Colonist or Citizen?

A study of the assimilation of Danish immigrants in America through case studies of *Danish Brotherhood in America* and *Danish People's Society*, 1882-1921.

185,205 characters – 77,16 standard pages
Thesis by Nick Kofod Mogensen
Supervisor: Regin Schmidt
Københavns Universitet
SAXO-instituttet, Afdeling for Historie
Februar 2016

Indholdsfortegnelse

Abstract

Specialet undersøger, hvordan etniske organisationer har påvirket assimilationen af danske immigranter i USA. Det gøres gennem en analyse af debatten om assimilation og de etniske organisationers rolle deri, både den generelle debat hos danske immigranter og debatten internt i organisationerne, samt en analyse af de etniske organisationers holdninger til assimilation og bevarelse af dansk kultur i USA.

Undersøgelsen tager udgangspunkt i de to etniske organisationer Dansk Brodersamfund i Amerika og Dansk Folkesamfund. Trods vidt forskellige tilgange havde organisationerne det til fælles, at de var etniske organisationer og således var baseret på et ønske om at samle folk med dansk etnicitet i USA, og de ønskede begge at bevare dansk sprog og kultur i USA.

Dansk Folkesamfunds idealisme stemte meget dårligt overens med de typisk meget pragmatiske og praktisk-interesserede danskere. Pga. Dansk Brodersamfunds mere pragmatiske tilgang tiltrak de derfor markant flere medlemmer, men heller ikke Brodersamfundet formåede i nævneværdigt omfang at beskytte sproget og den danske kultur fra assimilationsprocessen. Dansk Brodersamfund tilpassede sig gradvist det amerikanske samfund, f.eks. ved at tillade brugen af engelsk ved møderne, men dette skete ikke i et forsøg på at assimilere immigranterne, men var tværtimod organisationen selv, der blev påvirket af de danske immigranters gradvise assimilation, som Dansk Brodersamfund så sig nødsaget til at lade sig tilpasse for at overleve som organisation. Dansk Brodersamfunds pragmatiske tilgang og større tilbøjelighed til at ændre karakter for at tiltrække medlemmer betød således, at organisationen selv i stigende grad blev assimileret og i højere grad var en familieorganisation og et socialt netværk end en forkæmpere for dansk kulturs bevarelse i USA.

I dag er der intet nævneværdigt etnisk dansk miljø i USA, da størstedelen af amerikanerne med danske rødder må anses som assimilerede. Jeg mener, at der i stedet er sket en institutionalisering af etniciteten: enkelte institutioner er opstået med det eksplicitte formål at bevare mindet om dansk kultur i USA, før det forsvinder. Idéen om en etnisk vækkelse i tredje generation, som dansk-amerikaneren Marcus Lee Hansen var fortaler for, må således siges ikke at være sket.

1. Introduction

Danish immigrants to America is generally perceived to have assimilated rather quickly. Many factors came into play for that to happen, but most important was the lack of ethnic concentration in the immigrants' settlement patterns. The wide dispersal of Danish immigrants meant that they had more direct contact to people of other ethnicities and non-immigrant Americans and less so with other Danish immigrants, thus naturally beginning the assimilation process to fit in with the new neighbors.

Ethnic concentration, e.g., in separate ethnic communities or towns in America, is widely acknowledged as one of the most important factors in assimilation. The greater ethnic concentration an immigrant group had in their settlement patterns, the slower assimilation

generally went. That raises the question: did ethnic organizations in America have a same effect on immigrants?

Ethnic organizations were common in immigrant America, and came in many forms. Some organizations explicitly stated avoiding assimilation as the primary goal, while others actually wanted to help members become Americans. While the influence of ethnic organizations regarding assimilation were thus likely different according to what type of organization it was, ethnic organizations regardless of their individual characteristics had one important thing in common: they were by definition an exclusively ethnic community. While some ethnic organizations thus wanted to use that ethnic community to help members become American, the very fact that only people of a certain ethnicity could become members meant that the organizations by definition caused a greater degree of ethnic concentration, if not physically regarding settlement patterns then at least regarding the primary group relations of immigrants. Thus it is possible that even an ethnic organization that wanted to help immigrants adapt to American society and thus make assimilation easier actually, perhaps inadvertently, slowed assimilation down by creating a closed ethnic community, thus increasing primary group relations with other Danish immigrants.

