WEAKENING U. S. NOT ANARCHY, FORD INSISTS

Still Regards Advocates of Bigger War Forces as Murderers.

BOMBERS ONLY "EXCITED"

Mexican Troubles of 1916 Riots, Not a Condition of Anarchy.

Special Despatch to THE SUN.

MOUNT CLEMENS, Mich., July 21.—Henry Ford resumed the stand at noon to-day in his suit against the Chicago *Tribune* to meet a heavy assault of questions from Elliott G. Stevenson, opposing counsel, who sought to lead the manufacturer into admissions that the very things he complained were damaging to his reputation were in fact anarchistic and therefore justified the publication of the editorial for which he desires $1,000,000. The earlier part of the morning was taken up with legal arguments, during which the court warned the attorneys that the jurors are fretting under the length of the case and want to get back to their farms.

Mr. Stevenson conducted a verbal duel with the witness, with Alfred Lucking and Alfred J. Murphy, the plaintiff's counsel, interjecting frequent objections. Mr. Ford did not answer questions as freely as he did last week. Questioned whether he thought conditions in Mexico and in Texas in 1916 constituted anarchy, he declined to answer directly and insisted that he did not understand some of the questions.

"I suppose you would say that any one who countenanced anarchy is an anarchist?" said Mr. Stevenson confidently.

Mr. Ford refused to admit it.

Asked whether he could tell the difference between "trouble on the American side" and anarchy, the witness said he could not tell.

"What would be anarchy?" asked the attorney.

Bomb Throwing Anarchy.

"One who throws bombs is an anarchist."

"The men who threw bombs at the preparedness parade were anarchists, weren't they?"

"I don't know whether they tried to overthrow the Government. They may have been excited."

"Wasn't that the purpose of your propaganda, to get men excited against the men who were for preparedness?"

Mr. Ford was not sure of the meaning of the question, but finally answered that he was trying to get people to think.

Question. You have given us, Mr. Ford, your definition of anarchy as I understand you?

A. Yes.

Q. And that was that an anrchist was a bomb thrower or some one who wanted to overthrow the Government.

A. Yes.

Q. I suppose you recognize, Mr. Ford, that in Mexico, in 1916, the spring of 1916, there was anarchy, did not you; no Government that was effective to protect the interests of the people?

A. There was trouble.

Q. You have told us about that, but that doesn't answer my question.

A. I don't know whether it was anarchy or not.

Q. There was disorder, and no Government, wasn't it so?

Didn't Know of Government.

A. I don't know whether there was any Government or not.

Q. You knew that there were contending factions down there quarreling and fighting for several years?

A. Yes.

Q. And that they had driven out all of the peaceable people there were there, who had been driven out for fear that they would be killed; that was true, wasn't it?

A. I didn't know that.

Q. I understood you to say the other day that you did recollect that?

A. No, there may have been some, yes.

Q. Didn't you know that Mr. Bryan warned the American citizens in Mexico to come out of there; that there was danger that they would be killed?

A. I don't remember, Mr. Stevenson.

Q. You don't remember that? Well, I suppose you would say that a man who undertook to continue or maintain anarchy would be an anarchist, wouldn't you?

A. Yes.

Q. You would recognize, wouldn't you, that there was anarchy on the American side of the border before the National Guard went down there, wouldn't you?

A. There was a condition of trouble, certainly.

Q. Don't you recognize that as anarchy?

A. I don't know whether it was anarchy or not. It was trouble of some kind.

Q. What is the difference, in your mind, between the troubles that you speak of and the anarchy that I am referring to?

Doesn't Know Difference.

A. I don't know what the difference is.

Q. You don't know what the difference is? Do you mean to convey the idea that you do not recognize that, when hundreds of miles of border, extending back as far as seventy-five miles in some places, where these raids went, the people were being terrorized and murdered and their property destroyed and burned, there was not a condition of anarchy?

A. Condition of troubles. I don't know whether it was a condition of anarchy.

Q. I ask you what is the difference in your mind between the condition of trouble that you refer to and the condition of anarchy? What would be anarchy according to your mind if that was not anarchy?

A. I don't know. I am sure. Trouble. Invasion of some kind.

Q. Haven't you any idea of what anarchy is?

A. I kind of have the idea that an anarchist is one who throws bombs and—against the Government.

Q. An anarchist who throws bombs throws them to murder somebody?

A. Yes, sir.

Anarchist a Murderer.

Q. So that an anarchist is a murderer?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. He is the same thing as a professional soldier, isn't he?

A. I don't know, I am sure.

Q. How would you distinguish? You have stated that a professional soldier was a murderer. Now you say a bomb thrower, or an anarchist, is a murderer. What is the difference?

A. I don't quite understand just so that I can explain it thoroughly.

Q. You have stated, as I understand you, Mr. Ford, that an anarchist was a bomb thrower who threw bombs to murder somebody. Is that right?

