

## **FORD'S SADDEST JOURNEY: LONDON TO LONDON 1909-1936**

**Brian Ibbotson Groth**

The city figures prominently in Ford's writing throughout his career. On the very first page of his first novel, *The Shifting of the Fire*, he wrote 'the air was filled with a mighty hustling that drowned the distant rumble of traffic, never ceasing in this our city'.<sup>1</sup> His interest in the city never ceased; the subject fascinated him right to the end of his life. In what Ford's bibliographer David Harvey says was perhaps the last article he wrote for publication before his death ('A Paris Letter' of 1939), Ford describes the City of Light as it impressed itself upon him in that fateful year.<sup>2</sup>

Ford wrote about numerous cities in his lifetime but it was the book on London, the city of his childhood and youth, which became his first commercially and critically successful work for adults. *The Soul of London* was published in 1905, and dwells almost exclusively on the past and present in England's capital. The future is far less prominent. In 1909, however, Ford published a long essay entitled 'The Future in London' which, even though it appeared and was probably written several years after *The Soul of London*, could perhaps be described as the 'missing chapter' from the 1905 book, especially as it has the same impressionistic, discursive style that Max Saunders feels is typical of *The Soul of London*.<sup>3</sup> 'The Future in London' formed the final chapter in a two-volume work entitled *London Town Past and Present*. W. W. Hutchings wrote the remaining 1110 pages. 'Chapter' is something of a misnomer, however, since 'The Future in London' is really an essay quite independent of and different from the material that precedes it.

Over a quarter of a century later Ford took London as his subject for the last time. This was in a much shorter essay entitled 'London Re-visited', published in 1936 in the December issue of the *London Mercury*. When did he write this essay? Though a cautionary note must always be added when dealing with Fordian facts, biographical evidence largely supports his statement that: 'since July 1916 I have been domiciled elsewhere than in London. That makes just twenty years' (between then and writing the essay),<sup>4</sup> which seems

to claim that 'London Re-visited' was written shortly before its publication in 1936. However, in 1936 Ford spent only one month in London, whereas at the very beginning of the essay he tells us he had been back in his childhood city for three months. This would place the writing somewhat earlier than Ford suggests. The three-month time span must refer to the period from March to May 1934 when he took his *de facto* wife Janice Biala to London. They were to return for a month in July 1936. Saunders dates the writing of 'London Re-visited' to around the time of this second visit (Saunders vol. 2, 497), and were it not for the three-month claim this latter stay would neatly confirm the period of 'just twenty years' mentioned in the essay. What probably happened was that Ford combined impressions from both visits and presented them as being from one stay in 1936: it was after all the truth of his impressions not the accuracy of facts that he was about.

Impressions of London vary widely in 'The Future in London' and 'London Re-visited'. The first essay often bubbles with *joie de vivre* about the city which is and is to come; prominent in the second are images of a capital lacking in energy mainly because its inhabitants have such a poor diet. Things get worse: in the dramatic conclusion to 'London Re-visited', Ford exhorts Londoners to abandon the city as if it were a sinking ship, such is his pessimistic view of its future. So between 1909 and 1936 Ford's impressions of his hometown and his predictions for its future shift from those associated with joy and hope, to despondency and despair. Describing this transition – from his view of the London of his youth to that of his old age – as 'the saddest journey' would therefore not seem entirely inappropriate.

As I now examine the two essays in some detail there is one obvious and overwhelming question. Why this major change in Ford's impressions and mood about London? There is more than one possible response. Ford's age could be a reason. He was in his mid-thirties at the time of writing 'The Future in London', but over sixty when 'London Re-visited' was published. Couple this with the pattern of his commercial and critical success. In 1909 Ford had enjoyed several years of excellent reviews and reasonable sales of his books, especially, as noted, *The Soul of London* and then *The Fifth Queen* and its two sequels (1906-8). The period from 1905 to 1909 had also been an extremely productive period for Ford. In all he published an impressive fourteen books during this time. Furthermore, by 1909, as Saunders observes, he was invigorated by his affair with Violet Hunt, whom he had started to see regularly from the summer of 1908, while

he was also approaching the height of his powers as a writer (Saunders vol. 1, 289).