In this thesis, I will attempt to study that phenomenon by answering the following question:

> *How did ethnic organizations influence the assimilation of Danish immigrants to America?*

By doing so, I hope to contribute to a better understanding of the assimilation process of Danish immigrants in America by helping to better understand the intentions of ethnic organizations, as well as the possible unintentional effects the organizations could have.

1.1 Research Question

> *How did ethnic organizations influence the assimilation of Danish immigrants to America?*

1.2 Research Discussion

Research in Danish immigration to America can be roughly divided into three phases:

1. Before 1970s: Memorial and biographical history
2. 1970s and 1980s: Emigration from Denmark
3. 1980s and later: Danish immigrants in America

The memorial and biographical phase was predominately done by Danish immigrants or descendants themselves. The people who led this phase often wanted to document the journey they had taken and preserve the memories they had from both Denmark and the early years in America. Often based on important individuals, institutions or events in the Danish immigrant community, it described what had happened at different points in the history of Danish immigration to America and often showed what people's thoughts were regarding the transition from being Danish to being American.

In the first phase, little scholarly attention was thus being paid to Danish immigrants in America by Danish historians, as it was mostly being done by immigrants themselves.

Interest in the topic from Danish historians first began when Kristian Hvidt wrote his doctoral thesis *Flugten til Amerika*[1] in 1971. Hvidt's 1971 doctoral thesis began a wave of interest in Danish immigration to America among Danish historians. Just as Hvidt, these often focused on "the Danish side": who emigrated and what motivated them? Often, they were based on statistical analyses and focused on the Danish immigrants as a group with little distinction to individuals.

In the 1980s, attention turned to the Danish immigrants instead, e.g. due to Erik Helmer Pedersen.[2] What happened to the Danish immigrants once they had settled? Torben Grøngaard Jeppesen has studied the assimilation of Danish ethnics in America and why Danish immigrants generally assimilated rather quickly.[3] Other historians returned focus to the biographical and memorial history that dominated the first phase, using sources like memoirs and letters to portray the everyday life of immigrants.[4] Linguists have studied another important factor in Danish immigration to America, the changes in language over time. This has particularly been done through analyses of the interesting linguistic developments in the Danish language in America, being both outdated and renewed: outdated because it is often more than a century since the immigrants came to America and thus since they imported the language, and renewed because it has transformed in unique ways not seen in Danish spoken in Denmark.[5]

Most of the research have thus focused on either portraying events and individuals' lives, or ignored the individuals and instead focusing on overall demographic changes. In this thesis, I have combined those two approaches: through a discussion of specific events and the opinions of Danish immigrants regarding those events, an analysis of important trends in the assimilation of Danish immigrants to America has been made. By doing this, it is my goal to shed light on an aspect of Danish immigrant history previously underexposed.

2. Methodology and Theory

2.1 Methodology and Sources

To determine the influence of ethnic organizations on the assimilation of Danish immigrants in America, I have studied the discussions in the Danish ethnic community regarding assimilation and the ethnic organizations' role in that process, both within the individual organizations and generally in the Danish ethnic community. Through these

1 Kristian Hvidt, *Flugten til Amerika eller drivkræfter i masseudvandringen fra Danmark 1868-1914*. Doctoral thesis. (Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1971); or in English, *Flight to America, the social background of 300,000 Danish emigrants*. (New York: Academic Press, 1975).

2 Erik Helmer Pedersen, *Drømmen om Amerika*. (Copenhagen: Politikens Forlag, 1985) and *Pionererne*. (Copenhagen: Politikens Forlag, 1986).