A. That is one thing; yes, sir.

Q. You said a professional soldier was a murderer.

Judge Murphy—If your honor please, he does not include in the question the entire understanding of the witness as to what an anarchist is. This question does not include the entire answer; not merely throwing bombs, but the overthrowing of Government.

Mr. Stevenson—If your Honor please, are these suggestions to be permitted to the witness?

The Court—I hardly feel competent to stop all speechmaking, and hardly would, unless I had an axe or something, Mr. Stevenson.

Q. Your idea of an anarchist, you have said now, was that he threw bombs, or undertook to overturn the Government—overthrow the Government—was that what you said?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I suppose now a man who would do either would be an anarchist, wouldn't he?

A. A man that would do anything against any law and order is an anarchist.

Q. Do you mean a man who would overthrow Government or who would throw bombs to kill a man is not an anarchist, according to your idea?

Might Not Be Anarchist.

A. He might not be an anarchist.

Q. The man or men who threw the bombs at the preparedness parade and killed a good many and wounded a great many more, there was nothing about overthrowing government in connection with that, was there?

A. Well, I don't know whether they were anarchists or not.

Q. Haven't you heard your counsel say that those men were murderers as you have—?

Judge Murphy—That is objected to as immaterial.

Q. You don't know whether those were anarchists who killed these men with bombs or not?

A. I don't know.

Q. You would not call them anarchists?

A. I don't know whether they were or not.

Q. What is there lacking in your mind—they threw the bombs and killed the people—what is lacking in that?

A. They may not have been overthrowing the Government; they may have been excited or cranks.

Q. Were not they excited by the propaganda that you and others like you have circulated?

Judge Murphy—Now, your Honor, that seems to me as wholly incompetent, and—

The Court—How could he state what they were excited about?

Propaganda to Excite.

Q. Wasn't that the purpose of your propaganda, to excite people against people who were advocating preparedness?

A. Cause people to think and open their eyes.

Q. Was not the purpose of your propaganda to incite people against those who were advocating preparedness?

A. Educate people and cause them to think.

Q. Do you think it was necessary to call them "murderers" to cause them to think?

A. I don't think I called anybody "murderer."

Q. Didn't you call people who were advocating preparedness "murderers"?

A. People who were advocating over preparedness.

Q. Yes, over preparedness, were murderers?

A. Preparedness for aggression.

Q. People, that, according to your definition, were for preparedness for aggression, you characterized as murderers?

A. We felt as though we had a right to take sides.

Q. You characterized them as murderers, didn't you?

Had Right to Take Sides.

A. No, I had a right to choose sides against over preparedness.

Q. And you chose sides against over-preparedness by calling the people who were for preparedness or for over preparedness "murderers" and promoters of murder, didn't you?

Mr. Lucking—I object to that because he is saying something which is not true. There never was any such thing said, and counsel cannot produce any such statement in the record, nor from anything which was published.

Q. Did you hear what Mr. Lucking said?

A. I did not pay much attention to it. (Question read by the stenographer as follows: "And you chose sides against over-preparedness by calling the people who were for preparedness or for over-preparedness 'murderers and promoters of murder,'" didn't you?)

Mr. Delavigne put it in the book; I did not say it; I said I was responsible for it.

Q. Then what you mean is that you are responsible for the public being informed that according to your views the men who advocated what you call over-preparedness were murderers and promoters of murder?

A. It was in the book, and I will have to stand for it.

Q. That is what you understood the people would understand your views were, wasn't it?

A. Yes.

Q. That the men who advocated over-preparedness, as you have defined it, were murderers and promoters of murder?

He Avoided Personalities.

A. I never referred to any personality of any kind.

Q. Just a few moments ago you said that Mr. Delavigne put it in the book that they were murderers and promoters of murder.

Alfred Lucking—I submit that that book should be produced, your Honor. We have never seen it yet, or any such statement in Mr. Delavigne's book.

Mr. Stevenson: The witness said a moment ago that he did, and the witness is now being instructed to say that he did not. I say it is entirely and perfectly outrageous to have this sort of suggestion to the witness.

Judge Murphy: I say that the witness said "if it was in the book," he was responsible for it.

The Witness: That is what I did say—that is what I intended to say.

Q. Now, then, do you want to change that, Mr. Ford?

A. No, I don't want to. Of course I am posted now; I don't know whether it was in the book or not.

Q. Do you want to change from what you have already said on that subject, Mr. Ford?

A. I don't want to change anything that is there.

Q. If you don't want to, I don't want to. We will leave what you said on the record then.

A. I cannot change it.

Q. I call your attention expressly, Mr. Ford—you regarded men who were for overpreparedness as advocating promotion of murder?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you want to change that testimony?

A. I cannot change it if it is there; I was against the system for war.

Q. You called Mr. Joy an apostle of murder, didn't you?

Admits Responsibility.