Compare this with the mid 1930s. Though he had achieved a measure of romantic happiness with Janice Biala, Ford's personal life was far from untroubled; he was at odds with his teenage daughter Julie and her mother Stella Bowen over Julie's upbringing. Moreover, Ford was periodically ill with gout and insomnia and had been having difficulty getting his work published since the Depression (Saunders vol. 2, 486, 498). His most recent books, *Henry for Hugh* (1934) and *Provence* (1935), had not even found English publishers in 1936.

Such personal and professional matters undoubtedly affected Ford's outlook, but I will argue that Ford's optimism in 1909 and his pessimism in 1936 are also closely tied to his unorthodox theory of history. As H. Robert Huntley has noted, this theory is best explicated in *The Spirit of the People* (1907), though references to it appear throughout his work right up to *Great Trade Route* (1937), at the end of his career.<sup>5</sup> In the *The Spirit of the People* Ford postulates that history is an evolutionary process in which 'the psychology of the civilised world changes – that the dominant types of the world alter with changing, if mysterious, alternations in the economic or social conditions of the races'.<sup>6</sup> Applying this concept of 'dominant types', Ford divides English history into three ages, each ruled by a special personality. Each type controlled and symbolized its age until, as Huntley has observed:

With the inevitable circling of the years, each of Ford's historical-cultural ages, along with its dominant psychological type, was fated to give way before an ensuing historical epoch with a variant dominant type, a type better fitted to survive, even excel, in the altered historical milieu to follow. (Huntley 36)

And the Ford we meet in 'The Future in London' appears very much as one of the dominant types of his age who is not just surviving but excelling in England's capital. Even in the later essay, he was to describe himself in 1909 as a member of a class acknowledged by deference everywhere he went:

You see [...] in the nice easy old coat of a metropolis of our hot youths and vigorous manhoods you were the ruling class. Because you did not wear reach-me-downs. You drifted about on your easy affairs all over that great, easy befogged space to a perfect hailstorm of yessir-nosirs. (LR 180)

The reader sees the city in 'The Future in London' through the eyes of an optimistic author who feels very much at ease and in control in his

metropolis and who is confident enough to make predictions as to how it will be to live in London in the years to come. Ford shows himself to be a forecaster of a certain amount of accuracy, and in addition he alludes to topics that stamp him as something of an early environmentalist.

Yet at the very beginning the essay concerns itself more with London's past than its future. Without showing any of the regret and melancholy for the city's past that sometimes features in *The Soul of London*, Ford nonetheless notes that 'London is being so rapidly and so constantly "made over" that today there are parts of the town in which it is difficult to find one's way'.<sup>7</sup> He remembers maying as a child (i.e. collecting flowers for May Day) where the Olympia Exhibition Centre now stands and is mildly surprised by this. But with a characteristic and optimistic time shift he moves quickly into a consideration of the future, given that he 'may reasonably expect to see a London of three or four decades hence' (*FL* 1095). (An unconsciously poignant statement since he was to die exactly thirty years after 'The Future in London' was published, though in France not London.)

In considering the London to come Ford presents two of what he terms 'sections'. Today we might call them scenarios. One he calls 'the Future Probable' or 'the Future that seems likely', the other is 'the Future Utopian' or 'the Future that we should like' (*FL* 1095). He then goes on to say he will examine each scenario separately, but in somewhat typical Fordian fashion he quickly abandons that plan. What we get is almost exclusively 'the Future Utopian' or 'the Future we should like'. Or perhaps he should have said, 'the Future I should like', since most of what follows is really how Ford would like to see London in the future.

Dominating his examinations are the roads of the capital. If the medieval pilgrims believed that 'all roads lead to Rome', Ford believes the same now applies to London for he writes, 'London is great today because so many roads lead to it'. As if to underline how important he considers roads to be, he adds, 'the chief feature of a city's life is its roads' (*FL* 1095).

But in Ford's Utopian London of the future he also sees 'railroads', as he calls them, as the other lynchpin holding his transport vision together. Displaying the same fascination with trains that Sara Haslam has observed in some of his other works,<sup>8</sup> Ford envisages building 'an extremely efficient railroad with some ten to twenty lines of rails side by side'. Then as if one railroad is no longer enough, an apparently enraptured Ford immediately ups the number to

'four or five railroads radiating from Trafalgar Square'. And quantity would be matched by quality since he proposes that 'along the ten to twenty lines I should send the most efficient, the speediest possible trains. I should make travelling free, smooth and luxurious' (FL 1098).