3 Torben Grøngaard Jeppesen, *Danske i USA 1850-2000, en demografisk, social og kulturgeografisk undersøgelse af de danske immigranter og deres efterkommere*. (Odense: Odense Bys Museer, 2005) and *Skandinaviske efterkommere i USA, etniske grupper eller kerneamerikanere?*. (Odense: Odense Bys Museer, 2010); or in English, *Scandinavian descendants in the United States, ethnic groups or core Americans?*. (Odense: Odense Bys Museer, 2011)

4 E.g. Marianne Hjort Hansen, *Brev fra Amerika, danske udvandrerbreve 1874-1922*. (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1981); Anne Lisbeth Olsen and Niels Peter Stilling, *Et nyt liv, den danske udvandring til Nordamerika i billeder og breve*. (Birkerød: Strandberg, 1985); or in English, *A new life, Danish emigration to North America as described by the emigrants themselves in letters 1842-1946*. (Aalborg: Danes Worldwide Archive, 1994).

5 E.g. Karoline Kühl, "'Det er easy at tale engelsk også'. Amerikadansk i 1960'erne og 1970'erne" in *Nydanske Sprogstudier*, no. 47. (2014), 39-64.

discussions, I have also studied the changing identities and goals of ethnic organizations as the Danish ethnic community became gradually more assimilated.

It is far beyond the scope of this thesis to study all Danish ethnic organizations in America. Instead, two specific ethnic organizations have been selected, *Danish Brotherhood in America*[6] and *Danish People's Society*. For different reasons that will be discussed later, the two organizations were important Danish ethnic organizations regarding assimilation. The two organizations also advocated significantly different approaches to assimilation and the preservation of Danish culture in America. By analyzing these two organizations, a broader discussion of the role of ethnic organizations regarding assimilation of Danish immigrants can be unfolded, and new aspects of the demographic changes and gradual assimilation of the general Danish ethnic community can be exposed.

The thesis will study the period from 1882-1921. In 1882, the Danish Brotherhood was founded, thus an obvious time to start the study. In 1921, the Emergency Quota Act was enacted effectively putting an end to European mass immigration and thus also mass immigration from Denmark. By choosing the period in question, the thesis studies the period from the ethnic organizations were founded and until mass immigration stopped. That was the most important period for both ethnic organizations, since both were mainly appealing to Danish immigrants.

Danish ethnic newspapers in America and member publications have been studied and analyzed. Different ideas regarding assimilation, cultural preservation, and the role of ethnic organizations in the ethnic community have been identified, and these ideas have been compared and put in relation to the changes that the Danish ethnic community underwent at the time the ideas were discussed. In addition, the changes regarding ideology, character and role in the ethnic community that the ethnic organizations themselves underwent have been analyzed.

For Danish People's Society, the analysis particularly focuses the ideological foundation of the organization and the public discussion among immigrants as well as the discussion within the *Danish Church* that erupted when the organization was founded. That is based on articles related to Danish People's Society in the Danish ethnic newspaper, *Dannevirke*. Dannevirke is the ethnic newspaper where most of the discussion regarding Danish People's Society happened, probably as a result Danish People's Society's close relationship to Dannevirke and its editor, who himself was a member of the organization.

The analysis of the Danish Brotherhood is divided into two parts: the first part is the public discussion and the discussion within the Danish Church when they were formed. The analysis of the criticism against the Danish Brotherhood is based particularly on F. L. Grundtvig's pamphlet "*Jesu Kristi Kirke og de afgudsdyrkende Foreninger",*[7] both because it was an important example of the criticism against the Danish Brotherhood, but also because it would later be used against the author himself in the criticism of Danish People's Society which he founded. Reports from Danish Church meetings and discussions in Dannevirke will also be included. The other part of the analysis focuses on the discussion regarding the

6 From now on simply referred as the *Danish Brotherhood*.

7 F. L. Grundtvig, *Jesu Kristi Kirke og de Afgudsdyrkende Foreninger, skrevet til Overvejelse for Menighederne i den danske evangelisk-lutherske Kirke i Amerika.* (Cedar Falls, Iowa: Dannevirkes Trykkeri, 1887).

Danish Brotherhood's identity as an ethnic organization which particularly took place in the first half of the 20th century due to changes like a decreasing immigration, growing size of Danish American generations in relation to immigrants, and the First World War, as these developments and events and the discussion that erupted as a result of them reflects the thoughts that the organization and its members had about the objective and ideological foundation of the organization, as well as its vision regarding the Danish ethnics in the future. That part of the analysis is mainly based on their member publication *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*.[8] The magazine started in 1916, 34 years after the organization was founded and just when the discussion of a changing identity among immigrants and Danish Americans was most relevant.