A. I didn't: I did not do it, but I am responsible for it.

Q. And you called him a brief holder of murder, didn't you?

A. It is in the book; it is not my language.

Q. These were in your name and not in Delavigne's?

A. Yes.

Q. And therefore they were going out to the country as your views and not Delavigne's?

A. They were going out against war and overpreparedness; for the sole purpose of educating and causing people to think. I knew that.

Q. You knew that they were going out as your views and not Delavigne's?

A. Yes.

Q. Although you now say Mr. Delavigne put it in that language?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, going back to the question that we were referring to, you don't seem to be very clear what a condition of anarchy would be, do you, Mr. Ford?

A. War, I guess, is a condition of anarchy, as much as anything.

Q. War is a condition of anarchy?

A. Yes.

Q. Anybody who was in favor of war would be an anarchist?

A. Not in favor of war.

Q. Isn't any one who is in favor of anarchy an anarchist?

A. I was in favor of war when we got into it.

Q. Do you question that a man who is in favor of anarchy is not an anarchist?

A. He might not be.

Q. Can you suggest how anybody who is in favor of anarchy might not be an anarchist?

A. I don't know. I cannot suggest anything.

Q. You cannot tell?

A. Maybe in favor of some phase of it.

Q. What phrase?

A. Might be in favor of some of it.

Q. You would not recognize that a man who was in favor of a continuation of anarchy would be an anarchist, do you?

A. I don't know, I am sure.

Q. Mr. Ford, the issue in this case, as we understand it, is simply this: That there was in Mexico and in Texas, along the Mexican border, a condition of anarchy.

A. I don't know whether it was or not.

Q. That was our contention.

A. It was not war.

Q. What was it?

A. I called it riots the other day, and you said aggression of some kind.

Q. What do you mean by a riot?

A. Some one hired to attack somebody else perhaps.

Q. You understood that bandits from Mexico were crossing into the American territory and killing our people, didn't you?

A. I read something about it.

Q. You told us repeatedly that you understood that was the condition down there in 1916, at the very time you were putting out these advertisements.

A. I understood it from the papers.

Q. You were advertising it for the purpose of preventing the Government from getting forces to go down there and quell that trouble or riot, or whatever it was?

A. A great many people thought that we had plenty of protection.

Q. I call your attention to the fact that the President said he did not have troops enough to patrol the border, let alone defend it.

Congress Divided, He Says.

A. Lots of people thought that we had, and Congress was divided about it.

Q. Tell me the name of a single Congressman?

A. I cannot; no.

Q. Tell me the name of a single man outside of Congress who said the President was talking fiction?

A. I do not know any.

Q. Now, going back to the advertisement in which Delavigne said the President's statements were fiction and were not true; that is a fact, isn't it.

A. That the President's statements were just fiction?

Q. Yes, the President's statements; you said here that the President's statement was just fiction, these stories; don't you recall that?

A. No.

(Here Stevenson refreshed Ford's recollection by reading portions of the preparedness advertisements).

Q. Now, you recollect that talk about fiction was right, don't you?

A. I think the President himself said that.

Q. Just a moment. The question is, Were not these statements made by you in "Humanity and Sanity," in April 1916, just after the President had made his speeches throughout the country?

A. I think they were.

Q. And they were made for the purpose of counteracting the influence of the President, weren't you?

A. They were made because we were on that side; on the opposite side, yes, sir.

Q. And for the purpose of counteracting the influence of the President, weren't they?

A. They were made because we were on that side. I would like to straighten that up, or out, if his honor does not understand it.

Q. You mean that the President took one side and you took the other?

A. The President was on one side and I guess we were opposed at that time, yes, sir.

Q. The President was trying to influence the enactment of appropriations or provision for appropriations to increase the army to protect the Mexican border, wasn't he?

A. I suppose he was; I don't know about the Mexican border.

Q. Didn't you know about the Mexican border; didn't he speak specifically of the Mexican border, and say, "I haven't even troops enough to patrol the Mexican border?"

A. Well, I know that I was only against a large army for aggression.

Q. Now, just a moment, Mr. Ford. We will settle this matter very much quicker if you will answer my questions directly.

A. I agree with you. I absolutely agree with you.

Q. As you agree with me, will you try and follow it; do you understand the question, Mr. Ford?

A. No, I don't understand it.

(The question was read).

A. Well, he may have said it. He said it in his speeches, but there was a great many that contradicted—that is, differed with him.

The Court—The question is whether he did or did not say it.

A. Well, he did say it in his speeches.

Q. He did say it in his speeches, and you knew?

Don't Know What He Knew.

A. I don't know whether I knew it or not.

Q. Yes, you must have known it. Your campaign was to prevent Congress making appropriations to increase the army for the Mexican border, wasn't it?

