
2. “What is felt to be needed to defeat it [the conspiracy] is not the usual method of political give-and-take, but an all-out crusade.”
3. “The [political] paranoid [is] a militant leader . . . [The] quality needed is . . . the will to fight things out to a finish.”

4. “The enemy is clearly delineated: he is a perfect model of malice, a kind of amoral superman.”

This “paranoid” taxonomy will be instrumental in identifying Ford’s political pathology by looking at his political discourse (Hofstadter, 1966). This grouping will identify and label chapter two through five in the following fashion: chapter 2) A vast and sinister conspiracy; chapter 3) All out crusade; chapter 4) A militant leader; and chapter 5) A powerful enemy. No chapter will be devoted solely to an historical overview, as history is intertwined with the rhetoric associated with it in the progression of this study. A brief preview of chapters two through five will now be provided:

Chapter 2—A Vast And Sinister Conspiracy

In order to understand exactly what Ford was concerned with, an examination of Ford’s peace journey, The Protocols and the surfacing of those documents in the office of Henry Ford will be provided. Henry Ford’s reaction to the Protocols will be analyzed using Hasian’s 1997 study “Understanding the Power of Conspiratorial Rhetoric: A case study of The Protocols of The Elders of Zion.” The introduction of the Protocols into this study at an early point is crucial, although it will have to be handled carefully, for Ford had begun his campaign before coming upon the documents.
Chapter 3—All Out Crusade

Confronted with the Protocols, Henry Ford, a man with inexhaustible means, took it solely upon himself to change the world, again. According to Bryan (1997) the Dearborn Independent’s, with circulation of 72,000, lost $284,000 in its first year. Within five years, still without ever turning a profit, the Dearborn Independent had a circulation of over 900,000.

Right from the beginning, publishing his response to the Protocols, Ford drew severe criticism and varying libel suits from members of the Jewish community. The Dearborn Independent essays on Jewish activity were specific and brutal on their assessment of the Jewish “conspiracy.” In examining the Dearborn Independent, Hart’s 1971 essay “The Rhetoric of the True Believer” will be employed to make various assessments.

Chapter 4—A Militant Leader

Just from the nature of his position and personality, Henry Ford was a militant leader. Evidence of this militancy can be seen years before the Dearborn Independent was even published. This chapter will discuss: 1) the widely misunderstood $5.00-a-day program; 2) examine the various “committees” set up by Ford to exert social control over his employees; and 3) finally discuss if Ford had the will to “fight to the finish.” This last area of examination will pay close attention to the rhetoric surrounding Ford’s “apology” and the Jewish response that followed. Hofstadter’s 1966 hypothesis will be employed as a whole to examine the issues in this chapter.
Chapter 5—A Powerful Enemy

Ford, a prisoner of his billion dollars, a prisoner of his empire, which he built with his own hands, was terrified that the Jewish conspiracy, almost undefeatable, would ruin not only his company but the whole world as well. Ford’s reaction to the Protocols was based upon the fact that he was facing an enemy, to which there was no equal. According to Burke’s interpretation of “The Rhetoric of Hitler’s ‘Battle’” (1967), the mere existence of the Protocols was “proof that the ‘Aryan’ has been ‘seduced’ by the Jews” (p. 195). It would appear that Ford understood that he could not defeat such a superior enemy. Ford’s actions and the rhetoric of the Dearborn Independent will be examined closely to identify the fact that Ford believed wholeheartedly that the Jews were in fact a “powerful enemy.”

General Observations and Conclusion

The forthcoming analyses will hopefully expand on solid theories in the field of communication. The following study will not attempt to generate any type of organic criticism. It will, though, intertwine various related studies and historical implications in order to “get at and understand,” Ford’s “political pathology” (Hofstadter, 1966). Just the fact that the Dearborn Independent existed in the fashion that it did remains a mystery today. The fact that its popularity is making a comeback, and reprints of the collection are being distributed today is even more interesting.

Just as Virtual Jerusalem cried out “Ford’s anti-Semitism was no anomaly,” this paper will hope to prove that Ford was no anomaly as well. Using Hofstadter and Smith’s theories, this study will show that Ford and his rhetoric followed a natural
progression—dictated by the events of the time. The progression may be unique in its specifics, however it is not unique in its pattern.
Now the mystery is finally dispelled. Henry Ford is a Yankee mechanic, pure and simple; quite uneducated . . . but with naturally good instincts and some sagacity . . . He has achieved wealth but not greatness; he cannot rise above the defects of education, at least as to public matters. So the unveiling of Mr. Ford has much of the pitiful about it, if not of the tragic. We would rather have had the curtain drawn, the popular ideal unshattered.
—Nation, 1919

Hofstadter claims that the foundation of politics lies in the fact that certain strategies are necessary in order to be successful. Furthermore, the utilization of such strategies will require some degree of secrecy (Hofstadter, 1966). Naturally, this type of practice could be labeled “conspiratorial.” Hofstadter, though, adds that the paranoid style derives not from the fact that “its exponents see conspiracies or plots here and there in history, but [rather] they regard . . . conspiracy as the motive force in historical events. History is a conspiracy” (p. 29). Hence, a passing involvement or affiliation ought not to qualify. Henry Ford, as will be shown, not only qualifies under Hofstadter’s definition, he, alone, could define it.

This chapter will look at a variety of subjects. First, an attempt to discover the birth of Ford’s anti-Semitism will be provided. Second, this chapter will provide an examination of Ford’s little known peace journey. Lastly, documents known as the Protocols of the Elders of Zion will be examined. This section of the chapter will provide
a brief history of the Protocols, then discuss how Ford came into contact with them, and finally what they meant to him. The three seemingly unrelated topics will come together to add to the fact that Ford believed that a "vast and sinister conspiracy" did in fact exist.

To begin with, this chapter will attempt to explore the birth of Ford's animus toward the Jewish population. This preliminary examination is essential in developing the character of Henry Ford for the reader, and to show just what part Ford "thought" he played in the geopolitical sphere of the early twentieth century. Already mentioned, however, is the fact that the source of Ford's "distrust" remains obscure, and it might remain as such forever. In discussing Ford's racism, regardless of his socioeconomic status, he was not a very well educated man—even for his time. Ignorance alone, though, cannot account for Ford's racism.

The area in Detroit in which he grew up was very "white." People of Jewish origin were commonly referred to as a "Shylock" or "Fagin", and looked upon with a great distrust. The social clubs of the time were "white" before Ford could afford to be affiliated with them. They were "white" during the time when he and his wife were members—and they were "white" long after he died. Interestingly enough, the first Jew to be admitted to the prominent Detroit Club, Max Fisher, was brought in by Henry Ford's grandson, Henry Ford II. Henry Ford II was well aware of his grandfather's anti-Semitism and was deeply troubled, "[He] had breached single-handedly the prejudiced fortifications of the Detroit Club, which did not admit Jews to membership; he proposed Max Fisher and fought the application through" (Hayes, 1990, p. 119). The year was 1971! The walls of prejudice are not easily breached, and do indeed have very solid, and...
very old, "fortifications." To fault Ford for growing up prejudiced lends itself to other, much larger arguments.

There were literally millions of people who thought the same way as Ford. They did not, however, turn out to be "political paranoids." This chapter searches for the birth of Ford's "practical," or "tangible" prejudices. Was there, at some specific point it time, an event that occurred (in Ford's mind) which transitioned the Jew into a contributor to the demise of society, rather than the butt of family jokes? Furthermore, did such an event, or chain of events, elicit a response—a "conspiratorial" response? The answer has to be a resounding "yes." However, such attempted discovery is wrought with difficulties. This ambiguity might be due partly to the fact that some of the writings available are reluctant to comment on such a "question." Through a variety of inferences (from documents both praising and despising him), though, this essay contends that a likely source of Ford's animus can be traced not to the Protocols (which will be examined later in this chapter), but to a lesser known chapter of the world's first billionaire's life. This essay contends that a possible origin occurred in 1915, aboard a ship called the Oscar II.

If the point of Ford's bigotry, or at least its first practical reinforcement can indeed be pinned down to 1915, it is ironic in nature; for the beginnings of his hatred then stemmed from a bout of pacifism. In 1915, Ford who was troubled over the events of WWI, and was especially distraught over the sinking of the Lusitania and the 1,153 men and women who had lost their lives aboard the ship, went public with his thoughts. He was quoted as saying to Theodore Delavigne, a reporter for the Detroit Free Press, "that he would 'give everything [he] possesses if he could stop the war and prevent the amassing of arms in America" (Lewis, 1976, p. 78). Ford's first step was to endow a $1,000,000 fund which
was designed to show the destructive powers of war, and the benefits of peace. He wanted to "inaugurate a 'world-wide campaign for universal peace'" (Lewis, 1976, p. 78). The majority of the press was favorable, for a time. For on the surface, Ford's actions seemed nothing but altruistic. He was, though, not without his critics. Not without surprise, Ford's first critics toward his pacifist attitudes and actions were the military presses. Their views were highly suspicious of Ford. The military press claimed the following:

[They] dismissed the Detroit industrialist's crusade as "only an advertising scheme."

"When under the guise of a peace advocate, a man attempts to sell automobiles by referring to the men who wear the United States uniform as 'sloths and lunatics,'" reported the Army and Navy Journal, "he is surely going too far . . . evidently he thinks that the millenium will be at hand when everybody owns a Ford." (Lewis, 1976, p. 78-9)

Ford drafted a list of potential peace delegates who would accompany him overseas, aboard a chartered ocean liner in order to quash global hostilities. However, most of the most influential invitees declined to take part in the journey. They included people of such stature as Thomas Edison, William Howard Taft, William Jennings Bryan, Luther Burbank, John Burroughs, and Helen Keller. The majority of the people who did accompany Ford as "delegates" were people, aside from meaning well, were not worth mentioning. What was worth mentioning, though, was the fact that half of the almost 150 people sailing abroad were members of the press, the majority of whom, their editors had sent aboard to satirize the journey. The newspapers of America were less than kind, especially with their editorials and cartoons. Ford, once the journey was underway,
noticed the powerful backlash that the media was generating at home, “Said Henry: ‘The fight to stop the war is too big a thing to stop before the vaporings [sic] of editorial-writing comedians’” (Sinclair, 1984, p. 38). While the attacks on Ford in the media did go on at home, the members of the press who accompanied Ford on his “Peace Ark” were eventually swayed by the American icon’s sincerity in regards to his mission. On December 15, 1915, when Ford and his wife arrived at the docks in Hoboken New Jersey, where the Oscar II was ready to set sail, “[They] were greeted by fifteen thousand people shouting, ‘Hip-hip-hooray for Ford’” (Gelderman, 1981, p. 111). The departure made headlines across the country. The New York Times, claiming that only three-thousand people were in attendance, reported that “The departure of the peace ship was attended by one of the most picturesque, as well as noisy, demonstrations ever witnessed in New York Harbor” (1915, p. 1). Thomas Edison, “who is an old friend of Mr. Ford . . . went on board, shook the hand of the man who hopes to end the war, and then hurried ashore” (New York Times, 1915, p. A1).

The mission encountered countless troubles along the way. Still, outwardly at least, Ford remained determined. What follows is possibly Ford’s first public showing of his over inflated sense of his role as a shaper of world policy. The following appeal is provided in order to give the reader a sense that Ford had fallen upon, perhaps, his first vision of a utopian society. This essay does not contend that Ford was the first to envision world peace, nor will he be the last. He was, though, one of the first people who may have tried to buy it. On December 7, 1915, Henry Ford, by wireless message, sent a message to Congress. It read as follows:
We, citizens of the United States, now sailing to Europe on the steamship Oscar II, with the serious purpose of uniting with citizens of European neutral countries in an organized effort to deliver the men from the trenches and the women from their suffering and agonies and restore the peace of the world upon an honorable and just basis which will stop the mad race of competitive armament, do hereby earnestly petition and entreat you to give the peace mission your support and encouragement, so that it may succeed at the earliest possible moment. (New York Times, 1915, p. 2)

President Wilson’s denouncement of the message two days later, aside from devastating the members of the peace junket, was indicative of the multinational sense of folly in regard to Ford. The Government of Germany viewed Ford’s mission as an outright “Manifestation of American eccentricity” (New York Times, 1915, p. 1).

The climax of the journey, for the lack of a better term, was strange. On December 18 the Oscar II docked at its destination in Oslo, Norway. Demoralized, and physically sick, Ford did not emerge until December 22 at which time he called a press conference. No one quite knows why he did what he did next. After all the money he spent, and ridicule he endured, Ford emerged not talking about mediation, but rather his new tractor. Perhaps, the American military press was correct in calling Ford’s expedition nothing more than an advertising ploy. Did Ford know all along that he would be promoting his new product at the end of his journey, or did he suddenly change his mind? This essay will make no judgement on that question. Ford did, though, try to explain altruistically that his new tractor was unpatented—and that armament makers could turn a greater profit by making tractors than weapons. The reporters present were nothing less then
bewildered. One reporter revealed his sentiments by saying, “He must be a very great man who permits himself to utter such foolishness” (Lewis, 1976, p. 90).