This reference to fast, efficient and luxurious trains brings to mind the sumptuous first paragraph of *Some Do Not* . . . when the main character, Tietjens, a fellow member of Ford's 'ruling class', makes his fateful railway journey from London to the South Coast:

The two young men – they were of the English public official class – sat in the perfectly appointed railway carriage. The leather straps to the windows were of virgin newness; the mirrors beneath the new luggage racks immaculate as if they had reflected very little; the bulging upholstery in its luxuriant, regulated curves was scarlet and yellow in an intricate, minute dragon pattern, the design of a geometrician in Cologne. The compartment smelt faintly, hygienically of admirable varnish; the train ran as smoothly – Tietjens remembered thinking – as British gilt-edged securities. It travelled fast; yet had it swayed or jolted over the rail joints, except at the curve between Tonbridge or over the points at Ashford where these eccentricities are expected and allowed for, Macmaster, Tietjens felt certain, would have written to the company. Perhaps he would even have written to the *Times*.<sup>9</sup>

Such is the breadth of Ford's vision and optimism, if not his grasp of financial and economic reality, that he proposes not only superb free railways but a veritable spectrum of other transportation as well:

Along the railways I should set motorways, and, between hedges, moving platforms for pedestrians and those who needed exercise. I should clean out the Thames and set upon it huge, swift and fine express launches. (FL 1098)

Ford even predicts that this mass transport by road, rail and water might be supplemented by air travel. 'If we come to airships', he writes, they will glide 'over the Brighton road' (FL 1097). Not a bad piece of forecasting made in an essay probably written before Bleriot first flew the English Channel in July 1909.

The speed, comfort and cheapness of getting in and out of central London would mean, in Ford's vision, that people would rather live in places like Alresford, Hampshire though they may still work in London. And the fact that almost everyone would want to live outside the central areas would lead to vast tracts of abandoned residential areas being turned into parklands, galleries, restaurants and the like. A quick look around central London today and one might say that was a reasonably accurate prediction. On the other hand, the status of shops and shopping is only briefly touched upon and does not seem to be a major element in

Ford's vision of Utopian London. He does, however, correctly forecast the demise of the street trader:

'Shopping' might become more centralised, or it might not; but because of the great distances, the baker shoving his hand-cart full of loaves, the obstructive milk-cart, the dilatory chemist's boy with his box-tricycle – all these slow-going and cumbersome things would vanish from the streets. I presume that either my housekeeper would order the day's supply over the telephone from Alresford, and the things would be blown through a pneumatic tube from the stores in South Kensington, or these stores would have a department in Alresford, in direct underground communication with the central offices. In either case we should be rid of the whole host of sutlers and camp followers who have no business to cumber the streets of our city. (*FL* 1101)

And while these people and what Ford calls their 'hangers-on' live their lives on the outer ring of the city, inner London would be given over to 'sensible people' who would spend their working hours in 'tall, white buildings that hold ten thousand workers apiece' and their breaks in hundreds of acres of 'parks, squares and open spaces' (*FL* 1101). Again, aside from the 'white' of the buildings and perhaps a substitution of 'tens' for 'hundreds' of acres, a pretty accurate forecast.

This then is how Ford describes what an ideal weekday would be like for him and other 'sensible people' in the future:

My line of rails would make it possible for me to inhabit a bright, joyous little card-house, say in Alresford in Hampshire. I could lunch at my club, stroll in St James's Park and adore the pretty little ducks, return to Alresford to dress and dine, go to a theatre in the Strand and be in bed in Alresford by half-past twelve, much as I do in Kensington today. (*FL* 1100)

Besides improvements in transportation and changes in residential patterns, Ford proposes other measures that would help 'render my Great London of the Future the most attractive city in the world'. Telephones would be made 'perfect' while the problems of noise, air and what might be termed equine pollution would also be solved (*FL* 1101).

This would be achieved by getting rid of the horse – a 'pestiferous nuisance in the city', petrol driven motor traffic, steam trains and steamships, and replacing them all with electrically driven trains, cars and vessels. Coal fires would also disappear, at least from inner London, as people moved out of the centre taking with them what he calls the 'domestic hearth'. At the same time factories, offices and 'large commercial buildings' would begin to use electric heat (*FL* 1101). Accurate as regards the demise of coal fires, though obviously totally off the mark in respect of petrol driven cars, even if Ford must be

considered notable and praiseworthy in desiring their replacement. Remember this wish was expressed in 1909 when motoring was in its infancy.