A. Not for the Mexican border, but for any large army.

Q. You understood that the President wanted more men for the Mexican border?

A. I cannot say that it was for the Mexican border, Mr. Stevenson. It was for any large army.

Q. Didn't you say for any increase whatever, Mr. Ford?

A. Any army for Mexico?

Q. Didn't you say that you were opposed to any increase whatever in the army that you called overpreparedness, any increase of the ordinary army as to what it consisted of, at that time—wasn't that your statement?

A. I don't know about that.

Q. Didn't you say that anything more than what we then had you regarded as overpreparedness?

A. Perhaps we understood that was enough; perhaps we did say that.

Q. I am talking about that feature of it. That was your understanding of it and your explanation, wasn't it? Anything more than we had—anybody advocating more armed men than we had then was advocating overpreparedness?

A. Probably so, yes, sir.

Q. Now, I want to call your attention to another definition of anarchy: "Any person who promotes disorder, or excites revolt against an established rule, law or custom." Would you recognize that as a definition of anarchy or of an anarchist?

General Objection Made.

Judge Murphy: I should like to get this general objection in to this question and any similar questions that may be put following it.

The position of the plaintiff in this case is that the word "anarchist" in the libel, which is the basis of this suit, can be taken in only one sense, and that is its ordinary sense, its plain sense, its legal sense; the sense that the million and a half readers of that paper took it; not in a technical sense, a limited sense nor a special sense, nor a philosophical sense; as our Supreme Court in this State has said, and as the courts of last resort in other jurisdictions have said, the language of such an article as this intended for the general reading public must be taken in its plain, ordinary and usual meaning.

Now, as to whether anarchy meant some other meaning, limited or qualified or technical, we think is wholly immaterial here. We urge this at this time.

The Court—That same objection you have made and is upon the record half a dozen times—exactly the same objection.

Q. (Reading)—"Any person who promotes disorder or excites revolt against an established rule, law or custom." Do you recognize that as describing an anarchist?

A. May not.

Q. What is lacking?

A. He might not throw bombs. He might not be a bomb thrower.

Must Be Bomb Thrower.

Q. Do you think a man has got to be a bomb thrower? Do you think nobody else can be an anarchist?

A. An anarchist, I think, is the only way that you can think of that could be applied.

Q. That a man who advocated preparedness is the worst that you could think of; can you think of anything worse than you called the men who advocated preparedness?

(Objected to.)

Q. Just tell us anything worse than you could have said about the men who advocated preparedness.

(Objected to and excluded.)

Q. Do you think a man has got to be a bomb thrower in order to be an anarchist? Is that the idea?

A. No, I do not. He may be a bomb thrower as well.

Q. Do you think he has got to be a bomb thrower?

A. No, not necessarily.

Q. Don't you know that men who never saw a bomb are anarchists?

A. That I don't know. I don't know about that.

Q. Did you ever hear of Tolstoi?

A. I have, yes.

Q. Who was he?

A. He is a writer, that is all. I know his son well; he visits me occasionally. Tolstoi was a writer.

Knows Tolstoi's Son.

Q. He was an anarchist, wasn't he?

A. I don't know.

Q. (Reading) "Anarchy: Absence or insufficiency of government, a state of society in which there is no capable, supreme power, and in which the several functions of the state are performed badly, or not at all." Do you recognize that as a definition of anarchy?

A. I would not recognize it.

Q. What is lacking in that?

A. Everything that goes to break up everything, I guess.

Q. You would recognize that anybody who undertakes to render a Government inefficient is helping prevent the Government from performing its functions, don't you?

A. He might be doing the best he knew how.

Q. What is government, Mr. Ford?

A. That is hard to explain. I don't know what explanation I would give to that.

Q. You cannot give an explanation of that. You know there would be a difference between an efficient Government and an inefficient one, wouldn't you?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. An efficient Government would be able to protect its people in their rights, wouldn't they?

A. As far as they knew, yes.

Q. For instance, if we were down on the Mexican border, and we had a lot of troops there, the Government could then protect the rights of the people, couldn't they?

A. Yes.

An Inefficient Government.

Q. If they did not have a sufficient number of troops to protect the rights of the people they would be inefficient, wouldn't they?

A. Depends upon conditions, of course.

Q. Can there be any condition about that, that a government who could not protect, did not have troops enough to protect its citizens in their rights, and in their persons, and rights of property, would be an inefficient government, when they were being assailed by bandits coming over from Mexico?

A. Might protect themselves.

Q. Who might protect themselves?

A. People that are there; soldiers.

Q. I am asking you if the Government did not have sufficient troops, sufficient soldiers, to defend them, would not that Government be insufficient?

A. Yes.

Q. Then we agree about that. Then the difference between a Government who is able to protect its citizens and one who is unable to is the difference between efficiency and inefficiency, isn't it?

A. I said yes.

Q. Mr. Ford, do you contend that a man who is advocating a policy to keep the Government inefficient, unable to protect its citizens in their persons and in their property, was not advocating anarchy?