Entrenched in international embarrassment, Ford left the delegates to continue their work toward ending the war. He headed to America as quickly as possible. What happened upon Ford’s return is as baffling as any part of his entire journey. He returned a hero. Somehow the country overlooked the specifics of the mission and applauded the effort. The oddity of this change of heart can be observed in the following:

He had sailed away a short time before one of the most ridiculed men of his generation; he sailed back into an atmosphere of sympathy. In the meantime, his expedition had appealed to the imagination of his countrymen. The very hopelessness of the task he had attempted commanded a sort of respect. “God’s Fool,” the Springfield Republican calls him, striking in those two words perhaps the keynote of the comment of the majority of the journals of this country . . .. (Lewis, 1976, p. 90)

Was the journey a success? The answer depends on just what was being attempted aboard the Oscar II. The remaining delegates, calling themselves the Neutral Conference for Continuous Mediation, still financed by Ford, met continuously until 1917, “when the hopelessness of attaining peace became apparent to the industrialist” (Lewis, 1976, p. 90). The war escalated. Apparently Ford had no visible success. Through failure, though, comes introspection. And perhaps, through such introspection, a much larger picture was becoming clearer to Ford. If he couldn’t stop the war—then someone was to blame. Hasian (1997) claims that “[Ford] himself claimed that in the mid-1910s several Jews had bragged to him about the power of their race” (p. 203). One of these “Jews,”
who Ford named, Hermann Bernstein was, without much surprise, on the Oscar II. Bernstein, a Jewish reporter, later sued Ford for libel once he had learned that his name was associated for substantiating the claims of Zionism later propagated by Ford (Ford eventually settled the lawsuit out of court). Gelderman (1981), in discussing Ford's anti-Semitism and the birth of the Dearborn Independent, claims the following:

Henry remembered a Jewish newspaperman named Herman Bernstein whom he had met on the Peace Ship. Bernstein had insisted then that the way to end war was to get the Jewish bankers to stop supplying funds for war to Germany and France. “They couldn’t carry on war without loans from the Rothschilds and the Warbrugs and people like that. We’re going to tell about them someday.” (pp. 218-9)

[Emphasis added]

Although scholars cannot quite agree over the origins of Ford’s anti-Semitism, one can begin to see what shape it was taking. The Jews were beginning to take on a different shape to Ford. And regardless of the origins of Ford’s animus, the Jews could now be blamed. By blaming the Jews for the war, which he did, Ford saw the beginnings of a conspiracy. Whether it was because he failed to stop the war that he scapegoated the Jews, or because he blamed them for the demise of the society that was growing around him, Ford began to believe the Jews were secretly responsible for something he couldn’t control. They were becoming the “motive force” in the shaping of history.

What should be firmly established now is the fact that Ford, regardless of where it originated, was anti-Semitic. Furthermore, the reader should have a taste for what kind of person Henry Ford was. This essay does not fault Ford for his “eccentric” goals, but hopes to expand on them in order to show that he was the type of person who would have
a predisposition to view history as a conspiracy. This characterization is especially important to understand as this essay next delves into one of the great conspiratorial documents ever—the Protocols.

The Protocols, whose exact origin and author remain unknown, were a set of documents that wreaked global havoc at the beginning of the twentieth century. The Protocols were supposedly minutes of a secret meeting of Jewish elders who were on a quest for world domination. They were “one of the most important forgeries of the modern times, present[ing] a Jewish plot to take over the world and reduce non-Jews to abject slavery” (Levy, 1995, p.3). If a set of documents were indeed a forgery, which they are, why then are they worth studying, and what relation do they have to this study?

Hasian claims in his 1997 essay entitled, “Understanding the Power of Conspiratorial Rhetoric: A Case Study of the Protocols of The Elders of Zion”, that “[His] essay tries to explain why so many apparently rational human beings believed in this symbolic construct” (p. 196). His study is extremely useful in exploring the issue. However, Hasian only looks at the construct—and assumes that all people are rational. To use the term “rational” is to use a term that is subjective by nature. Hasian’s article was published relatively recently; and perhaps eighty years from now today’s general population will be studied for many things not rational. The point is that the world was an extremely different place at the last turn of the century. Societies such as America, Russia, and Germany, with newspapers being their primary form of news, trusted print a great deal—and relied heavily on their socialization circles for their opinions. Levy states the following:
The Protocols combines two distinct motifs: the conspiratorial and the antisemitic . . . Conspiracy thinking was not then and is not now exclusively the property of the semieducated . . . For most people, conspiracy remains a recreational or aesthetic consideration. But on occasion and for even the highly intelligent and well educated, conspiracies explain the real world. (1995, p. 5) [Emphasis added]

Hasian’s article is helpful, though, in understanding the impacts of the Protocols. The fact that Germany felt cheated with the outcome of WWI and the adoption and signing of the Treaty of Versailles is common knowledge. Hasian (1997) makes the assumption that “Adolph Hitler . . . was sure that he had found the real culprits behind Germany’s defeat—the ‘International Jews’ who conspired behind the lines” (p. 195). This essay contends that while Hasian’s ideas are possibly simplistic in this observation, he is useful in setting up the argument for this essay.

The second half of this chapter will help to explain above mentioned “picture.” First a brief description of how and why the Protocols came into being will be provided. Also to be discussed is how the Protocols found their way to Ford, and what they meant to him.

The Protocols of the Elders of Zion, “supposedly a written record of some secret meetings of Jewish leaders who were planning on dominating and dividing the world amongst themselves” (Hasian, 1977, p. 196), originally surfaced in an abbreviated edition in Russia about 1903. By 1905 Sergei Nilus had published a full-length version in his book, The Great in the Small. Nilus was not the author, however, he was the individual responsible for making the Protocols available for mass consumption. For the next twelve or so years, Nilus and a man named Butmi republished the documents several
times. Around 1920, the Protocols made their way to America—and to Henry Ford. To understand that the Protocols did not come to Ford as a forgery is essential to know. If Ford knew of the document’s questionable origin, no one can say. Smith, who in 1977 discusses the “nature of evidence in politically paranoid discourse,” states, “The ‘paranoid’s’ belief in a conspiracy apparently serves him as both warrant and claim. This strategy enables him to account for any potentially dissonant information without distortion . . .” (p. 289). This essay argues that Ford did not believe that the documents brought to him were indeed dissonant, but if he did, his zealous acceptance of them can be explained.

The Protocols weren’t successfully proved to be a forgery until 1921—almost sixteen months after the Dearborn Independent devoted its lead articles to exposing a “vast and sinister” Jewish world conspiracy. A man named Phillip Graves was credited with unearthing the forgery. Graves, the Times of London’s Constantinople correspondent, claims that he was confronted by a “Mr. X” in 1921. At this time, “Mr. X” gave Graves a book. The battered artifact, in French, was entitled, Dialogue aux Enfers entre Machiavel et Montesquieu, ou la Politique de Machiavel au XIX. Siecle. Par un Contemporain. Its 1865 author, “Maurice Joly, a Paris lawyer and publicist, was arrested by the police of Napoleon III, and sentenced to 18 months imprisonment” (Graves, 1921, p. 9). The book, which the Times referred to as The Geneva Dialogues, was, in its simplest form, a conversation between Machiavelli and Montesquieu. If Graves is correct, their discovery was nothing short of an accident, without which, the documentation of the Protocols as a forgery might have taken a substantially longer time.
Graves, in a 1921 three part series between August sixteenth and eighteenth, sought to expose the Jewish plot—claiming “Truth at Last.” Graves reported that Mr. X obtained a selection of used books from an old soldier of the Russian Political Police (Okhrana) who escaped to Constantinople. The Geneva Dialogues were among one of the books he purchased. What sparked the expose was the fact that Mr. X noticed that a few of the passages seemed vaguely familiar to him. They were familiar to him because they were similar, if not identical in nature, to the recent publications of the Protocols. The Protocols are indeed a forgery. However, they are not a very clever one. Below is a comparison between the Geneva Dialogues and the Protocols, both showing contempt for the masses:

**Geneva Dialogues, p. 43:**

Machiavelli—“You do not know the unbounded meanness of the peoples . . . weak, implacable to faults, indulgent to crimes, incapable of supporting the contradictions of a free regime, and patient to the point of martyrdom under the violence of an audacious despotism . . . giving themselves masters whom they pardon for deeds for least which they would have beheaded twenty constitutional kings.”

**Protocols, p. 15:**

In their intense meanness the Christian peoples help our independence—when kneeling they crouch before power: when they are pitiless towards the weak: merciless in dealing with faults, and lenient to crimes: when they refuse to recognize the contradictions of freedom: when they are patient to the degree of martyrdom in bearing with the violence of an audacious despotism. At the hands of their present
dictators, Premiers, and Ministers, they endure abuses for the smallest of which they would have murdered twenty kings. (Graves, 1921, p. 11)

Since the Protocols were nothing more than a thinly veiled forgery, or a series of paraphrases, a reader has to ask him/herself “what were they used for?” The effect that they had in Russian politics is essential in understanding what effect they had on Ford. Following the first Russian Revolution, the forgeries were used to effect change and not one for the positive either. There was a growing discontent among conservatives in Russia regarding a domineering bureaucracy. The Protocols were used strategically to shift blame for the unfavorable conditions away from the existing government and onto a worldwide Jewish conspiracy. The result was that the liberal Prince Sviatopolk Mirski fell from power in 1905, the same year that the Protocols were introduced by Sergi Nilus—a government official.

Phillip Graves, ending his series in the London Times, offered a final thought on the Protocols which is relevant to this study. Graves (1921) states the following:

So much for the Protocols. They have done harm not so much in the writer’s opinion, by arousing anti-Jewish feeling, which is older than the Protocols and will persist in all countries where there is a Jewish problem until that problem is solved; rather, they have done harm by persuading all sorts of mostly well-to-do people that every recent manifestation of discontent on the part of the poor is an unnatural phenomenon, a factitious agitation caused by a secret society of Jews. (p. 10)

[Emphasis added]
The reason that this lengthy explanation of the Protocols is so important is because it illustrates just what type of document showed up on Henry Ford’s desk, five years after he had tried to stop the war, and one full year before they were proven to be a forgery.

This line of reasoning hopefully transcends Hasian’s claim of rationality. The Protocols are unique. They are unique in their creation, discovery, and they are unique in their purpose. The conspiracy preached by those documents did not just appeal to the undereducated, which Ford was, but they appealed to societies in general; they appealed to those cultures already immersed in anti-Jewish sentiment—looking for a scapegoat. With the personality of Ford, illustrated in the description of his peace journey, the reader can see why a document of such prowess had such an effect on an anti-Semitic man with unlimited money and a predisposition to change the course of history.

No one can seem to pin down the exact circumstances under which Ford came into contact with the Protocols, and even “Ford’s reasons for disseminating the Protocols and for attempting to politicize anti-Jewish feeling in America remain matters of conjecture” (Levy, 1995, p.25). According to Upton Sinclaire, though, even if it is through the use of hyperbole, a situation—some situation had to have occurred which demanded Ford’s attention when the Protocols were presented to him. The Dearborn Independent, at its inception, was free with its support of President Wilson and his efforts for a fair League of Nations. However, much was wrong with the world at the start of 1920. Sinclair (1984) states that “The world seemed to be on the verge of chaos . . . It was evident that there was some evil force at work, thwarting good capitalists like [Ford] . . .” (p. 55). Furthermore, Sinclair (1984) states that “Something was desperately wrong; and Henry Ford sought earnestly to find out what it was” (p. 55).
Before an analysis of this chapter is offered, a final insight into the situation that presented itself to Ford will be offered. As will be discussed later in this essay, Ford surrounded himself with a virtual fortress of assistants, secretaries, and even a private police force. According to Sinclair, a Russian by the name of Boris Brasol made it past the multitude of secretaries and into Ford’s office. Brasol informed Ford about the wicked forces of the Bolsheviki that were at work in his home country. Ford, who already was suspicious of the Jews, believing that “whenever anything happens on a big scale, there is always money behind it” (Sinclair, 1984, p. 55), was more than ready to attend to any information that was being presented to him, especially if the Protocols were “proofs which would be valid in any court of law” (p. 56). And, if Sinclair (1984) is to be believed (as Lewis asks in 1976), Brasol exclaimed to Ford the following:

Just look, Mr. Ford! The bankers have been trying to take your business away from you. Who are they? Jews! All the international bankers are Jews: Rothschilds and Samuels and Barings, Belmonts and Baruchs and Strausses, Warburgs and Kuhns and Loebs and Kahns and Schiffs. The list of munitions magnates who made the war reads like the membership of a synagog [sic]. And look at the list of revolutionists: Trotsky and Radek and Zinovieff, Bela Kun and Liebknecht and Luxemberg. Does it surprise you that the Jews should be using strikes and revolutions to break the nations to their will? (pp. 55-6)

As the information leading up to Ford’s racial epiphany will for always remain obscure, this essay contends that either the above conversation, or at least one similar took place in Ford’s office, whereupon he was confronted with the existence of the Protocols.
This chapter set out to qualify the events and rhetoric that surrounded Ford as being relevant to Hofstadter’s hypothesis. Divided into four major categories in 1977 by Smith, the first of Hofstadter’s claims is that “[The political paranoid] perceives ‘a vast and sinister conspiracy to undermine and destroy a way of life . . .’” (p. 275). Hasian states (1977), that, in regards to the Protocols, “the critic needs to pay attention to the origins, culture, and influence of such conspiratorial rhetorics” (p. 198). This statement is especially true of Ford as well, for the rhetoric of Ford to be examined later in the essay is doubly conspiratorial. The Dearborn Independent was born of conspiracy and then propagated further conspiracy to a wider, more receptive audience then the Protocols originally had. This essay argues that the anti-Semitic rhetoric that was eventually produced by Ford was not just a conspiratorial response to the Protocols, but was (in a larger context) a response to the increasingly modern world—one which Henry Ford helped to create. In regards to a question the reader might pose, “Why didn’t Ford just ignore the Protocols,” Smith offers up a possible explanation in the following:

Convenient as it may be to discount politically “paranoid” discourse as inaccurate, how often do we examine the accuracy of that discourse with which we are predisposed to agree? It may well be that political discourse in general is inaccurate, but that we accept that with which we agree as accurate, while rejecting as inaccurate that with which we disagree. The point is: at present we have no way of knowing.

(1977, pp. 276-277)

And neither did Ford.
CHAPTER 3

“ALL OUT CURSADE”

Move over please, and make a place for Henry Ford on the editorial tripod. The new volunteer is thrice welcome. If he does as much good with his journal of civilization as he has with his factories, band, school, farm, and hospital, the world will be better for his “hunch” that he ought to have a newspaper.