Ford rounds off his essay with a summary of his Utopian London in the future. The metropolis would be a massive expanse of city stretching in what he envisages as a sixty-mile radius from Dover to Oxford with a 'huge, light, white, inner city filling the greater part of this shallow bowl that is London'. To realize this vision 'London – Great London – would have to be a place not of seven, but seventy millions of imperially-minded people' (FL 1102). During the week the workers would pour into this inner city using the vast networks of railroads that would be built. Journeys would be free and quite quick. He envisioned, for example, a trip from Oxford to inner London taking about half-an-hour on what he called 'my non-stop, monorail expresses' (FL 1103). This, he says, was about the same length of time it took for him to get from Hammersmith to the City. Furthermore, travellers would become politer and more courteous, Ford thought, since he had found less rowdiness when people travelled in larger groups. Thus there would be 'an immense gain in what is called manners' (FL 1106). English football supporters have put this prediction sorely to the test!

People would live outside the inner city, which should not be called 'the suburbs', since Ford thought the prefix 'sub' demeaned and subordinated these residential areas by portraying them as 'temporary shelters for gallant spirits'. Instead he preferred the German term *Vorstadt* for the 'outer ring that greets the traveller before he reaches the heart of the town'. And this vast *Vorstadt* ought to be a garden city. In this way Londoners, who Ford felt largely lacked pride in their capital, would be able to embrace what he called 'an awakened corporate spirit' (FL 1109).

Ford's optimism permeates 'The Future in London', especially in respect of his Utopian vision being realized. He really did seem to think that his 'Great London of the Future' could be turned into 'the most attractive city in the world' and made into what he terms 'the Ideal City that all the populations of the world would flock to' (FL 1099). The prediction regarding London being the world's most attractive city and an ideal one would probably be disputed by many today. On the other hand, Ford was right in forecasting that England's capital would become a multicultural metropolis. Furthermore, his use of the words 'flock to' gives the prediction great contemporary relevance since one of the key and divisive issues of the British General Election of May 2005 was precisely the size of immigrant populations that should be allowed to

enter the United Kingdom. And it is an issue that British politicians and society in general will continue to grapple with in the years to come.

However, despite his strongly optimistic mood in 'The Future in London', Ford concludes his essay on a cautionary note with words that must again be said to ring every bit as true and relevant today as they did in 1909:

For, after all, the Future of London is very much in our hands. We are the tyrants of the men to come; where we build roads, their feet must tread; the traditions we set up, if they are evil, our children will find it hard to fight against; if for want of vigilance we let beautiful places be defiled, it is they who will find it a hopeless task to restore them. (*FL* 1110)

The overarching optimism of 'The Future in London' is the voice of Edwardian Ford, confident member of the 'ruling class', speaking in the age of *belle époque*, an age shaped and controlled, he felt, by like-minded 'sensible people'. Yet what he hoped and believed about London, its ruling class, and its future was not to endure. In 'London Re-visited', the pendulum of his impressions had swung very much the other way.<sup>10</sup>

Now it is the views of Ford the 1930s expatriate rather than the optimistic Londoner of a younger century that dominate the writing. England's capital no longer appears to him as the 'Ideal City', but 'our poor old charlady amongst metropolitan cites'. It is the 'lower middle classes' who now rule and they define not only England's capital, but also the new era throughout the world (*LR* 177). The old rulers have in Ford's unorthodox view of history been swept aside and new dominant psychological types are in control. The happy, confident Ford who strode around the capital before the Great War and made optimistic predictions about its future, was, he now feels, a case of mistaken identity:

You see ... in the nice easy old coat of a metropolis of our hot youths and vigorous manhoods you were the ruling class [...] I don't, then, know what claim I had to be called ruling class – I or the people with whom I drifted about. (*LR* 180)

As he has shown in other works, notably the *Parade's End* tetralogy, Ford believed that this pre-war ruling class had been displaced during the Great War by a debilitated, poorly nourished lower-middle class: 'Well, that is all gone and the real lower middle-class, as it were, naked and unashamed, has the ball of the world in its hands' (*LR* 180).