The sources selected as the foundation of this thesis give an excellent view of how the ethnic organizations and the issue of assimilation related to those organizations were discussed. Thus it helps explain how the organizations and leading members of the Danish ethnic community perceived ethnic organization. Unfortunately, it is less likely to expose what the average Danish ethnics felt about the issues in question. A farmer or factory worker would not necessarily have the resources or the literary talent required for often complex and ideological discussions in writing. Furthermore, the discussion was likely only engaged in by people with particular interests in the matter, either because they were adamant in their opposition to the issues or organizations discussed or because they were strong supporters, e.g. because they were members or even leading members of the ethnic organizations in question. Thus, an analysis based on newspaper and member publication discussions is likely to show how people with strong opinions and a certain status in the ethnic community and organizations felt about the issues, but not the perhaps majority of people who did not have strong opinions either way or the literary capacity to take part in the printed discussions. Furthermore, the coverage and discussion of the issues in Dannevirke might have been affected by Dannevirke's close relation to Danish People's Society.

Still, the newspaper and member publications discussions are important sources for the understanding of ethnic organizations in the Danish ethnic community as they show the opinions and goals of the people most actively involved with them. Although it might not fully show e.g. why average members joined the organizations or what they thought of them, it does show what the leading and most active members of the ethnic organizations and ethnic community in general thought of the issues. Therefore, the selected sources are important to study in order fully understand ethnic organizations and the influence they had on the assimilation of Danish immigrants in America. Also, the two ethnic organizations caused a public debate regarding assimilation, Americanization and cultural preservation in the Danish ethnic community. For that reason, studying these ethnic organizations is important, not just to understand the specific organizations better, but also to understand how other parts of Danish ethnic community felt about assimilation and cultural preservation.

8 In 1941 when the language of the publication was changed to English, the name was also changed to the English translation of the original name, *Danish Brotherhood Magazine*.

2.2 Defining 'Danish American'

When discussing Danish immigrants in America and their descendants, a few terms concerning ethnic and national group affiliations need further explanation.

Danish or *Dane* when describing people refer to those residing in Denmark. Danish-born people who have emigrated from Denmark are thus not included. An exception is when it is used in context of other descriptive terms, i.e. Danish ethnic organizations, where it refers to ethnic organizations in America with a Danish ethnic identity.

Danish immigrant, naturally, refers to Danes who have immigrated to another country.

Danish Americans are not to be confused with Danish immigrants, as the two terms are used to refer to different groups of people. Whereas Danish immigrants are born in Denmark, Danish Americans are born in America by Danish immigrant or Danish American parents.

Admittedly, not all historians and immigrant scholars use those definitions of 'Danish immigrants' and 'Danish Americans'. 'Danish American' can also be used as a general term for the entire group, immigrant and descendant alike. It is my opinion, however, that it is important to have terms that clearly differentiate between immigrants and American-born generations to fully appreciate the significant differences between the two groups regarding ethnic identity, attachment to Denmark as well as status and opportunities in America. An immigrant to America, having often grown up and perhaps lived a part of their adult life in Denmark, has typically a much closer connection to Denmark and has Danish culture and habits ingrained in a way that few American-born descendants have. The emotional connection to Denmark is likely to be much stronger for a person that has lived and can remember life in Denmark, and the nostalgic longing back to a country lost can sometimes be quite strong, even for those who have fully and unquestionably embraced America and its culture. Without a clear conceptual difference between 'Danish immigrants' and 'Danish Americans', the description and analysis is likely to miss important nuances.

Danish ethnics, then, is used in this thesis to refer to the combined group of Danish immigrants and Danish Americans, as this refers to the shared ethnic background of the two.

2.3 Defining 'Ethnic Organization'

Ethnic organizations are organizations that are based on the shared ethnic background of their members. Ethnic organizations can vary significantly in both goals, activities, scope, etc. The organizations are not necessarily based on any specific ideological attitudes towards assimilation or ethnicity, and it does not necessarily exist to further specific ethnic causes or interests. The defining feature of an ethnic organization is thus solely the ethnic uniformity of its members, and a specific ethnic group as its intended target group. Other than the ethnic uniformity of its membership base, ethnic organizations can, in other words, be quite different from one another.