—Detroit Times, 1919

As discussed in the previous chapter, many more people besides Ford believed that, in some form or another, the Jew was responsible for a variety of hardships around the world. If, though, the only thing that Ford was guilty of in the early 1900s was racial prejudices there would be no reason for this study. Other than an historical or anthropological type of curiosity, there is nothing inherently provocative about a rich man whose distrust of the Jewish population was public knowledge. Ford, a man who single-handedly created the automobile industry and then fought off the unions for years, could, for the most part, act and speak any manner he chose. Ford may have been looked upon as a villain, and in some respects he might have been. However, when he purchased the Dearborn Independent and used it as a medium for the dissemination of denigrating material, Ford crossed an invisible line when he decided to undertake a tangible campaign of attack. His campaign of anti-Semitic attacks would eventually reach millions. It became his mission; it was his crusade.
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Just labeling the Dearborn Independent as being applicable to Hofstadter's original hypothesis, though, would be simplistic in nature. Labeling the second point on the hypothesis, Smith states, "What is felt to be needed to defeat it [the conspiracy] is not the usual method of political give-and-take, but an all-out crusade" (p. 275). There is not much doubt that the anti-Semitic campaign undertaken by Ford would qualify under such a definition. However, there is much more to this story. This chapter will outline the uniqueness of this "crusade" by doing two things. First, an historical background will be provided that will explore not only the birth of the Dearborn Independent, but the reasons for its longevity as well. And, secondly, in order to further strengthen the argument that Ford was indeed a political "paranoid," the content of the Dearborn Independent will be examined by using ideas proposed by McEdwards (1968), Hart (1971), Rosenthal (1971) and Smith (1977). These authors will be useful in arguing that the rhetoric produced by Ford, from the beginning, was structured specifically in order to influence a much larger audience than those on the Dearborn Independent's subscription list.

Much as the source of Ford's prejudices remains obscure, so too does the impetus for the creation of the Dearborn Independent. Lewis (1977) believes that "Two considerations motivated Ford to publish a personal journal" (p. 135). The first consideration had three parts. First, as will be discussed in the following chapter, Ford received severe criticism for his introduction of the five-dollar day. Also, as was discussed in the previous chapter, criticism befell him as a result of the ill-fated peace ship. And, thirdly, Ford, for a variety of reasons, was being criticized by a multitude of newspapers. The Chicago Tribune was especially critical of Ford's pacifism. Furthermore, "bitter allegations [were] leveled against Ford during his 1918 senatorial
campaign, particularly the attacks on his son, Edsel . . .” (Lewis, 1977, p. 135). A composite picture shows that Ford had something to say to the world, but he thought that the press was maliciously misrepresenting him. Ford needed a medium of his own, one that was not “tainted.” So, in the latter part of 1918, almost two years before the introduction of the Protocols, Ford purchased a small-town Michigan newspaper called the Dearborn Independent.

The Dearborn Independent did not begin operations until January 1919. And while there were great hopes that Ford would do well, he was instantly met with criticisms of his new venture. The criticisms were not due to the questionable racial content of the paper, for such articles did not exist yet in the Dearborn Independent; they were simply due to the crude form of the fledgling paper. While Ford had wanted an arena free from outside influence to enlighten the world with his beliefs, he seemed not to be able to escape his past. This meant that he should most likely stick to producing automobiles, for he lacked the finesse required to lead a respectable journalistic endeavor. In regards to reports surfacing at the inception of Ford’s paper, Lewis observes some concerns of the time in the following:

Most press reviews . . . described the Independent as dull; “as tranquil as a peace ship upon a painted ocean . . . the Oscar II of the becalmed journalistic main.” Commentators inevitably compared the enterprise with what the publisher had accomplished in other realms. “He has led always,” reported the Detroit Times, “but he is not now a pathfinder; he is just a humble follower. The role doesn’t fit the genius of Ford.” (1976, p. 136)
Ford offered his opinions on a variety of topics including, but not limited to "traditional values of sobriety, hard work, and thrift..." (Levy, 1995, p.25). Ford, for the most part, though, accosted his readers with truisms wrought with patronizing cliches. Wishing him well, Life said "Good luck to [Henry] and to the Dearborn Independent," observing prophetically that if a man "forms the habit of putting out printed words it amounts to an habitual exposure of his character in the altogether" (1919, p. 180).

Apparently, having an uneducated millionaire telling the other "ordinary" people to pull themselves up by their bootstraps did not have quite the effect that Ford had intended. The Dearborn Independent was almost immediately proving itself to be an unprofitable venture.

The Dearborn Independent never earned a profit. Originally selling for five cents a copy, or a $1.50 a year, the paper lost a reported $284,000 in its first year. Its original circulation in 1919 was around 70,000. By the time of its eventual demise in 1927, (which will be discussed in the following chapter) though, the Dearborn Independent had a weekly circulation of 900,000 (Bryan, 1997). By 1928, it is estimated that Ford, who may never been interested in turning a profit from the newspaper, lost close to five million dollars (Levy, 1995). Not only had the number of subscriptions being sold changed, the content of the newspaper had changed as well.

The Dearborn Independent, often subtitled the Chronicle of the Neglected Truth, soon began to print attacks on the Jewish community. The Dearborn Independent's lead article on May 22, 1920, which was unsigned, was titled "The International Jew, the World's Problem." The first article attacking the Jews can be evidenced in the following passage:
In simple worlds, the question of the Jews has come to the fore, but like other questions which lend themselves to prejudice, efforts will be made to hush it up as impolitic for open discussion. If, however, experience has taught us anything it is that questions thus suppressed will sooner or later break out in undesirable and unprofitable forms. The Jew is the world's enigma. Poor in his masses, he yet controls the world's finances. Scattered abroad without country or government, he yet presents a unity of race continuity which no other people has achieved. (Issue of May 22, 1920)

The important fact to understand is that this campaign, or "crusade" was already established before Ford had any experience with the Protocols. Using the Protocols was not far away, appearing in July of that year. They were, however, not the impetus of Ford's attacks.

Throughout the course of its history, the Ford Motor Company had published a variety of literature, including pamphlets and periodicals. None, however "became as troublesome as the Dearborn Independent" (Bryan, 1997, p. 101). The Dearborn Independent, a periodical that Ford had read for quite some time, had existed since 1901. The newspaper proved to be a modest Mid-Western paper, produced from a modest Mid-Western town. Ford, after purchasing the Dearborn Independent in 1918, decided to keep the newspaper's original name. The term "independent" was appealing to him. He was the president, his wife was the vice president, his son Edsel was the treasurer, and a man by the name of E. G. Pipp, whom Ford had recruited from the Detroit News, was the first editor. Aside from Ford's family being on staff, most likely in name only, the hiring of Pipp is of great interest. For Pipp had brought with him William J. Cameron, also from
the Detroit News. Pipp lasted for only a brief period of time at the Dearborn Independent. When he resigned in protest over the budding racial issues, Cameron took over as acting editor. Cameron was significant because he eventually became a scapegoat for the public denunciation of Ford’s anti-Semitic rhetoric.

This essay contends that no matter who had influenced Ford with whatever philosophies or arguments, it was Ford who attached his name to his paper. When, in 1927, Ford claimed that he had no real idea what was being printed in the publication on which he was losing millions of dollars, William J. Cameron, and the new acting manager, E. G. Liebold, both took a large share of the blame. Cameron, upon complaints from Ford’s family, had dismissed claims that his anti-Semitic writings would hurt the company’s business.

Liebold, who was previously the head of Ford’s detective agency in New York and whose job it was to gather negative material about Jews, took over as managing editor of the Dearborn Independent in the middle of 1923, about the time that Ford took his wife and son’s name off of the masthead. Liebold, sometimes acting as a barrier to the “outside world,” often caused much trouble for Edsel and a number of Ford’s associates. He was openly abrasive and up front regarding his views of the Jewish community. Again, regardless of Cameron or Liebold’s history or beliefs, it is Ford, alone who has to take ultimate responsibility for the rhetoric disseminated across the globe—to which his name was attached.

The anti-Semitic material of the Dearborn Independent, while being purchased by some, was being forced upon a large number of people who had no interest in the content. In the early 1920s, in an effort to offset the production cost, Ford dealerships were being
“asked” to offer subscriptions to their customers. Almost all Ford dealerships were, in fact, given quotas to fulfill. The handling and distribution of the *Dearborn Independent* was soon a cost of doing business with Henry Ford. Many dealers resented such demands being placed upon them, especially since a large portion of their customers were Jewish. Many dealers did not acquiesce, though. In order to maintain a good standing relationship with the company, a large number of dealers simply sent the Ford Motor Company a check for the “paid” subscriptions. The addresses of such subscribers were, at random, selected from local phone books. While the dealers thought that this type of activity was just part of doing business, their actions were responsible for having the *Dearborn Independent* land, quite literally, on the front porch of many Jewish citizens. While some might have been simply confused, as Ford was quite popular, a lot of “innocent” people were accosted. The reason that subscriptions were of such importance was that sales at newsstands were, for obvious reasons, not a strong enough source of adequate capital, “averaging only .009 percent of the total” (Lewis, 1976, p. 142). So, when circulation figures of between 650,000 and 900,000 are discussed, a large number of these, while paid for by the dealer, were spurious in nature.

With so much of the country being blanketed by Ford’s anti-Semitism, naturally, resistance began to occur. While originally not wanting to be the source of even more publicity for the *Dearborn Independent*, the American Jewish Committee felt uncomfortable in publicly attacking Ford. However, as much restraint as they tried to practice, a large portion of public sentiment turned against Ford. Even though millions of people had read and enjoyed the publication, law suits (one of the most public involving Jewish farm organizer, Aaron Sapiro, will be discussed in the following chapter) and
public demonstrations were beginning to occur. Magazine salespersons were attacked, car dealerships were being faced with eviction from Jewish landlords, newsstands were destroyed, and even some riots occurred. Police in Boston attempted to stop the sales of the Dearborn Independent. However, they had no legal ground. Libraries around the country ceased carrying the publication. One of the most intriguing responses to the Dearborn Independent occurred in Cincinnati, where the city established a working censorship of the press. Dissatisfaction was not only becoming commonplace, it was beginning to be high profile as well, as evidenced when “Hartford Jews, when arranging a 400-car parade in honor of Dr. Chaim Weizmann and Albert Einstein, gained nationwide publicity by ordering ‘Positively no Ford machines permitted in line’” (Lewis, p. 1976, p. 142).

In January of 1922, the attacks on the Jewish community ceased. They would eventually be brought back, though. The inspiration to start again, after an almost two year cessation, was an expose on the farming industry. The affronts on the Jewish populous, while not being disseminated through the Dearborn Independent, were on the verge of taking on a much sinister role in history. For not only did the content of the Dearborn Independent continue to exist after a brief cessation, it began to take on a much more different form—one that would make it easier to be distributed to a much larger, in fact global, audience. The articles, which ran continuously for nearly two years, left behind a body of work that was to be combined into a collection. The collection was arranged and published as follows:

The articles were collected and reprinted in original offprints as The World’s Foremost Problem, Volume I, 1920; Jewish Activities in the United States, Volume
II, 1921; Jewish Influence in American Life, Volume III, 1921; Jewish Power in the United States, 1922. The four pamphlets together were called The International Jew. (Gelderman, 1981, p. 224)

Initially, the collection was intended to be distributed merely to “friends” of the Ford family. Approximately three thousand copies were printed and given away free of charge. Eventually, each volume was to sell for twenty-five cents a volume. However, in Germany, a man by the name of Theodor Fritsch, editor of the right wing publication Der Hammer, began European translations of the International Jew. Within a short time, the collection was translated into at least sixteen languages, and became a national bestseller in Germany. What was originally just a series of opinions expressed in a small, Mid-Western town, evolved into an international cornerstone in the foundations of racism. The results of which, though perhaps just conjecture, had dire consequences in Germany.

The fact that the International Jew had such success globally raises an interesting paradox. Henry Ford, while not only being an American, was representative of a system of government in which his primary audience, nationalist movements in Europe, to phrase it lightly, did not entirely agree with. The content of the International Jew enjoyed a “crossover” type of audience. For, in the Dearborn Independent, Ford put the problem of the Jew in a much larger context. The Jew was on a quest for world domination. Furthermore, the theme that the Jew was the enemy of the Anglo-Saxon civilization reflected a type of Nordic, or Aryan supremacy. In relating to Germany specifically, the International Jew claimed that “The main source of the sickness of the German national body is charged to be the influence of the Jews” (Issue of May 29, 1920). The fact that
Ford was being shown strong support in Germany can be observed in the following quote:

In 1922, a New York Times correspondent interviewed Hitler at his headquarters in Munich. “The wall beside his desk is decorated with a large picture of Henry Ford. In the antechamber there is a large table covered with books, nearly all of which are a translation of a book . . . published by Henry Ford. (Gelderman, 1981, p. 224)

What this essay is arguing at this point is, that from very early on, Ford put the context of the Jewish “problem” in a global context. Hence, worldwide success of the International Jew can be explained more easily. The reason, though, that Ford took it upon himself to undertake such a crusade of besmirching an entire “race” of people is much more difficult to understand.

At this point, the reader should have a working knowledge of the unique history of the Dearborn Independent, and subsequent publication as the four-volume set, the International Jew. What now follows is a discussion of the content of the first of the four volumes, the International Jew, The World’s Foremost Problem. Hopefully, through the following analysis of Ford’s anti-Semitic rhetoric, some of the ambiguity regarding Ford’s “crusade” will be eliminated.