Ford felt that this dominance of the unambitious, unhealthy lower-middle class in the thirties was everywhere to be seen, not only in



London but also in other major large cities he was familiar with such as New York, which he had recently visited, Paris and Buenos Aires. He felt there was uniformity in the architecture of new buildings, the goods offered in shops and the way people dressed. Even the film posters outside cinemas seemed the same. And though the posters in London largely advertised American films, Ford does not adhere to what seems to have been a widely held belief even then that Britain's capital was being Americanised. In fact he holds that if the United States had not existed the situation would have been exactly the same, for it is the tastes of the new rulers rather than their nationalities that have determined the changing appearance of London and so many other cities.

A primary reason for the parlous state of the new rulers, in whom Ford clearly lacked confidence, was, he thought, poor diet. The state of the green vegetables and fruit laid out for sale in the London markets causes him special concern. The first sentence of the essay conveys these worries: 'The quality, the age, the condition, the appearance of the green vegetables and fruits displayed for sale in the London markets, and their paucity and lack of variety, are appalling' (LR 177). He goes on to maintain and lament that 80% of the food Londoners eat is from cans and that which is not canned is treated with dangerous preservatives. He compares this unfavourably to the market of his *provençal* home which displays 'sixty-eight varieties of vegetables and salads and nineteen kinds of fruits – each one of them not two hours out of the earth or off the tree' (LR 183).

Ford wrote this essay at around the same time he was espousing the merits of the 'small producer' and the philosophy of the kitchen garden in works such as *Provence* (1935) and *Great Trade Route* (1937). And it shows. In these two books, widely regarded as his best work after the *Parade's End* tetralogy, Ford described himself as 'a man with an inspired mission'.<sup>11</sup> This mission was to persuade readers to support and adopt the frugal, altruistic and healthy life of the Mediterranean small producer because 'it is that spirit that could yet save the Western World'.<sup>12</sup> In a world he felt was increasingly being dominated by arid, selfish materialism and acquisitiveness – traits he summed up as 'the eternal nothingness of Northern ideals' (GTR 256) – Ford believed that 'only the Estate of the Small Producer [...] can radically restore the face of the World to sanity and health' (GTR 174-5).

So the Ford of 'London Re-visited' felt he had the solution for the new rulers if only they would embrace it. In his opinion the portents were not good, however, and consequently these rulers, and

by extension the countries they ruled, were at great risk. The lack of fresh vegetables was creating a passivity that was dangerous: 'if they do not have a sufficiency of fresh, real, green vegetables, their digestions must suffer, and so their brains ... and their nerveless fingers must fall from the plough-handles of affairs' (*LR* 183).

Though Ford's justification for his fears may seem mildly humorous and somewhat quirky, there was nothing funny about the reason for his disquiet and fear. There were, he felt, much more sinister dominant types from the lower middle-classes eager and able to assume control if the present poorly nourished rulers weakened and their spirit waned. These were the fascists led by a diet-conscious German Chancellor:

Mr. Hitler – don't forget that – like the rhinoceros, the gorilla, the bull, the stallion, and all the fiercest beasts of the world, is a VEGETARIAN<sup>13</sup> ... whilst London's vegetable supplies are the worst in the world. (*LR* 183)

Emphasising the import of his dire warning, Ford repeats it two paragraphs later, 'yes, Mr. Hitler *is* a vegetarian ... and a member of the lower Middle Classes who have inherited the earth and the power thereof, at that' (*LR* 183).

It is not by chance that Ford singles out fascism and its German leader as a major concern. As Saunders has noted, from the time he met and fell in love with the Jewish-American painter Janice Biala in 1930, Ford's political views had shifted to the Left although neither of them was a communist. Ford thought both communism and fascism were 'mass manias'. He became especially concerned about the fate of the Jews in Europe and wrote to newspapers supporting Jewish refugees from fascism and spoke out forcibly against the fascist dictators.<sup>14</sup>

Nothing in 'The Future in London' and 'London Re-visited' better demonstrates the development of Ford's thought on these subjects than the conclusion of each essay. Though in 1909 the young Ford warns against the dangers of tyranny and evil, he feels the future of London can be shaped in a positive way because he trusts the ruling class to which he belongs. They will indeed create the 'Ideal City that all the populations of the world would flock to' (*FL* 1099).