A. There is a great difference of opinion, Mr. Stevenson.

Q. Give me your opinion; I am asking your opinion now.

Not Advocating Anarchy.

A. No, they were not advocating anarchy.

Q. Where do you think that a man who advocates keeping the Government unable, for lack of troops, to protect its citizens is not an anarchist?

A. Because an anarchist is worse than that.

Q. You recognize, don't you, that it is the duty of the Government to protect its citizens?

A. As far as it can, yes.

Q. Isn't that one of the fundamental principles of government? You have heard of that, haven't you?

A. Yes.

Q. Where did you hear that?

A. I don't know.

Q. Mr. Delavigne did not tell you that, did he?

A. I don't know where I heard it.

He Had Heard of Declaration.

Q. Did you ever hear of the Declaration of Independence?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You think you may have heard of it, there?

A. Yes, and elsewhere, too.

Q. If the government finds itself unable to do it, it ought to prepare, shouldn't it?

A. It depends upon how they prepare, I guess.

Q. If it prepared just for sufficient strength isn't that performing a duty?

A. Yes, sir, it is, I suppose.

Q. Now, I ask you again, isn't any man who undertakes to obstruct the government in rendering itself able to discharge that duty, by getting sufficient force to protect their citizens, an anarchist?

A. No.

Q. That is not anarchy?

A. No.

Q. Why, Mr. Ford?

A. Because he might go further. An anarchist might go further, it seems to me.

Q. He would not have to go any further than that, would he?

A. He might.

Q. Did you have any reason for disputing the President's statement?

A. It wasn't disputed. There was a debate on at that time.

Q. What?

A. My knowledge was that there was a debate on it; that is, there was sides and differences of opinion.

Q. The President of the United States is supposed to know all about it, isn't he?

A. I don't know whether he did or not.

Q. You recognize that, Mr. Ford (handing magazine article to the witness), I mean, referring to the cut.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. This purports to be Mr. Abbott's interview with you?

A. Yes, I recognize the cut.

Q. You recognize the cut; it is the cut of a picture taken on board the Oscar II., isn't it?

A. Yes, sir; I recognize that cut?

Q. That is all I refer to at this moment is the cut. Mr. Ford, you see yourself there and you recognize others who were on board?

A. I recognize other, yes, sir; the captain of the ship.

Recalls Abbott's Visit.

Q. Do you recollect Mr. Abbott's visit to you?

A. I do remember the visit to me some time ago, not very long ago.

Q. Were you here at the time this was read, Mr. Ford?

A. I don't think I was, Mr. Stevenson.

Q. I don't hardly think you were here; it is quite a long interview. There are other cuts there that you will recognize or notice. That is a cut of an eagle, isn't it?

A. A cut of an eagle, yes, sir.

Q. You see your name here, signed to this?

A. I see the name signed, yes, sir.

Q. Will you look it over, Mr. Ford, and see whether——

A. I can't get that clear enough by looking it over.

Q. You can't get it clear?

A. If somebody will read it I will be glad to have them.

Q. Well, I take, Mr. Ford, that this statement here is a synopsis of the larger interview, over your signature; I will read that at this time.

(Reads lengthy article in which Ford said did not believe in war and that.)

A. This is why I signed it, that little part there, that statement.

Q. What?

A. That is why I signed it, on account of that last little portion there. The rest was what he picked out; I never saw the whole article; I don't remember ever seeing that little synopsis.

Q. Is there anything in this, Mr. Ford, now that I have read it to you, that did not correctly express your sentiments?

Never Read Own Article.

A. I never read the article.

Q. Now, is there anything in that statement, Mr. Ford, that I have read to you that purports to be signed by you that does not express your sentiments, or did not express your sentiments at the time that you talked to Mr. Abbott?

A. Well, I don't know there is anything else that I can recall just now.

A. I remember when he brought something for me to sign; it was just a little bit of a portion.

Q. You did not believe in war generally, but you did believe in this war.

A. I believed in that war, yes, sir; war to end war.

(Mr. Stevenson, reading further.)

"I was convinced, as soon as I had an opportunity to study the war situation in Europe at first hand, that this war could be ended by only crushing the foes of peace."

Q. I am not talking about the language. I am asking the substance of the expression. I understand this is Mr. Abbott's language.

A. I don't remember of being convinced at the time that we were.

Q. Whether you were convinced, you thought that that was the situation, didn't you?

A. Well, I don't know about that.

Had in Mind Foes of Peace.

Q. You had in mind the foes of peace were the people engaged in that war, and you said that it was started by militarists?

A. We did talk some of the causes of war, I think. I never saw the article, and it was a long time ago.

Q. Mr. Abbott says he read this to you.

A. I doubt very much that he read all of it.

Q. Let us see what is the matter with this:

"I was convinced, as soon as I had an opportunity to study the war situation in Europe at first hand, that this war could be ended only by crushing the foes of peace."