Perhaps one of the biggest questions that this essay is attempting to answer is, quite simply, “why?” In the preface of the first volume of the International Jew, the very first words in fact, ask the same question; “Why discuss the Jewish Question?” The “Jewish Question” as observed by the Dearborn Independent can be defined in the chapter entitled, “The Jewish Question—Fact or Fancy?” It states:
[The Jewish Question] begins in very simple terms—How does the Jew so habitually and so resistlessly gravitate to the highest places? What puts him there? Why is he put there? What does he do there? What does the fact of his being there mean to the world? (Issue of June 5, 1920)

The phrasing of the first line of the preface is a key point to the arguments which are to follow. For the reader is not accosted initially with harsh diatribes. Instead the reader is supplied with a “question” that will be discussed in the literature, provided to him/her by the Ford Motor Company. The resulting body of work was, though, not entirely an arena for a matter of fact discussion—as the preface had claimed it would be. Most likely, the content of the preface was added in order to: 1) add credibility; and 2) offer up a type of disclaimer. The preface states that “The motive of this work is simply a desire to make the facts known to the people,” furthermore, “We give the facts as we find them; that of itself is sufficient protection against prejudice or passion” (1920, October).

The reasoning behind keeping the initial arguments in a discussion type of format has a variety of effects. It does, as the preface suggests, take the onus off Ford and his staff. For promoting racism was not their stated goal. This type of semantic maneuvering is not new. McEdwards, who discusses agitative rhetoric, its nature and effect, states that “The agitator in society deliberately tries to select the diction, the imagery, the syntax that will move his audience emotionally and intellectually to call for change” (1968, p. 37). The agitator, hence, is not a bitter or spiteful person, at least with his/her rhetoric. For “the bitter speaker uses invective for catharsis of self alone,” and that “the language of invective is churlish, malicious, and surly” (McEdwards, 1968, p. 37).
The interesting question raised by McEdwards is, again, “why?” Why is it then, if an agitator primarily preaching to the choir, does s/he have to be careful with the wording? Shouldn’t a rhetor, if speaking to an audience with a predisposition to agree to whatever message is being disseminated, be allowed to be freer with his/her words? This line of reasoning might hold true if the rhetor’s only audience was his/her primary one. However, the wording of Ford’s attacks had to be equivocal for the main reason that “In reality, the audience of the agitator is always the public . . . [who] do not hold his opinion . . . because he advocates a change so extreme . . . (McEdwards, 1968, p. 37). The danger of this statement should be apparent. In discussing “The Rhetoric of the True Believer,” Hart (1971) states that extremism, such as the type advocated by Ford, is a powerful force in society. Furthermore, Hart states that extremism leads not only to fanaticism but as Hoffer observed it can lead to “enthusiasm, fervent hope, hatred and intolerance; all of [which] are capable of releasing a powerful flow of activity . . .” (p. 249).

Hart (1971) claims that “doctrine [cuts] across ideological lines and does generate a unique set of human utterances—a rhetorical genre” (p. 249). And this essay argues that if Ford’s rhetoric is to be placed into a preexisting genre, it ought to qualify as doctrine. This genre, though, is not entirely specific, exhaustive, nor is it even “predictive.” Hart establishes the category merely as an “explanation of a rhetorical phenomena observed” (p. 251). This qualification makes sense in the fact that this type of rhetoric, which does indeed breed fanaticism, would be next to impossible in which to predict patterns. Hart, in the most basic sense, designed his study to simply “suggest hypotheses.” What he does find, though, has a high degree of relevance for this study.
One of the major points of Hart’s study shows that Ford was entirely more culpable for events that proceeded his publishing of the *International Jew* than was discussed when he “apologized” in 1927 (which will be discussed in the following chapter). Hart (1971) states that communication is “enthymematic in that speakers can only encourage listeners to complete the speaker’s reasoning” (p. 251). Furthermore, “indoctrinated” listeners, such as the primary audience of the *International Jew*, are “especially dependable in this co-creation” (Hart, 1971, p. 252). This means that, “[indoctrinated listeners] are willing to contribute a good deal to the rhetorical enterprise by filling in the speakers’ logical gaps” (Hart, 1971, p. 252). The question of culpability for the anti-Semitic rhetoric produced by Ford finds its roots in the observations by Hart. In 1923, when Hitler was jailed for treason after attempting to precipitate the failed Beer Hall Putsch, he had plenty of time to fill in the gaps. Already mentioned was the fact that passages from *Mein Kampf*, which was written while Hitler was in prison, are not only similar to those of the *International Jew*, they are almost identical. This essay is not arguing that Ford should be held personally responsible for the events that took place in Europe during WWII. However, to say that Ford’s rhetoric bears no responsibility at all is not entirely correct either.

As valuable as Hart is to the study of doctrine with his essay, he becomes self-contradictory—making it difficult to apply the whole of the essay. With such contradiction, though, he has provided this essay with an excellent segue into the next point, involving the reliability, usefulness, and nature of evidence used by the *International Jew*. As mentioned, Hart, in qualifying his essay, stated to his readers that any hypotheses derived from his study should not be used to predict future patterns. Yet,
shortly after, Hart claims that “Doctrinal speakers rarely speak of final rewards or ultimate compensations,” and that “stylistic analysis of their speeches shows . . . that these speakers rarely use specific, numerical citations to bolster their arguments” (p. 253) [Emphasis added]. While this observation might be true of a variety of doctrinal speakers and their rhetoric, it is not predictive of the entire genre—which he helped to identify. The International Jew relied heavily on specific citations of names, dates, and numbers to “bolster” its arguments. If Ford believed that his only audience was his primary one, instead of the public, which McEdwards claims is ultimately the agitator’s final audience, then the type of generality which Hart believes to exist in doctrine would have been enough to suffice. However, as it turns out, the world was Ford’s audience. The Dearborn Independent was built upon evidence that would appeal to a large audience.

While it is true that a lot of the claims made in the International Jew were indeed general, a large portion of arguments were backed with specific data. The chapter of the International Jew, chapter I, “Jewish History in the United States,” opens with the following:

The story of the Jews in America begins with Christopher Columbus. On August 2, 1492, more than 300,000 Jews were expelled from Spain . . . and on August 3, the next day, Columbus set sail for the West, taking a group of Jews with him . . . . There were three Maranos or “secret Jews” who wielded great influence at the Spanish court: Luis de Sandagel; Gabriel Sanchez, who was the royal treasurer; and their friend, the royal chamberlain, Juan Cabero. (1929, p. 13)

In this opening passage of the chapter, names, dates, and numbers are all provided to the reader.
The importance of evidence in the rhetoric of the *International Jew* is crucial in understanding its existence. Smith (1977), in examining Hofstadter's original hypothesis, sets out to explore the "evidentiary character of politically 'paranoid' and 'non-paranoid' discourse" (p. 274). Smith also claims that "Hofstadter contends that 'political paranoia' is characterized by the peculiar manner in which one draws inferences from his observations to justify his arguments" (p. 275).

Smith found, contrary to Hart, that the documentation of evidence by "political paranoids" is directly related to the rhetor's purpose. This means that the *International Jew* was destined for a much larger audience than may have been admitted. In regards to such an audience, Smith states "the political 'paranoid's' conspiratorial worldview should lead him to distrust his audience," and "the 'paranoid' would therefore attempt to combat this perceived hostility with cold, hard facts—verifiable references to credible others" (pp. 282-3).

The reasons for such an argument can be found with Rosenthal, who in 1971 discusses credibility in persuasive messages. Rosenthal (1971) states that persuasive messages are those which "have been selected and organized to represent certain empirical facts which, if believed by the listener, are expected to motivate him to desired behaviors" (p. 393). Returning to the original hypothesis stated in the beginning of this chapter, stating that Ford's rhetoric was intended for a larger audience, Rosenthal's claims might not apply. This means that if Ford's intended audience was the primary one, then the readers would be homogeneous in nature. However, this was not the case. The *International Jew* is saturated with evidence, most notable being the Protocols, which were introduced in the issue of July 10, 1920 of the *Dearborn Independent*. The article
asks the question, "Does a definite Jewish World Program exist?" The arguments presented in this chapter of the *International Jew*, and for the entire volume of work, are obviously designed to confront a heterogeneous type of audience. Rosenthal (1971) states that "when the audience is heterogeneous . . . the lack of specific empirical content in the message can materially diminish the persuasive effect" (p. 397). Smith (1977) says similarly, "it is possible that this 'paranoid' tendency to seek extrinsic support may be due largely to their attempts to persuade more skeptical audiences" (p. 288).

Clearly stated, at this point, is that the *International Jew* relied heavily on evidence to support its claims of a worldwide Jewish conspiracy. The last question remaining has to be "just what kind of evidence was used to prove such a theory?" Was the evidence presented in such a way to be a distortion of the truth? And is that typical of such discourse? This question is tough to handle. Having the benefit of hindsight is an invaluable tool to a critic. However, the world (especially Europe) existed on a different plane in the early 1920s. Smith's final conclusion states that "paranoids" do not necessarily draw on false sources for documentation. In fact, Smith states:

Apparently the political "paranoid" is able to present evidence accurately—or more precisely, as accurately as "non-paranoids." Although "paranoid" and "non-paranoid" discourse do appear to differ with respect to the sources to which they turn for implied credibility, any *marked* difference between a "Paranoid Style" and a "non-paranoid style" would appear to stem (as Hofstadter originally suggested) from the manner in which each style draws inferences from evidence to warrant its conclusions. (1977, p. 289) [Emphasis in original]
When the Dearborn Independent cited the Protocols, although suspicions were prevalent, the document had no historic basis for challenge. In fact, the Dearborn Independent even cites the London Times, which was eventually responsible for providing indisputable proof of the forgery to lend credibility to its case. In the chapter introducing the Protocols, the Dearborn Independent states that “while there was the usual outcry by the Jewish press, the London Times in a review pronounced all the Jewish counter-attacks as ‘unsatisfactory’” (Issue of July 10, 1920). The Dearborn Independent did what any person might do in a situation involving a persuasive argument—it cited a respected newspaper of the time. And, while the Protocols might have been an odd source to cite, the documents were not proven to be a forgery at the time they were introduced.

The International Jew provided name after name, date after date, and figure after figure in order to prove its point. All the information provided, when presented to a homogeneous audience, would have the appearance of dogma. Conversely, when presented to a heterogeneous audience, one where “its audience members [are] unknown to each other, [and who are] dissimilar in experience, ideology, culture, and social status . . .” the information is not only appears to be credible—it can be verified.

The topics being discussed in this chapter were designed not only to show the uniqueness of the Dearborn Independent, and its subsequent publication as the four-volume set, the International Jew, but also to illustrate the fact that it was directed at a much larger audience than the United States. The reasons for such targeting will be discussed in the next chapter, which will discuss Ford’s “militancy.” Furthermore, this chapter argues that the Dearborn Independent does indeed qualify as a type of “crusade”
that Hofstadter originally identified. Lastly, this chapter set out not to discuss the exact content of the Dearborn Independent, but rather the credibility of its arguments. The Dearborn Independent used appeals, which were not necessarily false or even distorted, but were rather quite mainstream in their attempt to disseminate its anti-Semitic message. The message, which the reader hopefully understands at this point, had a variety of effects on a variety of people across the globe, the consequences of which might never be fully realized.
CHAPTER 4

"A MILITANT LEADER"

The discussion of Ford's "militancy" involves a rather complex chain of events and spans a number of years. As mentioned in the first chapter, Smith addresses the topic of militancy by saying that ""The [political] paranoid [is] a militant leader . . . [The] quality needed is . . . the will to fight things out to a finish"" (1977, p. 275). While it is an accurate depiction of Hofstadter's original hypothesis, it is too brief for the purposes of this essay. Even though Smith used this definition when studying the nature of evidence in "paranoid" discourse, this essay will turn back to the original theory originally offered by Hofstadter.

The issue of "militancy" is indeed a complex one. Hofstadter pays special attention to this aspect in his formulations. Smith's third point can actually divided into two separate issues addressed by Hofstadter. Examining Ford using Hofstadter's two ideas on "militancy" is beneficial for two separate reasons. The first, being that this type of division will lay the structure for this chapter. Secondly, as will be noted in the end of this essay, it lays the groundwork for further studies of this type. The structure is identified in the following:

1. Nothing but complete victory will do. Since the enemy is thought of as being totally evil and totally unappeasable, he must be totally eliminated—if not from
the world, at least from the theater of operations to which the paranoid directs his attention.

2. Since what is at stake is always a conflict between absolute good and absolute evil, the quality needed is not a willingness to compromise but the will to fight things out to a finish. (Hofstadter, 1966, p. 31)

The sum of these parts is equal to "militancy" as Smith describes it.

This chapter will rely not so much on the examination of text, but rather examine Ford and his actions. This historical type of observation is crucial in labeling Ford a "militant" leader. The beginning of the chapter will deal with the Five Dollar Day labor initiative and the Ford sociological investigations. Secondly, in order to determine if Ford did indeed have the will to fight things out to a finish, Ford's relationship with Hitler, the resurgence of anti-Semitic articles in the Dearborn Independent, and the subsequent apology will be examined. This chapter argues that the following analysis, using the above-mentioned framework, will show just how "militant" Ford actually was.

The first point of Hofstadter's "militancy" aspect has its roots in a variety of contemporary situations. The "paranoid" believes that the enemy is evil incarnate, and only "complete victory" will do. However, such victory is not now, nor has it ever been feasible. A person cannot shape the world in the way he/she sees fit. Hitler tried. The results lay heavily on the human race as a whole—now, and forever. The reason that identification of "militancy" is so valuable to a critic is because a microcosm of the "paranoid's" world-view can usually be seen within the "theatre of operations to which the paranoid directs his attention" (Hofstadter, 1966, p. 31). Eliminating the enemy from
this “theater” is not only feasible, it was done, literally, with a great deal of precision in
the world of Henry Ford.