However, by 1936 the author despairs and can only counsel flight from the city towards the warm south: 'down to the land where blooms the olive flower', there to be welcomed 'by a population as kindly as themselves' (*LR* 183). In an extraordinary last few paragraphs of 'London Re-visited', Ford gives up exhorting England's new ruling class and trying to save them. Instead he turns to London's 'two-million-fold' children and urges his companion, 'the depressed

expatriate from Manhattan' (more specifically his partner Janice Biala) to assume the role of someone akin to a latter-day Pied Piper. She is to stand atop Primrose Hill, fiery cross in hand, and urge the children of London, and thus its future, to abandon their city. This is the same city he had said he hoped the whole world would flock to in 'The Future in London'. Now the capital's young are told to flee and leave 'the Ruling Classes and the Mother of Parliament Front Benches for Mr. Hitler to plunder and play with' (*LR* 184).

A final telling and sad comparison between the two essays concerns his views on Germany. In 'The Future in London' Ford looks to Germany to enhance London and its future. He hopes that all the architectural improvements he proposes, many of which are modeled on German cities, will instill in Londoners 'an awakened corporate spirit – the spirit of which I have spoken as existing in almost every German city – how much more beneficent that would be' (*FL* 1109).

Yet, when he came to write 'London Re-visited', Germany and the culture of its people were no longer something for Londoners to admire and copy. On the contrary, Germany and its fascist ruler were putting London at terrible risk and represented the supreme danger to its future. Hueffer had definitely become Ford in more than name only.

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Ford Madox Ford, *The Shifting of the Fire*, London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1892, p. 1.
- <sup>2</sup> David Dow Harvey, *Ford Madox Ford: 1873-1939: A Bibliography of Works and Criticism*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962, p. 270. The article was published in the Winter 1939 number of the *Kenyon Review*.
- <sup>3</sup> Max Saunders, *Ford Madox Ford: A Dual Life*, 2 vols, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996 – hereafter cited as Saunders; vol. 1, p. 197.
- <sup>4</sup> Ford Madox Ford, 'London Re-visited', *The London Mercury* (Dec. 1936) – hereafter cited as *LR*; p. 177.
- <sup>5</sup> H. Robert Huntley, *The Alien Protagonist of Ford Madox Ford*, Chapel Hill, CL: The University of North Carolina Press, 1970 – hereafter cited as 'Huntley'; p. 36.
- <sup>6</sup> Ford Madox Ford, *The Spirit of the People*, London: Alston Rivers, 1907, p. 63.
- <sup>7</sup> Ford Madox Ford, 'The Future in London', *London Town Past and Present*, vol. 2, London: Cassell and Company, 1909 – hereafter cited as *FL*; p. 1094.

- <sup>8</sup> Sara Haslam, 'Ford's Training', *Ford Madox Ford's Modernity*, ed. Robert Hampson and Max Saunders, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2003, pp. 35-46.
- <sup>9</sup> Ford Madox Ford, *Some Do Not . . .*, London: Duckworth, 1924, p. 9.
- <sup>10</sup> Ford's changing views of London are also discussed by Elena Lamberti on p. 141 of this volume.
- <sup>11</sup> Ford Madox Ford, *Great Trade Route*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1937 – hereafter cited as *GTR*; p. 67.
- <sup>12</sup> Ford Madox Ford, *Provence*, Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1935, p. 257.
- <sup>13</sup> The question of whether Hitler was a vegetarian has been much debated over a considerable period of time. There are countless pages on the Internet discussing the subject. The *New York Times* of 30 May 1937 reported somewhat incongruously that Hitler was a vegetarian 'although he occasionally relishes a slice of ham'. *Hitler's Table Talk*, New York: Enigma Books, 2000, pp. 204, 230, 231, 442, 443, 572, 640, records numerous purportedly verbatim conversations with Hitler in the period from 5 July 1941 to 30 November 1944 in which he claims to be a vegetarian. In another conversation Hitler is reported as saying: 'One may regret living in a period when it's impossible to form an idea of the shape the world of the future will assume. But there's one thing I can predict to eaters of meat, that the world of the future will be vegetarian!' (*Hitler's Table Talk*, p. 125). He could almost have been quoting Ford.
- <sup>14</sup> Saunders, vol. 2, 371.