A. I didn't study the war very much in Europe.

Q. (Reading): "Ever since I returned from the peace ship expedition I have devoted all my thought, energy and resources to this end."

Q. Is that true, or isn't it?

A. I don't remember talking about that.

Q. Isn't all this article, or a great part of this article, about what you were doing about the present war?

A. Yes, it goes clear back to the peace ship, and I don't remember talking about that at that time.

Q. The whole thing is built around the peace ship?

A. I don't know.

All About Peace Ship.

Q. And pictures of the peace ship at the head of it?

A. I don't know what the whole article is.

Q. I am just asking about this that is in this here because it seems to be a condensed statement of things that refer to the article itself.

A. Yes.

Q. That you were engaged then very actively in the support of the Government?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that this war you were in favor of although you were opposed to all war before that time?

A. I was in favor of this war after we got into it.

Q. And that you had, since your return from Europe, devoted your energy, your time and your thoughts to seeing what you could do?

A. That is not true.

Q. To that end, to bring about peace?

A. No, that isn't true.

Q. Before this country got into the war certainly you were opposed to war of the country going into the war?

A. Yes.

Q. And you were opposed to the country preparing for war more than it was then preparing.

A. More than was needed.

Q. Now, then, there came a time when you changed your mind and found that the country did need more preparedness, and I want to know when that was?

A. It was when we broke off.

Q. Broke off what?

When His Mind Changed.

A. When we broke off diplomatic relations with Germany.

Q. Was that the first time that you had given it any thought?

A. It was the first time I had given any thought to it.

Q. You found, when you got around to preparing for this war, that this country was entirely unprepared for it, didn't you?

A. I thought we were pretty well prepared to do anything that was necessary.

Q. You found that it was totally unprepared, and did not even have any airplanes?

A. In my opinion, we did not know how to make them.

Q. They didn't have any, did they?

A. No.

Q. And everywhere there had to be a great rush of people to get ready and prepare themselves for carrying on and taking part in the war?

A. Yes.

Q. Practically all of the great industrial facilities of the country were engaged as quickly as possible to start in the work?

A. War work, yes.

Q. I want to ask you a fair question, or what seems to me a fair question, Mr. Ford. Didn't you find that you were mistaken in your views that you entertained prior to the time the country actually became engaged in this case?

His Opinion Unchanged.

A. No, sir.

Q. You were still of the opinion that the country should not be prepared more than they were prepared?

A. I was still of the opinion that we were right and were well prepared.

Q. Didn't you find that it took long months, and even years, to make preparations after we really did get started?

A. We had good factories and facilities.

Q. Even the factories had to be reequipped, didn't they?

A. Not cars.

Q. You had to change your machinery?

A. Of course, some things, yes.

Q. Didn't you have any—— Well, I won't press that.

A. I certainly did not.

Q. Did you change your mind that the soldiers who entered the Federal army were murderers?

A. This was not a war of aggression.

Q. They became professional soldiers, didn't they, according to your definition?

Not Professional Soldiers.

A. No, they did not. I don't think so. No, sir. There were no professional soldiers in that war.

Q. The Regular Army was there, weren't they?

A. Yes, I guess they were.

Q. Don't you know the Regular soldiers were the first to be sent over with Gen. Pershing to face the enemy.

A. I possibly didn't know it at the time, yes.

Q. Don't you know it now?

A. Yes, if you say so.

Q. Don't take my word for it, Mr. Ford.

A. Among the first, I guess.

Q. All of them, the men that you called murderers.

A. I never called anybody murderers; just the system.

Q. Well, we won't discuss that. I called your attention this morning, a little while ago to where you said they were all murderers, in your testimony. You have said you don't want to change that. Do you want to change it now?

A. I said all professional soldiers.

Q. Are you not prepared now to say, Mr. Ford that you did a great injustice to those men that you called murderers, because they were professional soldiers?

A. No; I think they would be glad to get out of it, right now.

Q. A good many of them never got back here; that is a fact, isn't it?

A. Yes—I guess so. I have never called any individual one of them a murderer.

Called All Murderers.

Q. You called them all murderers; that includes all of them?

A. I only called it because it happened to be a quotation from somebody.

Q. It was in this book where you called professional soldiers murderers?

A. Mr. Delavigne.

Q. Well, Delavigne did?

A. Apostles of murder.

Q. You don't understand those are quotations from somebody else?

A. No, I do not.

Q. Do you say you did not tell Mr. Abbott just what he quotes you here as saying?

A. I did not sign all that is in that book.

Q. Your name is——

A. I gave him my name for the purpose of putting it under what I said about Mr. Hearst.

Q. Is that all?

A. That is all.

Q. Then Mr. Abbott put something else on you?

A. I said the same thing in California to another reporter.

Q. Do you know Mr. Sinclair, Upton Sinclair, and his interesting wife?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You gave him an interview?