Nineteen-fourteen was the year that Ford began to show the world that he had
another agenda, one that didn’t include just making cars. Up until 1914, the Ford
factories traditionally operated eighteen hours a day, utilizing two shifts. In 1913, the
Ford Motor Company distributed approximately $11,200,000 in dividends to its twelve
stockholders, and less than one million dollars to “a select list of employees” (Lewis,
1976, p. 69). Early in January of 1914, though, the way that the Ford Motor Company
operated was about to change. It changed through a program called the “Five-Dollar
Day.” Up until 1914, the Ford Motor Company provided its employees with a
competitive minimum wage of $2.34—a day. This wage, seemingly low by today’s
standards, was as good, or better than any of Ford’s competitors. In the beginning of
1914, Ford “astonished the industrial world by the announcement of his plan to share
$10,000,000 of 1914 profits with employees” (New York Times, 1914, January 9, p. 1).
What this boiled down to was that the daily minimum wage would more than double,
going from $2.34 to a then unheard of five dollars a day. The announcement of such a
plan sent shock waves throughout the world. For on Tuesday following the
announcement, the New York Times reported that “something like 10,000 men flocked to
the gates of the factory at Highland Park . . . . The idea of making $5.00 a day or more
had a strong appeal” (1914, January 11, p. 1). Of course it had a strong appeal; and that
will be a major focus for the discussion that follows.

This essay argues that the implementation of the five-dollar day was more than just
an attempt at sharing profits. Also, it was more than just a tactical business move, which
raised the standard of living of the Ford employees as to make them customers and not just workers. It was an attempt to eliminate the enemy "from the theater of operations to which the paranoid directs his attention" (Hofstadter, 1966, p. 31). The enemy, as of yet was not necessarily the Jew. The enemy, rather, as thought of by Ford, was in fact a type of lifestyle which contradicted Henry Ford's view of a good, moral society.

Henry Ford did not see society as a type of Babylon, as Hitler was beginning to see it. Ford did, however, feel that problems existed in the way that a large portion of the population was living. As can be evidenced in the articles of the Dearborn Independent, Ford devoted a great deal of energy to speaking out against typical vices, such as liquor and gambling. In essence, if a person "squandered" his/her money, s/he was not a respectable person, at least in Ford's eyes—and should not be eligible for the increase in wages. Hence, there were restrictions on the new profit sharing program.

The five-dollar day had many exclusions. The program eliminated most women, unless they were heads of households. The program also excluded men under the age of eighteen. Most importantly, though, and most relevant to this essay, the program eliminated the people Ford did not think worthy of the extra money. And, in order to find out just who was worthy and who was not, Ford established a type of social investigation into the lives of his workers. As will be shown, what Ford was doing amounted to a type of ethical and moral blackmail.

Ford believed in thrift and sobriety. He felt that everybody who worked for him should behave according to his standards. If his "program" of thrift and sobriety was followed, then the workplace would be a much more efficient environment. Meyer (1981) states that the five-dollar day "represented an ambitious program to transform the
attitudes and behavior of Ford workers” (p. 123). A Ford worker, after an investigation from the Sociological Department, was quoted as saying, “It was kind of a funny idea, in a free state...” (Meyer, 1981, p. 123). The mission of the Sociological Department, and its relevance can be identified in the following:

Ford workers had to meet very strict social and moral requirements. In order to receive the Five Dollar Day, the company noted, a young worker “must show himself sober, steady, industrious and must satisfy the superintendent and staff that his money will not be wasted in riotous living. A worker...is only put on the list of profit-sharers after he has been carefully looked up, and the company is satisfied that he will not debauch the additional money he receives.” (Meyer, 1981, p. 125)

The year may have been 1914, but the previously quoted Ford worker raises some interesting questions when identifying the oddity of such an investigation in a free state.

What was Ford trying to accomplish, and why? Furthermore, what made him believe that he could regulate worker’s lives in the way he did? As with the Dearborn Independent, Ford spent large sums of money and endured a barrage of criticism for the creation of the Sociological Department. With the Dearborn Independent, this essay has argued that profit was never the goal of the controversial endeavor. While Ford may have claimed otherwise, attempting to draw a parallel between a thrifty worker and increased efficiency on the assembly line, this essay argues that, as with the case of the Dearborn Independent, profit was never the motive in establishing the strict standards set for workers by the Sociological Department either.

Ford’s arbitrary decision to double the minimum wage brought him even more fame than he was accustomed to. His decision made headlines across the world. It was
estimated that Ford’s plan to share ten million dollars bought him nearly twenty million dollars in advertising (Lewis, 1976). However, aside from the social implications, not everybody was pleased by Ford’s decision. Gelderman (1981) claims that Ford was “denounced as a quack, a visionary, a glory seeker” (p. 54). And “The Wall Street Journal called it blatant immorality—a misapplication of ‘Biblical principles’ in a field ‘where they do not belong’ (Gelderman, 1981, p. 54). Why, if Ford was raising the standard of living for the working class, were people so upset? Presumably, the decision by Ford would have desirable consequences. If the Ford Motor Company could raise its wages, then so should competing companies—raising the standards of living for all. This, however, was not the case. Other companies, quite simply, could not follow suit without suffering dire financial consequences. In essence, Ford forced the unwilling hands of his competitors. No one followed suit. Ford’s efforts “should have inspired imitation, but in fact what they inspired was an epithet for Henry Ford—the ‘mad socialist’ of Highland Park” (Gelderman, 1981, p. 58).

The effect of the noncompliance by other competing industries gave Ford carte blanche with his own work force, his “theater of operations,” to do with as he pleased. Ford couldn’t control the world. He could, though, control the lives of his workers. Further evidence of his manipulation by the Sociological Department of his workers can be evidenced in the following:

They were going to compel unmarried men to visit a clergyman or a justice of the peace before they set up housekeeping. They were going to break up the habit of boys running away from home and failing to support their elderly relatives. They were going to stop at least the worst drinking, and see that homes were kept clean,
and that children and sick people were taken care of. These were worthy aims, and the prize to the worker who would assist the Social Department was a check every fortnight amounting to somewhere between twenty-five and fifty dollars. (Sinclair, 1984, pp. 29-30).

In summary of the program, the Social Department investigated three basic attributes of the Ford employee. The first was the gathering of social and bibliographical information. Secondly, the economic and financial condition of the worker was investigated. Lastly, and most relevant to this essay, the worker's morality was investigated. Meyer remarked (1981) that “In this area, the Ford Motor Company clearly and concretely attempted to reform and to remake men in the Ford image” (p. 132). In order to show specifically the impact that this program was having, one of many published reports will be examined. The Ford Motor Company published many such cases in order to show to its employees how not to act. The following story is of a nameless young man working at the Ford plant in 1914:

The investigator reported: “The profits have been a detriment to this young man. After getting a share of the profits he started having a good time. He not only spent all of the profits he received, but the money he had in the bank as well. Has absolutely nothing to show for the wages and the share of the profits he has received since the last investigation.” (Meyer, 1981, p. 135)

This is an actual report by the Sociological Department, that while initially passing the first investigation, a follow up look revealed that a young man, enjoying the extra money he had been working for, had turned to folly. Hence, he was no longer eligible to receive the new wage. The nameless worker eventually changed his ways in order to get back in
the company's good graces. Myers (1981) notes, "Once again, the monetary incentive, backed by the ultimate threat of dismissal, convinced a Ford worker to change his habits and lifestyle" (p. 135).

These, incredibly, were the values that the Ford Motor Company were regulating. These investigations, which were performed on every Ford employee who earned less than two hundred dollars a month, mandated compliance. And, since other companies were not willing to pay such high wages, workers, in order to reap the benefits of such a "benevolent" employer, complied.

As mentioned before, this program amounted to a type of moral blackmail. Ford had the power and means to regulate the lives of his employees. By doing so, he all but eliminated the concept of free choice in his workers, who were supposedly participating in a "free society." While living a thrifty and sober life may indeed be a noble pursuit, the choice of lifestyle ultimately rests in the mind of the individual. Henry Ford saw any lifestyle contrary to his dogmatic principles as being an enemy to society. Ford, however, in relation to Hofstadter (1966) and his definition of militancy, attempted to eliminate the enemy from the theater of operations to which the "paranoid," Ford, directed his attention.

Moving to another aspect of militancy, Hofstadter (1966) notes that "failure constantly heightens the paranoid's frustrations" (p. 31), resulting in a sense of "powerlessness." And, "this in turn only strengthens his awareness of the vast and terrifying quality of the enemy he opposes" (1966, p. 31). Ford was still reeling from the failure and worldwide embarrassment of the peace journey when he purchased the Dearborn Independent in 1918. Hence, the material in the Dearborn Independent can be more easily explained.
However, in July of 1927, Henry Ford publicly apologized for the content of his publication. Should this apology qualify, or rather disqualify him as a “militant leader,” one with the will to “fight things out to a finish?” This essay argues, and argues strongly, that Ford did indeed have the will to fight things out to a finish—on a variety of levels. Furthermore, the following section of this chapter will expand on this conviction, showing Ford to be highly militant.

Aside from the Dearborn Independent, Ford was involved in other anti-Semitic activities. Examining these “activities” in retrospect gives even more credence to the “militancy” of Ford. At some point in the early 1920s, Hitler began to approach Ford for money. The fact that monies were given to the Nazi party, by Ford, leads this examination to an entirely different level—and so does the phrase “the will to fight things out to a finish.” Pool and Pool (1978) state that “Ford’s major motivation for financing the Nazis was his desire to support an organization which would further the fight against the Jews” (p. 111). A controversy exists today over how much money (if any) was supplied to the Nazi Party by Henry Ford. This essay, however, through the abundance of documentation existing that supports the flow of money, lays claim to the fact that Ford did in fact support the Nazi Party financially. In order to illustrate this connection, the historical context that surrounded the financial relationship between Ford and Hitler, their “common ground” will be examined first.

To state that Henry Ford and Adolph Hitler were similar in nature might be disturbing to the American citizen who still regards Henry Ford, or at least the Ford Motor Company as a representation of the American way of life. Yet, they were similar in many aspects—the most obvious being their ideas about the Jewish population. The
reader should keep in mind that in the 1920s there was nothing illegal about the Nazi Party.

The forced signing of the Treaty of Versailles was, in Hitler’s mind, an injustice of the greatest proportion. Germany was a technological giant in Europe in the 1920’s. However, even with its industrial prowess, Germany had a hard time rebuilding after the war because of the economic sanctions placed upon it by the treaty. Ford found sympathy with Hitler on this point. Ford was frustrated with his inability, at first, to establish a productive factory in occupied Germany. Ford, who first worked for a German toolmaker, always had a respect for the people and culture of Germany. Among other things, Ford considered the German people to be thrifty by nature. Ford was sure of success if he could begin to build factories in Germany. However, the same obstacle that was impeding Hitler, the Treaty of Versailles, was impeding Ford as well. The fact that Ford felt sympathy for the plight of the Nazi leader is more than evident. Hitler, however, looked upon Ford in a much different light. Adolph Hitler lavished praises upon the American Industrialist frequently. It was Ford who gave validity to Hitler’s arguments, not the other way around. And when Ford began to experience a backlash from his anti-Semitic publications, Hitler became sympathetic to Ford as well. As mentioned previously, Ford was the only American to be mentioned by name in Hitler’s Mein Kamph. The passage reads:

It is Jews who govern the stock exchange forces of the American Union. Every year makes them more and more the controlling masters of the producers in a nation of one hundred and twenty millions; only a single great man, Ford, to their fury, still maintains full independence. (Hitler, 1927/1971, p. 639)
There is no doubt that Hitler admired the American industrialist. However, just how much financial support Hitler received from Ford remains a matter of conjecture. Sinclair claims Ford had given Hitler forty thousand dollars in order to translate, reprint, and distribute the *International Jew* across Europe. Furthermore, Sinclair (1984) states that Hitler received close to $300,000 in support, sent by a grandson of the ex-Kaiser, acting as a middleman. These two claims, perhaps because of their ambiguity, are the most disputed by those who believed that no monies traveled to Europe in support of the Nazi party. However, while Sinclair's claims might indeed be vague, others exist which help to alleviate the doubt of the financial relationship.

The biggest debate regarding the financing of Hitler revolves around the mystery of just how it was done. Pool and Pool (1978) claim that “there is enough evidence to reduce the numerous possibilities to three of four definite channels through which the money flowed” (p. 113). There were a variety of ways in which money moved, or could have moved overseas to Hitler, however, in order to elaborate of the relationship between Ford and Hitler, two of the more accepted scenarios will be provide to the reader.

In 1918 Boris Brasol was employed by the United States government for work in the secret service. Brasol, a former investigator for the Czarist police, and collaborator of Nazi activities on three continents, had befriended Ford. Furthermore, “Brasol was the U.S. representative of Grand Duke Cryil Vladimirovich, the first cousin to the last reigning Czar Nicholas II” (Pool & Pool, 1978, p. 113), and was charged with raising money for the Russian Monarchist cause in America. During these frequent trips abroad Brasol was able to act as a courier to Hitler under the guise of diplomatic duties (Pool & Pool, 1978).
The second source as documented by Pool and Pool (1978) was one “through which Hitler received Ford’s financial support [that] has documented evidence to verify an exchange of money” (p. 115). This documentation was provided by the vice-president of the Bavarian Diet, Herr Erhard Auer, a respected Social Democratic official, who in a report, stated the following:

The Bavarian Diet has long had information that the Hitler movement was partly financed by an American, Henry Ford. Mr. Ford’s interest in the Bavarian anti-Semitic movement began a year ago when one of Mr. Ford’s agents . . . came into Diedrich Eichart [sic] the notorious Pan-German . . . . Herr Eichart asked Mr. Ford’s agent for financial aid . . . . The agent returned to American and immediately Mr. Ford’s money became coming to Munich. (Pool & Pool, 1978, p. 115)

The Ford agent was a man by the name of Warren “Fuzzy” Anderson. Anderson worked for the Ford Company from 1905 until 1921 when Ford fired him for fear that “it might become known that Ford had sent money to Eckart” (Pool & Pool, 1978, p. 115).