A. We walked from the road and talked, yes.

Q. Was Mrs. Sinclair with you?

Mrs. Sinclair Not There.

A. No. She was not.

Q. According to the interview, she asked you some questions?

A. I don't remember that.

Here court adjourned until Tuesday. Mr. Ford showed signs of extreme nervousness and the severe cross-examination is beginning to tell on him. Unaccustomed to such severe strain before a packed court room, he is extremely uneasy, but is being protected in every way possible by his attorneys, who fight every inch of the way and have succeeded in leading him away from many pitfalls by their timely objections. At times his voice is extremely low and his answers to questions not responsive. Mr. Stevenson will question him possibly all, or at least most of Tuesday, after which he will be cross-questioned by his own attorney.

Henry Ford and His Son, Edsel.

BAKER ACTS TO SAVE U. S. AERIAL SERVICE

Change of Front Comes With Reports of Aviation Activities in Europe.

Special Despatch to THE SUN.

WASHINGTON, July 21.—Fully realizing that the American Air Service is destined to crumble away unless prompt measures are taken to prevent it, Secretary of War Baker at last has decided to attempt to save it. He announced to-day that he shortly would transmit to Congress an urgent appeal on behalf of army aviation, and would submit data showing to what extent the service had been crippled and how it would be impossible to get a fresh start without needed appropriations.

This is the first move Mr. Baker has taken to aid the air service. The fact that it coincides with the return of Assistant Secretary of War Crowell from Europe led to reports that Mr. Crowell brought back data showing how foreign Powers were devoting concentrated efforts to build up aviation, while the United States was letting its air service calmly go to the scrap heap.

Until to-day there has been a pronounced tendency to avoid any attempt to save aviation on the theory that political capital be made out of the prospective wreck by blaming the Republican Congress for not having been more liberal with funds. This idea, coupled with the desire of Gen. March, chief of staff, to subordinate aviation to the rank of a subsidiary army enterprise generally is held responsible here for the failure of the War Department to act.

It now appears that the War Department has decided it cannot escape blame if it permits America's air service to crumble to pieces while every other Government apparently is attaching such great importance to the immediate development of aviation.

Secretary Baker, with Secretary of the Navy Daniels and the members of the Joint Army and Navy Aviation Board, held a long conference in Mr. Baker's office this afternoon. Plans were mapped out to present the entire situation to Congress.

SQUADRON TO FLY TO ALBANY.

Hazelhurst Aviators to Urge Gov. Smith to Favor Landing Places.

Four De Haviland airplanes will leave Hazelhurst Field on Hempstead Plains and fly to Albany to-day, where maps, photographs and other matter will be given to Gov. Smith to show the advantages to the various towns and cities when landing fields are established in their vicinity.

Flying in one De Haviland will be Lieut. John J. Roullot, who will have as a passenger Major Henry J. Miller. Lieut. R. C. Kirkpatrick will have Col. Archie Miller as observer. Lieut. W. C. Coates, Capt. Gordon Reel and Lieut. Alexander M. Roberts also will carry a passenger each. Curtiss planes also will make the trip and will land in Poughkeepsie. The De Havilands, which require larger landing spaces than the others, will go direct to Albany.

LAST FLIER QUITS ST. JOHN'S.

Raynham Embarks on the Grampian With Mis Martinsyde.

ST. JOHN'S, N. F., July 21.—The departure to-day of Capt. Frederick P. Raynham with his Martinsyde airplane on the steamship Grampian bound for England brought to a close the transatlantic aviation activities here.

Capt. Raynham, who was recalled after his machine had been twice wrecked in attempts to start a transocean flight, was accompanied by his navigator and mechanics.

BELGIANS HERE CELEBRATE.

Nations' War Claims Discussed on Their Independence Day.

Belgians living in New York celebrated the national Independence Day of their country last night in the Great Hall of the College of the City of New York. The plan to give the programme in the stadium was abandoned because of the weather.

The Rev. J. F. Stillmans, one of the speakers, said that although the British asserted that they had won the war and the same claim was put forward by Americans, the Belgians contended that it was won by all of the Allies under a single leadership.

Others who spoke were Pierre Mali, Belgian Consul General here, Jules Mertens, Guillame Van de Putte and the Rev. O. A. Nys.

ANSELL OUT OF THE ARMY.

Resignation of Courts - Martial Critic Accepted by Baker.

WASHINGTON, July 21.—The resignation of Col. Samuel T. Ansell, former acting Judge Advocate General of the Army, was accepted to-day by Secretary Baker.

Col. Ansell has announced that he will continue his fight for a radical revision of the army courts-martial system.

SEAMEN'S STRIKE MAY BE PROLONGED

Deadlock Is Unbroken, as Expected Concessions Are Withheld.

COAL MAY BE AFFECTED

Railroad Men Fear Tug Strike Would Injure Industry in New England.