The answer of the impending question, “Why would Ford want to finance Hitler in the first place,” is instrumental in further identifying Ford’s militancy. As previously mentioned, Ford had profound respect for the technological prowess, and efficiency of Germany. Ford looked to Germany as the “other” economic superpower. Ford believed that if there existed a strong anti-Semitic base in both countries, then the support of the International Jew could be weakened. Pool and Pool (1978) sum up Ford’s financial interest in Germany poignantly in the following. They state:

Ford’s financial support and his well-known book against the Jews would gain him recognition and respect in the ranks of the Nazi Party. And if this party did
eventually become an influential political force in Germany, then Ford's philosophy would play an important role in the battle against the Jews. (p. 112)

Hitler never admitted receiving funds from Ford. Konrad Heiden, Hitler's first biographer notes with specific interest that Hitler denied such a relationship while under oath on February 5, 1930. Believing Hitler to be lying, Heiden (1944) notes that Henry Ford "could have sent [Hitler] to prison for perjury by producing a document," and thus might have "spared the world its encounter with Hitler" (p. 369). However, as history reflects, Ford kept silent.

Even with all that Ford had done, his "militancy" may not appear absolute. For in 1927, after a twenty-week resurgence of the articles in the Dearborn Independent, Ford apologized to the world. In the apology he disavowed any knowledge of the material propagated in the Dearborn Independent. Such an apology, under ordinary circumstances would, and should disqualify a "paranoid" as having the will to fight to the finish. However, as will be shown, Ford's apology was not a normal or even honest act of contrition. He blamed staff members for their hatred of the Jewish Community and said that himself or his family did not share their opinions. The apology made headlines across the world. The following will elaborate on the events leading up to, and surrounding the apology. Eventually, this chapter will show that not only did Ford not write the apology, he never signed it either.

The Dearborn Independent closed its doors forever in the latter part of 1927, ending the longest running anti-Semitic attack in history. The series of articles that was in part responsible for the publication's ultimate downfall was entitled, Jewish Exploitations of Farmer Organizations. This series of attacks was primarily directed at Jewish farm
organizer, Aaron Sapiro. Sapiro, a successful Chicago attorney, began his career by
doing various legal work with California co-ops. In the early 1920s, Sapiro was earning
nearly eighty thousand dollars a year. Sapiro, with a wealth of knowledge and a
flamboyant sales personality, was able to create new co-ops in the struggling agricultural
associations in 32 states and Canada” (p. 228). Ford, deeply interested in agriculture, had
kept close watch on Sapiro. And, on April 12, 1924, the Dearborn Independent began a
twenty issue series pointing out weaknesses, and attacking Sapiro’s system. Sapiro was
indeed getting rich, while the farmers continued to struggle.

The system, while lucrative to Sapiro, did in fact operate unfairly toward the farmers.
The farmers were bound by contract to turn over their entire crops for a set number of
years, and accept any arbitrary payment as deemed fair by the co-op. Also, no where in
the contract was the co-op required to specify just when the farmers would get paid.
Furthermore, the contract gave the co-op free reign to sell the crops for any price to any
buyer that they saw fit. Gelderman (1981) states that “When the articles first appeared in
the Independent, thousands of farmers fleeced by Sapiro wrote to corroborate his
charges” with stories such as the following: “I lost my farm because of Sapiro . . . That
scoundrel should be sent up for life for sucking the life blood of farmers” (p. 229). There
was no doubt that Sapiro was getting rich off of the labor of the farmers. However, the
turning point for Ford and the Dearborn Independent came when the articles turned once
again to ad hominem attacks, focusing on Sapiro’s religion, not his actions. The
Dearborn Independent’s ultimate downfall can be observed in the following:
Not content to expose Sapiro’s inequitable system, Ford attacked his Jewishness. “A band of Jews—bankers, lawyers, money-lenders, and agencies, fruit-packers, professional office managers and book-keeping experts—is on the back of the American Farmer.” Before long, the Independent charged, all co-ops would be combined into an international monopoly dominated by Jews. Sapiro sued for libel. (Gelderman, 1981, p. 229)

At the same time that the libel suit was being brought against Ford, Sinclair contends that another possible reason for the cessation of the Dearborn Independent existed. Sinclair claims that during Ford’s attempt to “dig up dirt” on prominent Jews in the world, he came upon a man by the name of William Fox, a producer of motion pictures. Fox, a Jew, got news of Ford’s investigation and threatened to begin a national campaign targeted at showing just how unsafe Ford’s cars actually were. This action, threatened by Fox, was to be done by collecting accident footage from all over the United States and incorporating it into the beginning of newsreels. However it happened, be it through Sapiro, Fox, or the growing Jewish boycott, not only did the Dearborn Independent cease its publication of anti-Semitic material, Henry Ford apologized as well.

The apology, drafted during the first week of July 1927, was front-page news on July 8. Under the headline, “Ford Now Retracts Attack On Jews; Orders Them Ended,” the New York Times, among many others, printed the entire “retraction.” The apology, under the heading of “Mr. Ford’s Statement,” states the following: “To my great regret I have learned that Jews generally, and particularly those of this country, not only resent these publications as promoting anti-Semitism, but regard me as their enemy” (1927, Friday, July 8, p. 1). The apology shows Ford denied any type of responsibility for the
attacks, as evidenced in the last paragraph where “Ford” states, “Had I appreciated even the general nature, to say nothing of the details of these utterances, I would have forbidden their circulation without a moment’s hesitation . . .” (New York Times, 1927, Friday, July 8, p. A1). The statement ends with Ford “giving [the Jews] the unqualified assurance that henceforth they may look to me for friendship and good will” (1927, p. 1).

While most Jews accepted the apology at face value, not everybody was happy with Ford’s retraction. Lewis cites that “Many Gentiles wrote Ford that he had ‘turned yellow,’ ‘was built on the jelly-fish order,’ ‘was a pitiful quitter,’ and had ‘sold [his] birth right for a mess of porridge’” (1976, p. 146). However, what neither group was privy to was just who wrote the apology—and who signed it. Ford’s apology, while not entirely believable, was, and still is, taken at face value. Deborah Lipstadt, a world-renown Holocaust scholar, even makes this oversight. Lipstadt, in her book Denying The Holocaust, while acknowledging the damage that was done to the Jewish community through the publication of the Dearborn Independent, quite simply states that “Ford, facing a lawsuit, eventually apologized for fostering this fantasy” (1993, p.38).

In the end, it was Harry Bennett, Ford’s notorious henchman, who was able to come up with a solution. Interestingly enough, the apology was written, in part by two members of the American Jewish Committee, Louis Marshall and Samuel Untermeyer. The third person, whom Bennett had contacted to recruit the others was columnist Arthur Brisbane. Together, Brisbane, Marshall, and Untermeyer drafted the apology. Then, it was Brisbane who delivered it to Bennett. At this point Bennett called Ford. The conversation that proceeds identifies that Ford truly had no interest in asking forgiveness from the Jewish population. Bennett recalls the following:
Arthur Brisbane brought his statement to me at 1710 Broadway . . . I called Mr. Ford. I told him an “apology had been drawn up, and added, “It’s pretty bad, Mr. Ford.”

“I don’t care how bad it is, you just settle the thing up.”

I tried to read the statement him over the phone, but he stopped me, saying again, “I don’t care how bad it is, you just settle it up.” And he added, “The worse they make it, the better.”

So . . . I signed Mr. Ford’s signature to the document. (1951, p. 57)

Bennett’s involvement in the apology is now common knowledge for any person willing to do research on the subject.

Ford’s decision to apologize to the Jews was amounted to nothing more than a shrewd business move. Ford settled out of court with Sapiro for an undisclosed sum of money, and paid his legal expenses as well. The anti-Semitic articles from the Dearborn Independent stopped. Furthermore, Ford eventually began advertising in Jewish periodicals.

Regardless of Ford’s non-involvement with the apology, does a statement with his name attached disqualify him as not having “the will to fight things out to a finish?” This essay argues again that, no, it does not. Lewis (1976) states, “Nobody but Mr. Ford . . . could be ignorant of a major policy of his own newspaper,” and “Nobody but Mr. Ford could be unaware of the national and international repercussions of this policy of anti-Semitism” (pp. 146-7). Nobody, including and especially Ford was ignorant of the content of the Dearborn Independent. The anti-Semitic articles had run their course. The world in which Ford operated would no longer support, or even tolerate his “crusade.”
His decision to stop was based more on realism than a decision to back down. Ford's militancy remained strong through the entire campaign. The sheer length of the Dearborn Independent's run should be measure of Ford's willingness to fight to the finish, and not "his" inevitable "apology".

Henry Ford was an excellent example of a militant leader, as identified by both Hofstadter and Smith. Though, not entirely provable, this essay argues that Ford continuously thought of the enemy "being totally evil and totally unappeasable." In 1914, Ford sought to eliminate the enemy "from the theater of operations to which [he] [directed] his attention." The moral regulations he proposed were forced upon his workers. In essence, a worker had to live a life of thrift and sobriety—or starve. The Social Department made sure of this behavior through the use of demeaning interviews and follow up visits. Eventually, though, Ford's competitors caught up with him financially, and even surpassed him in their ability to deal with, and pay their employees. However, while he could, Ford attempted to shape human beings in his own image. The eventual demise of the Social Department, and the 1927 publication of the "apology" were in no way indicative of Ford's not willing to fight to the finish; for he did. He kept up his campaign possibly longer than any other American could have.

In regards to Hitler, if Ford did indeed contribute to the Nazi Party (this essay contends that he did), then the question of just what "finish" was Ford fighting for has to be raised again. As previously stated, the Nazi Party was not illegal during the 1920s. This essay argues that Ford did have another agenda, one which involved taking on the worldwide Jewish conspiracy—not just at home, but abroad as well. His contributions,
while possibly done in secret, only add to the fact that Ford had the will to fight to the finish—the finish possibly being the elimination of the enemy from the global theater.
CHAPTER 5

"A POWERFUL ENEMY"

"In those [early] days [of our movement] I read the Protocols of the Elders of Zion—I was really shocked" [said Hitler]. "The perilous stealth of the enemy, and his omnipresence. I saw at once that we would have to imitate this—in our own way of course... ."

"Don't you think," I objected, "that you are overestimating the Jews?"

"No, no, no!" Hitler screamed. "It is not possible to exaggerate the Jew as an enemy."

—Levy, 1995

According to Smith (1977), a major point in Hofstadter’s “paranoid” hypothesis observes that “‘The enemy is clearly delineated; he is a perfect model of malice, a kind of amoral superman’” (p. 275). Discussing the “powerfulness” of the Jew as an enemy, though, is paradoxical in nature. For, as stated before, the paranoid is only paranoid to the extent that the conspiracy toward which s/he directs his/her energy toward does not in fact exist (Smith, 1977). Therefore, this chapter will not address the actual powerfulness of the Jew, for the enemy is not actually tangible. Rather, through a closer look at Hofstadter’s notion of the political “paranoid,” this chapter will examine how the Jewish myth was perceived by Ford. Furthermore, this chapter will pay special attention to the seductive nature of the enemy, as well as the “Jewish Press.” Lastly, the anti-Semitism propagated by Ford will be shown to be born not only from hatred, but also from fear.

Hofstadter (1966) notes that the enemy toward whom the “paranoid” directs his/her attention will have defining traits. As will be shown in this chapter, the Jew (as perceived
Hofstadter (1966) notes that the enemy toward whom the “paranoid” directs his/her attention will have defining traits. As will be shown in this chapter, the Jew (as perceived by Ford), could be considered a model for Hofstadter’s observations. Anti-Semitism, possibly the world’s oldest form of racism, is unique. It is unique in the fact that the Jews are not a race. This essay acknowledges that throughout history, the Jews have been perceived as being a race. However, such perception has never been proven. On pondering this “question,” Montagu (1997), in her book *Man’s most dangerous myth: the fallacy of race*, concludes the following:

[The] Jews are not and never been a race or ethnic group, but that they are and always have been people of either Jewish faith or culture of both, widely dispersed among the nations of the earth and from the genetic point of view Jews are probably the most diverse of all known peoples. (pp. 434-5)

As evidenced by the *Dearborn Independent*, it was the Jews who were singled out for persecution by Ford. Yet, if Judaism does not constitute a race in and of itself, why did Ford and others (e.g. Hitler) devote so much energy in singling out this “race” for persecution? Montagu (1997) notes, “The belief in race, as in Nazi Germany, became a secular religion whose myths created reality,” and that “The power of myths and their related ideologies lies not in their objective truth, but in their being perceived as true” (p. 43). And what Ford observed as being true was not only contradictory to his lifestyle; it threatened it as well.

Hofstadter, in discussing the “superman” type of qualities of the enemy, first notes that such an enemy is usually “sinister, ubiquitous, powerful, cruel, sensual, [and] luxury loving” (1966, p. 32). These “paranoid” attributes were directly addressed in Ford’s
publications. The tenth, eleventh, and twelfth chapters of the *International Jew*, titled in their respective order are as follows: 10) “Jewish supremacy in the theatre and cinema;” 11) “Jewish jazz becomes our national music;” and 12) “Liquor, gambling, vice and corruption.” The following will examine these three chapters as they relate to the sensual and luxury loving characteristics of the “enemy.”

The *International Jew* traces the demise of the theatre (the Gentile theatre) back to 1885. The change can be observed in the following:

Down to 1885 the American Theater was still in the hands of the Gentiles; from that year dates the first invasion of Jewish influence. This date almost coincides with the beginnings of the organization and co-ordination of the Jewish world scheme for domination called Zionism, and this year marks not only the beginning of the Jewish wedge of control, but something far more important. (1929, pp. 146-7)

And it was the decline of art and morals in the theater that became “more important.” Art was noted as giving way to profit. The *International Jew* lays claim to the fact that the Jew, sensing large profits in the box office, created a demand for a product that they could not possibly fulfill—honorably at least. They did this by “taking over” the booking agencies, creating a “Jewish Theater Trust.” In reality, it was members of the Jewish community who helped to update an antiquated system of bookings, eliminating costly and frequent correspondence that resulted in theater managers spending large amounts of time in New York to plan seasonal schedules. The new “Theatrical Trust,” run by Klaw & Erlanger, allowed booking agents to “flood” the industry with as many motion pictures as demand dictated. At the time of this “Trust” being initiated, the box-office was evolving from novelty to a passion of the American public. Hence, the only way that the
enemy could fulfill such demand was to offer cheap entertainment that catered to the salacious appetites of the masses. The International Jew "[traced] the ‘psychic poison and visual filth’ to the subversive plot sketched in the Protocols" (Ribuffo, 1992, p. 84). Ford’s disdain for the motion picture industry was not absolute, though. Interestingly enough and with a touch of irony, Ford believed that “some Christian directors like D.W. Griffith still filled the screen with ‘delight and joy’" (Ribuffo, 1992, p. 84). But for the most part, “frivolity, sensuality, indecency, appalling illiteracy and endless platitude are the marks of the degenerate American Theater under Jewish Control” (The International Jew, 1929, p. 148).

Directly following the attack on the Jewish Cinema came the attack on Jewish music. More specifically, Jazz music was singled out as being a Jewish invention. The International Jew not only claims that Jazz is of Jewish origin, but “popular music is a Jewish monopoly,” and “the mush, slush, the sly suggestion, the abandoned sensuousness of sliding notes, are of Jewish origin” (1929, p. 163). The International Jew places special emphasis throughout its attack on Jazz, as well as the theater, contributing these Jewish attributes to the deterioration of the American moral fiber.

Not only is Jewish Jazz, or “popular music” as it was termed, indicative of a “sensual” enemy, the music was described as being decidedly “sinister” in nature as well. The International Jew, however, does not place the blame for the demise of society on the “people.” For according to Ford’s publication, it emphasizes that “it would be stupid to attack the addicts; common sense would urge the exposure of the panderers” (1929, p. 170). This pandering, Jewish Jazz, is labeled by the International Jew as being nothing
more than “monkey talk, jungle squeals, grunts and squeaks and gasps suggestive of calf love . . .” (1929, p. 163).

The next chapter of the *International Jew* to be examined in order to illustrate the sensual, and luxury loving enemy is chapter twelve, devoted to and titled, “Liquor, gambling, vice and corruption.” This chapter is prefaced with an excerpt from the Thirteenth Protocol. It states: “to prevent them from really thinking out anything themselves, we shall deflect their attention to amusements, games, pastimes, excitements and people’s palaces” (*International Jew*, 1929, p. 174). Perhaps, more than anything else, Ford considered liquor, gambling, vice and corruption to be a personal affront to his way of life. Ford believed stringently in thrift and sobriety. As evidenced by the creation of the Sociological Department, he valued these characteristics above all else in his workers. He theorized that a sober and thrifty worker would prove to be a more efficient worker on the assembly line.

Almost nowhere else does the hatred (and as this essay will claim—fear) of the Jew come to the surface as it does in chapter twelve. From the beginning of the chapter, the *International Jew* attempts to expand on the differences between the Jew and the Gentile. The Jew, while being acknowledged as having a gift for business and trade, is shown to have an aversion to actual work. Whereas, “the Gentile boy is prepared to work his way up, taking employment in the productive or technical departments,” the Jew “prefers to begin as a salesman, clerk, anything so long as it is connected with the commercial side of the business.” (1929, p. 175). It is this “commercial side of business” that becomes the focal point of the attacks that follow.
Ford portrayed the Jew as being the “steadiest drinker of all” (p. 176). During the times of prohibition, which Ford staunchly supported, the Jew was allowed (because of religious traditions) to possess, acquire, or drink up to ten gallons of liquor a year (International Jew, 1929). Through this ten-gallon loophole, the Jew was supposedly able to operate the majority of bootlegging operations. The International Jew claimed that “prohibition came sweeping the saloon away, but not depriving the Jewish compounder of his profits. Prohibition was swept away, but the booze rackets remained” (1929, p. 179). This type of racketeering, as shown by Ford, was indicative of the Jewish adeptness at making money from other people. Ford even took his attack one step further, blaming the Jew for the introduction of “nigger gin” to the streets of America. The International Jew cites this drink as being “a peculiarly vile beverage which was compounded to act upon the Negro in a most vicious manner” (1929, p. 179).

Furthermore, the bottles were “decorated with highly indecent portraiture of white women” (International Jew, 1929, p. 180). According to Ford, everything was a plot designed by a clever enemy to destroy the moral fiber of America. Just how strongly he thought about this matter can be evidenced in the following:

There is not a dialogue on the stage or screen that does not drip of drink patter. The idea of the abuse of drink will be maintained by means of the Jewish stage, Jewish Jazz and Jewish comics, until somebody comes down hard upon it as being incentive of treason. (International Jew, 1929, p. 181)

A brief mention of baseball and wrestling in the end of the twelfth chapter (under the heading of corruption) is instrumental in showing the “ubiquitous” nature of the enemy. The chapter states clearly that there are other matters which deserve the attention of the
International Jew. However, the attention was indeed warranted because the corruption of baseball in the early 1900s served to show the omnipresence of the Jew as an enemy. Stated is the fact that “it is possible to see the operation of the Jewish Idea in baseball as clearly as in any other field . . . the process is the same, whether in war or politics, in finance or sports” (1929, p. 181). And, “If ‘fans’ wish to know the trouble with American baseball, they have it in three words—too much Jew” (p. 183).

Henry Ford and the International Jew meticulously paint a sordid picture of the Jew in the chapters discussed above. In relation to Hofstadter, the Jew (as depicted by Ford), was indeed portrayed as being “sinister, ubiquitous, powerful, cruel, sensual, [and] luxury loving” (1966, p. 32). Furthermore, these characteristics of the perceived enemy were used to illustrate a direct attack on the moral fiber of America. This essay argues that, perhaps, this aspect, more than any other shown to be possessed by the Jew, bothered Ford the most.

While vices and the Jew’s ability to seduce mainstream America were always at the forefront of Ford’s attacks, there were other aspects of the International Jew that exhibited an exceptional disdain for the enemy. Other specific attacks deal sharply with the media, claiming the press to be Jewish owned and influenced. Hofstadter (1966), in describing an important characteristic of the enemy, states that “very often the enemy is held to possess some especially effective source of power: he controls the press; he directs the public mind through ‘managed news’ . . . he is gaining a stranglehold on the educational system” (p. 32). Not only is the myth that the Jew controls the media an old one, it is one that still persists to this day. Without doubt, the “special power” that Ford claimed that his enemy possessed was indeed the ability to control the press.
The fifteenth chapter of the *International Jew*, titled “The battle for press control,” addresses this power specifically. To begin with, the chapter is prefaced with an excerpt from the *Twelfth Protocol*. The passage claims the following:

We shall handle the Press in the following manner... we shall saddle it and keep tight reign upon it. We shall do the same also with other printed matter, for of what use is it to rid ourselves of attacks in the Press, if we remain exposed to criticism through pamphlets and books.... Not one announcement will reach the people save under our supervision.... Literature and journalism are two most important educational forces, and consequently our government will become the owner of most of the journals. (1929, p. 216)

Regardless of the debate surrounding Ford’s knowledge of his publication, its sheer existence is proof that he believed that the Jew controlled the press. This observation holds true even before the *Dearborn Independent* began printing its anti-Semitic attacks. For Ford created the publication precisely to avoid outside influence. The publication was entirely subsidized by the Ford Motor Company, not allowing any outside advertising. Outside advertising, which would have helped offset the loss of nearly $300,000 the first year, was not implemented until the very last days of the publication. As stated in Chapter 3, Ford was never actually interested in turning a profit with his publication. What he was interested in, this essay argues, is maintaining a periodical that was free from outside influence, the influence of the Jew.

The above mentioned claim is not baseless. The chapter dealing with “The battle for press control” cites the 1919 struggle of the *New York Herald* as precedent. The *New York Herald*, a popular newspaper New York City, was shown by the *International Jew*
to be a microcosm of the world's troubles with the Jew. The publication ran for nearly ninety years, ending with the death of its proprietor, James Gordon Bennett. Bennett, who the *International Jew* cites as being "a great American citizen famed for many helpful activities, had always maintained a friendly attitude toward the Jews of the city" (1929, p. 218-9). The *International Jew* claimed that Bennett's *Herald* enjoyed success over the years, due in part to its high prestige and desirability as an advertising medium due to the upstanding class of its circulation.

With the use of some generalities, though, the *International Jew* observes the *Herald's* downfall was due to the Jew. The generalities are used sparingly, and are seemingly anomalous when compared to most of the chapter. However, as always, the *International Jew* is specific when attaching blame. The *International Jew* claims that "most Jewish leaders are always interested in either getting a story published or getting it suppressed" (1929, p. 219). However, the *Herald*, which had been "performing great feats in the world of news gathering . . . [sending] Henry M. Stanley to Africa to find Livingston . . . [and] back[ing] the Jeanette expedition to the Arctic region," had, from the beginning, adopted a policy that would not let it be swayed from "from its duty as a public informant" (*International Jew*, p. 219). Trouble began for the *New York Herald*, according to the *International Jew*, as a direct result of the above mentioned policy, claiming that when scandal broke out amongst Jewish circles, they would use their influence to suppress such stories from coming to the surface. Such a stance against Jewish influence, the *International Jew* claimed, usually led to "the 'boycott' . . . [which was] the first answer of the Jews seem to think" (1929, p. 217). While the use of
generalities can be noticed in the above-mentioned claim, the accusations turn specific in the following.

The International Jew cited two such scandals that caused the Jewish community to boycott the New York Herald. The most notable one concerned a Jewish backed candidate for the mayor of New York. Again, according to the International Jew, the Jews believed that a candidate backed by the major department stores could not be refused by the local papers. So “[The Jews] drew up a ‘strictly confidential’ letter to which they sent to the owner of the New York newspapers, demanding support for the Jewish mayoralty candidate” (International Jew, 1929, p. 221). The newspapers were supposedly in a “quandary” until Bennett decided to go public with the letter: “It was printed in the Herald. The arrogance of the Jewish advertisers was exposed, and non-Jewish New York breathed easier and applauded the action” (International Jew, 1929, p. 221). The results were immediate; all Jewish advertising monies were withdrawn, “and now the combined and powerful elements of New York Jewry gathered to deal a staggering blow at Bennett. The Jewish policy of ‘Dominate or Destroy’ was at stake, and Jewry declared war” (International Jew, 1929, p. 222).

The International Jew claimed that the boycott of Jewish advertising in Bennett’s paper, which cost him nearly $600,000 a year, eventually backfired on the Jewish community. For the coveted advertising spots, once reserved by Jews, were now given by contract to non-Jewish enterprises, which were previously pushed into smaller spaces in the middle or back of the paper. The victory, however, was not complete. For the Jew, eventually, according to the International Jew, gained a stranglehold on the press—especially in New York. And “the trend toward Jewish control of the press set in
strongly, and has continued that way ever since. The old names, made great by editors and American policy, slowly dimmed” (1929, p. 224).

The case of Bennett’s Herald is provided to show the reader the importance that the International Jew placed upon the Jewish influence in the press. The International Jew claims that “the Herald is immortalized as the last bulwark against Jewry in New York, in America,” and “today the Jews are more completely master of the journalistic field.” (1929, p. 266). In summary, the International Jew states the following:

And this situation will remain until Americans shake their long sleep and look with steady eyes at the national situation. That look will be enough to show them all, and their very eyes will quail the oriental usurpers. (1929, p. 226)

Ribuffo (1997) notes that “the Independent singled out Jewish participation in any endeavor and concluded that they were acting as Jews” (p. 207). However, this essay argues that Ford paid special attention to the press, acknowledging that this (the press) was an area in which the enemy could direct the public through “managed news.” At the time that Ford was making these assumptions about the enemy, this observation was far from localized. Hitler loathed the Jewish influence of the media as well. Referring back to Hofstadter, who stated that the enemy “is gaining a stranglehold on the educational system” (1966, p. 32), the reader can begin to understand the “paranoid’s” animus toward the “Jewish Press.” Hitler observed that “it cannot be overestimated, for the press really continues education in adulthood” (1927/1971, p.240).

Hofstadter notes that “[the] enemy seems to be on many counts a projection of the self: both the ideal an unacceptable aspects of the self are attributed to him” (1966, p. 32). This essay argues that the “self,” as noted by Hofstadter, is not necessarily Ford himself.
Rather, the "self" can be seen as the American Gentile population. Ford, as evidenced by his rhetoric, was knowledgeable of American’s lust for sensuality and their weakness for vices. That is the unacceptable. The ideal is that the enemy, a people without a nation, are highly organized and efficient—the ideal that Ford had tried to attain. Hofstadter further notes that "a fundamental paradox of the paranoid style is the imitation of the enemy . . . the enemy, for example may be the cosmopolitan intellectual, but the paranoid will outdo him in the apparatus of scholarship, even of pedantry" (1966, p. 32). On this aspect, Ford fell short in his attempt to outdo his enemy in the "apparatus of scholarship," and especially pedantry. However, this observation is made with hindsight. For in retrospect, Ford not only tried to imitate the enemy, he tried to better them as well. This attempt at betterment can be observed, once again, in Ford’s willingness to keep his newspaper free from outside influence. What he was doing, though, was controlling the press himself, just the way his enemy supposedly was doing.