The deadlock into which the seamen's strike has settled remained unbroken yesterday. Union leaders had confidently announced that concessions would be made by the members of the American Steamship Association at their meeting held yesterday afternoon, but H. H. Raymond, president of the Clyde Line, who is head of the steamship men's organization also, denied that a compromise had been considered.

Such changes as were reported in the situation yesterday were only in the direction of extending the walkout. The crews of three seagoing tugs, operated by the Railroad Administration and used in towing coal barges to New England ports, joined the strikers, although they are not members of the unions which are officially out. They told the tug captains that they wanted $15 a month more.

Railroad officials here expressed fear that the crews of other tugboats in the same trade might be infected with the strike fever, but W. B. Pollock, marine superintendent of the Railroad Administration at this port, said that only the three cases had been reported to him. The tugs belonging to the coal carrying roads tow four or five barges, each with a capacity from 1,500 to 2,000 tons, and any interruption to this service would affect the coal supply all over New England, and if continued for any considerable time would seriously interfere with every sort of industry in that territory.

Marine Engineers Join.

The National Marine Engineers Association, which had previously only instructed its members not to take out vessels which had shipped non-union crews, pending negotiations which have been in progress with the Shipping board, is about to join the ranks of the strikers.

Mr. Brown, national president of the organization, issued a notice yesterday to the members that the negotiations with the Shipping Board had ended unsuccessfully and that no member of the organization should sign articles after July 31 at less than the rates provided in the union demands. This notice is in fact a strike order, effective August 1.

Mr. Brown has also notified the members of his organization that the engineers' demands are entirely independent of those made by the striking seamen, firemen and cooks and stewards and are to be enforced irrespective of any settlement made with the other unions. The engineers were cautioned by Thomas L. Delahunty, business agent of the local union, not to perform any duties other than ordinary engineers' work.

A survey of the waterfront made by the police of Harbor Station A yesterday revealed 250 ships tied up for lack of crews. This total substantiates recent statements made by members of the American Steamship Association, and is considerably below the estimates made by union officials last week. Some of the ships operated by members of the association have never been unionized and are still in operation.

Longshoremen Out of Work.

The strike has thrown a large number of longshoremen out of work, but it was said at their union headquarters yesterday that a strike vote of the freight handlers had been taken. At the Southern Pacific pier, however, the longshoremen refused to unload the steamer El Capitan, recently arrived.

Gus H. Brown, secretary of the International Seamen's Union, declared yesterday that the union was in a position to fight for several months. No strike benefits have as yet been paid to the men, however. A Chinese local has been formed here and organizers have been sent to Norfolk and other points to form locals among the negro workers. There are already Spanish and Portuguese locals in this city.

PEDESTRIANS IN PERIL.

Chimney Falls, Baby Narrowly Escapes.

Pedestrians in front of 106 West 135th street narrowly escaped injury yesterday afternoon when a chimney on that building toppled over and a shower of bricks fell upon the sidewalk. Attaches of the naval recruiting station there had attached one end of the rope supporting a recruiting banner to the chimney, the other end being fastened inside a window on the opposite side of the street.

The rain caused the rope to shrink and the extra strain was more than the chimney bricks could stand. Philip Clark of 504 West 122d street, was struck in the back by a brick but was not seriously injured. Another brick hit the baby carriage in which Mrs. Henry Crawford of 224 West 149th street was wheeling her three month's old daughter Marie, but the child was not hurt.

BOWDOIN TO SUPPLY ICEBOAT.

Alumni to Aid MacMillan in His Next Arctic Cruise.

PORTLAND, Me., July 21.—Donald B. MacMillan, leader of the Crockerland Expedition, will be provided with a small schooner with auxiliary power, to be christened the Bowdoin, when he leaves next summer on his next Arctic exploration trip, according to plans of the alumni of Bowdoin College. MacMillan is a member of the faculty as well as a graduate.

The schooner will be built to withstand the pressure of the ice floes and will have a crew of not more than ten men. The party will devote from two to three years to exploration work under the auspices of the National Geographic Society.

SPEED DEMONSTRATION REAL.

Man Who Was Making It Is Brought Into Court.

Joseph A. Vandergift, a wealthy resident of Great Neck, L. I., told Magistrate Miller, in the Long Island City court yesterday, that he was explaining New York city traffic regulations to Mayor John E. Miller of Callao, Peru, when he made such a speedy demonstration trip across the Queensboro Bridge that Motorcycle Patrolman McGowan handed him a summons at the easterly end.

Although McGowan declared that Vandergift had bowled along at a twenty-seven mile an hour clip for a distance of about eight blocks, the latter alleged that his speedometer registered only between fourteen and fifteen miles an hour. Vandergift was found guilty and sentence was suspended.

Mayor Miller, who was in the machine with Vandergift, now understands how the regulations are enforced.