This chapter has argued that Ford did in fact perceive the enemy as being powerful. The enemy, the Jew, through “his” superior powers undertook a calculated campaign to destroy the moral fiber of the United States, as evidenced in the Protocols. Also, Ford did not disparage the Jew in the same way that minorities are usually disparaged in the normal context of racism. Instead of claiming that the Jew to be an inferior race, by the nature of Ford’s publication, he showed the Jew to be a superior race instead. And while Ford may have hated the Jew (as this essay argues), he respected the power associated with his enemy. This power which Ford perceived, though, came through fear—and it is this fear that can readily be observed in Ford’s rhetoric.
CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION

Henry Ford was a unique individual. There is no denying that conclusion. While a critic can observe him and his rhetoric using contemporary criteria, Ford was a man of the past. This distinction is important when trying to understand Ford and his long-running campaign of anti-Semitism. Hofstadter (1966) notes that there is a difference between the new and old right wing. The line of such distinction falls at the turn of the twentieth century. The new right wing, which Ford was not a part of, feels that their country, their America, has been taken away from them. They are determined to take it back (Hofstadter, 1966). The members of the old right wing, however, saw their country or world as a much different place. Hofstadter (1966) claims that these people, who lived and thrived at the turn of the century, believed that they “stood for causes and personal types that were still in possession of their country—that they were fending off threats to a still well-established way of life in which they played an important part” (p. 23). And as evidenced by the material covered in this study, there can be no doubt that Ford played (or thought he played) an important part in fending off the world’s evil—organized Jewry, or Zionism.

Aside from, and before Ford’s anti-Semitic campaign begun as the Dearborn Independent, Ford’s willingness to control and protect his environment is highly
documented. The two most notable occurrences can be seen in: 1) Ford’s peace mission, and; 2) the Sociological Department created as a byproduct of the “Five Dollar Day.”

The peace journey (supposedly a point in Ford’s life where evidence was presented to him that showed that Jewish bankers were financing the war), regardless of his increased popularity upon his return, was an utter failure. The world scoffed at the eccentric American industrialist and his effort to stop WWI. It is in understanding Ford’s personality that the reader is better able to understand the rhetoric that was later produced. Ford, regardless of his station in life, or perhaps because of it, was a lone man who believed that he could change the world for the better.

The value of examining the Sociological Department lies in the fact that the reader can begin to understand that Ford not only tried to control the events of the world, but he attempted to regulate the actions, values, and morals of individual people as well. Like the peace journey, the creation of the Sociological Department should be looked upon as a failure as well. This negative judgement is made even though on the surface the program seemed to be successful. The idea of doubling a worker’s wage from $2.34 an hour to five dollars a day may have forced workers to straighten up for the interviews of the Sociological Department. However, absolute regulation of an individual’s morals is virtually impossible. By the time Ford had purchased the Dearborn Independent, nearly six years had passed since the inception of the Sociological Department. Ford’s competitors had passed the Ford Motor Company in their daily wages. Any attempt to control the lifestyle of the Ford workers, steering them toward a path of thrift and sobriety, was no longer plausible.
Ford was a perfectionist, or at least he tried to be. And while he might have achieved his goals on the assembly line, the world was faltering around him. His attempts at control were failing as well. Hofstadter (1966) notes that “this demand for unqualified victories leads to the formulation of hopelessly demanding and unrealistic goals, and since these goals are not even remotely attainable, failure constantly heightens the paranoid’s frustration” (p. 31). This frustration that Ford felt as a “paranoid” (which will be examined further in the conclusion) can be looked upon as caustic for the creation of the Dearborn Independent.

As mentioned before, the Dearborn Independent should be looked upon as the longest running anti-Semitic attack in the history of America, if not the world. When looked at in summary, according to Ribuffo (1997), the ideas stated in the Dearborn Independent can be divided into four sections, or themes. First, the Dearborn Independent “complained that both monopolistic activities of large corporations and the countervailing actions of government had produced a ‘steady curtailment’ of freedom” (Ribuffo, 1997, p. 205).

Second, the Dearborn Independent joined the search for moral strengthening that increased after WWI. The newspaper attacked and condemned new styles in dress, changing sexual values, “Hollywood ‘lasciviousness’ and the ‘filthy tide’ sweeping over the theater” (Ribuffo, 1997, p. 205). Furthermore, the Dearborn Independent, regarding the perceived decline of family values, warned that America’s youth was being drawn away from leadership found in organizations such as church and school and pushed into areas predetermined by organized Jewry for recreation (Ribuffo, 1997).
Third, Ford’s publication took notice of the huge stream of immigrants that had begun to flood America, especially in New York City (Ribuffo, 1997). This theme is best expressed in the following passage of the *International Jew*:

New York is the greatest center of Jewish population in the world. It is the gateway where the bulk of American imports and exports are taxed, and where practically all the business done in America pays tribute to the master of money. The very land of the city is the holdings of the Jews. (1925, p. 15)

Fourth, the *Dearborn Independent* worried about the interpretation of the truth in the modern world (Ribuffo, 1997). Irony exists in this statement and can be observed in the following passage by Ribuffo:

The *International Jew* protested that man was ruled “by a whole company of ideas into whose authority he has not inquired at all.” Not only did he live by the “say of others,” but “terrific social pressures” on behalf of “broadmindedness” discourages probes beneath conventional wisdom. (1997, p. 205)

The irony of this statement lies in the fact that Ford, being omnipresent as he was, discouraged his workers from "inquiring" about the validity of his arguments. This type of discouragement was achieved indirectly through the use of “terrific social pressures,” which he exerted over those in his employ.

The four themes mentioned above provide an adequate summary of the original ideas and intentions of the *Dearborn Independent*. However, before concluding this study, one last issue should be discussed. This point being that when the articles in the *Dearborn Independent* were collected and reprinted as the *International Jew*, the implications of the rhetoric changed. The collected volumes were translated and distributed across the globe.
And while Ford eventually asked for the publications to stop and his name removed, his request, made under pressure from the Jewish Community, had all the sincerity of his apology. Ford’s rhetoric related to, and played upon the world’s fear of a Jewish plot to dominate and destroy a well-established way of life. The four themes mentioned in this discussion applied not only to the America that Ford believed in, even though America was perhaps more questioning than other areas of the world as evidenced in Europe, where Ford’s inquiry into the “Jewish Question” found a more accepting audience. Aside from being distributed to a variety of countries overseas, Hitler, already indoctrinated with the Protocols, seized upon Ford’s rhetoric and applied it to his own situation. Furthermore, the International Jew, as previously mentioned, was distributed to not only the Nazi Party, but to the Nazi Youth as well. Ford’s rhetoric did have an impact in America. Of that there can be no doubt. However, the effect produced by selling subscriptions at Ford dealerships cannot compare with the effect that it had in Europe.

Limitations

The author of this study believes that the subject of the limitations involved has to be addressed. The subject of Ford’s anti-Semitism, while not exactly taboo in nature, has been conveniently forgotten by many. Even the Ford Motor Company has chosen to “forget” the colorful past of its founder. In February 1997, the Ford Motor Company made history by sponsoring a commercial-free broadcasting of Steven Spielberg’s “Schindler’s List.” This airing produced some interesting responses from the Ford Motor Company when confronted about its motives. Virtual Jerusalem observes the following:
Questioned on this aspect of the company’s history, Gerry Donnelly, communications and advertising director for the Ford Division, denied that the founder’s sins had influenced the decision to sponsor the Holocaust film.

“Many of our people were involved in this project, and no one ever mentioned Henry Ford,” said Donnelly. “I think quite a few are not even aware of this background.” (Tugend, 1997, p. 1)

While the believability of such a statement should be questioned, it is valuable for sensing the difficulties that have arisen in this project.

The first of such difficulties to be addressed is the problem of acquiring the necessary artifacts to complete such a study such as this one. Without the benefit of being able to go to the Ford archives in Michigan, secondary documents were used. And even these were difficult to come across. Actual issues of the Dearborn Independent could not be obtained for this study. Rather, two copies of the International Jew were used as reference. Furthermore, The International Jew, The World’s Foremost Problem is only the first of four volumes published, and was the only one available for this study. Abridged versions of the four-volume set were and are available for sale on a variety of White Power Internet cites. However, with no frame of reference to test the accuracy of their text, none were used for research. While once available at most libraries in the country, Ford’s rhetoric, while still existing, is to say the least—difficult to come by.

The next limitation, one perhaps more difficult to deal with than the availability of texts is one that is not necessarily unique to this study. Much is written about the life of Henry Ford. However much of the information written is from the author’s point of view. This means that the material available on Ford’s life has much of the “love ‘em or
hate "em" aura about it. Some texts, while having to acknowledge the existence of the 
*Dearborn Independent*, give only passing mention, and support the notion of Ford being 
ignorant in regards to the publication's content. On the other side, the same problem 
exists. Some material available exists only to disparage Ford. As mentioned this 
problem is not unique and can be observed in other areas of history. For some reason, 
though, this polarization of opinions comes to the forefront more when issues of race are 
involved. Because of which, this study, while trying to remain objective as possible, 
sometimes relied upon inferences that were drawn from conflicting sources. These 
inferences were not drawn lightly, though. Any observations made in this essay were 
done with the utmost consideration, and with as much documentation as possible. This 
author takes full responsibility for any errors, factual, or judgmental that might be found 
to exist in this study.

**Conclusion**

Pre-Holocaust, Burke (1967) observed that "our anti-Hitler Battle, is to find all 
available ways of making the Hitlerite distortions of religion apparent, in order that 
politicians of this kind in America be unable to perform a similar swindle" (p. 219). 
Hitler was not the only one who performed such a "swindle," though. Ford, a politician 
of that kind, executed the longest running anti-Semitic campaign in history. This study 
has not looked into much of the "how" as Burke did with Hitler, but focused more on the 
"why." The "how" is a basic question to answer. Quite simply, Ford had the money and 
the power to act as he pleased. However, the question of "why" is a largely more 
complex issue.
This study has utilized a combination of Smith (1977) and Hofstadter (1966), for the most part, in order to get at and understand the “why.” While Hofstadter originally laid the groundwork for examining the political “paranoid”, it was Smith who was one of the first who used the material in Hofstadter’s “Paranoid style in American politics” to formulate a four point model for analysis. While Smith originally used the methodology to discuss the nature of evidence in paranoid discourse, this study used the model to examine Ford, the “paranoid”, and his rhetoric.

The examination, or methodology used in four parts as identified in the following: 1) “A vast and sinister conspiracy,” 2) “All out crusade,” 3) “Militant leader,” and 4) “A powerful enemy.” Overall, this methodology proved to be especially relevant to the subject matter. Furthermore, the methodology proved highly useful in understanding why Ford created the Dearborn Independent, and why the material quickly turned against the Jewish population. The insight gained from the application of the methodology has hopefully provided the reader a new perspective into the life and rhetoric of Henry Ford.

The rhetoric created by Ford was, in part, a conspiratorial response to the Protocols as Hsian observed in 1997. However, the Dearborn Independent began printing anti-Semitic articles even before coming into contact with the Russian forgery. Something else, though, had spawned Ford’s animus toward the Jewish population. Hsian (1997) observes that “The Protocols was a key text . . . because it seemed to be a portentous document that provided some of the final warnings to an already embattled people” (p. 196). The value of Hsian’s statement, in regards to this study, lies in the identification of an “already embattled people.” This classification, this thesis argues, can be used synonymously with the identification of “frustration” as observed by Hofstadter as being
a characteristic of a "paranoid". For Ford, as a "paranoid", lived in the paradox of a conspiracy. This previously identified paradox stems from the fact that a conspiracy is only a conspiracy to the extent that threats against the "paranoid" do not in fact exist (Hofstadter, 1966). And this paradox leads a person, or persons to become "embattled," or "frustrated."

The last argument that this study will make is that Ford, a member of the old right wing was indeed a severely frustrated person. And the rhetoric produced was as much a product of such frustration as it was a conspiratorial response to the Protocols, as observed by Hasian (1997).

How can this thesis and these observations lend themselves to further studies? First, when dealing with topics of race, the critic will always face a difficult task. Through the use of Smith and Hofstadter, an examiner has before him/her a tool for a thorough examination that will hopefully produce an as objective study as possible. There are many political figures, or "paranoids" that, upon examination, a critic could produce a valuable study. George Wallace, Louis Farrakhan, and George Lincoln Rockwell are but a few. As Burke (1967) said, there are other ways of "burning books on the pyre" (p. 191) than just labeling such figures as racists. This thesis, while acknowledging Ford's racism, attempted not to fault him for it. Through examining high profile figures connected with racism, using Smith and Hofstadter, a critic can hopefully shed light on the circumstances that produced such volatile actions and rhetoric.

Secondly, for further study, a critic could utilize the subject of frustration as a key element in his/her study. If a "paranoid's" rhetoric, regardless of his/her association with the new or old right wing, or radical left for that matter, could be shown to be a response
not solely to conspiracy, but more to frustration (which breeds conspiracy), then a wealth of valuable studies could be produced.

On Confederate Memorial Day 1913, a thirteen-year old girl, Mary Phagan, was killed in an empty factory in Atlanta Georgia. On August 19, 1915 a man imprisoned for the crime, Leo Frank (a Jew) was dragged from prison and lynched by a vigilante mob. The town felt it necessary to pin the murder on a New York Jew. An estimated six million Jews perished during the Holocaust. Anti-Semitism, the world’s oldest form of racism has had devastating impacts on a multitude of societies. To place culpability on Ford for any such hardships was not the purpose of this study. In all honesty, the effect that Ford’s rhetoric has had upon the world may never be fully realized, even though some possible implications have been addressed in this thesis. Racism and distrust continually manifest themselves in a variety of ways. Any insight into the reasons why will always be useful. Hart (1971) states that “the doctrinaire, who has been with us for so long under so many different guises deserves renewed study. His prevalence alone demands such attention” (p. 261). And this study, hopefully, has proved itself useful in this regard.
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