2.4 Assimilation Theory

Assimilation refers to the process when a person or group change to resemble the "core society", a phrase Milton M. Gordon used to describe the white protestant majority in America of Anglo-Saxon ancestry.[9]

Gordon identified 7 types of assimilation that can be used to classify and determine the degree of assimilation in a group or individual. The 7 types are:[10]

Subprocess or Condition	Type of Assimilation
Change of cultural pattern to those of core society	Cultural or behavioral assimilation (Acculturation)
Large-scale entrance into cliques, clubs and institutions of core society, on primary group level	Structural assimilation
Large-scale inter-marriage	Marital assimilation
Development of sense of peoplehood based exclusively on core society	Identificational assimilation
Absence of prejudice	Attitude receptional assimilation
Absence of discrimination	Behavioral receptional assimilation
Absence of value and power conflict	Civic assimilation

Table 1. Gordon's 7 assimilation types.

According to Gordon, acculturation is usually the first to set in and can happen without the onset of any of the other types of assimilation. Acculturation often starts with adopting the language of core society, even happening in "*immigrant colonies sealed off [...] from extensive primary contacts with 'core society'*". For immigrants, this often only happens partially, but for descendants of immigrants, affected by American schools, etc., the cultural assimilation process is "*overwhelming*" – although happening slower in areas of ethnic isolation, particularly in rural areas.[11]

Gordon's fundamental thesis is:

> "*Once structural assimilation has occurred, either simultaneously with or subsequent to acculturation, all of the other types of assimilation will naturally follow.*"[12]

Structural assimilation is thus key to full assimilation, according to Gordon, and will inevitably lead to that. Acculturation, on the other hand, does not necessarily lead to structural assimilation. Structural assimilation is closely tied together with marital assimilation. If immigrants and members of core society have many primary group relations, e.g., by being members of the same clubs and organizations, it will lead to friendships and inter-marriages, i.e. marriages with people with another ethnicity than themselves. Marital assimilation, according to Gordon, automatically leads to structural assimilation. "[*C*]*ommunal leaders of religious and nationality groups*" are well aware of this, and thus they form youth organizations, clubs, and institutions of different kinds to make sure that the

9 Milton M. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion and National Options*, first edition. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), 72-73.
10 Ibid., 71.
11 Ibid., 77-78.
12 Ibid., 81.

immigrants' primary group relations are with people with the same ethnicity, thus counteracting assimilation and preserving the ethnic identity.[13]

According to Milton M. Gordon, there are three central theories of assimilation:[14]

1. Anglo-conformity: the complete elimination of the one's cultural heritage and adoption of core society's culture.
2. Melting pot: the blending of the culture of core society with other ethnic groups' culture into an "indigenous" American culture.
3. Cultural pluralism: the preservation of ethnic communities and at least significant parts of the immigrants' ethnic culture within the political and economic framework of America.

In relation to ethnic organizations, cultural pluralism is the most interesting of the three theories. Cultural pluralism describes a society where the ethnic groups have not undergone any significant acculturation or structural assimilation, where the cultural habits and traditions of the ethnic minorities continue relatively unaffected by American core society, thereby eliminating acculturation, and where ethnic communities are allowed to exist separately from core society, thereby refusing structural assimilation.

Ethnic organizations, by definition, constitute an ethnic community because the organizations are based on ethnic criteria. Thus, it can be argued that ethnic organizations at least somewhat counteracts structural assimilation, the key factor in full assimilation according to Gordon.

While that is a fair conclusion, ethnic organizations are not by definition advocates of cultural pluralism. Firstly, Gordon showed that many ethnic organizations do not have a specific and well-defined ideological foundation,[15] thus e.g. not necessarily consciously wanting to stop assimilation. More importantly, though, as already described Gordon pointed out that while structural assimilation automatically leads to acculturation, acculturation does not necessarily lead to structural assimilation. It is possible for a group to be structurally separated from core society, e.g.,by organizing on the basis of ethnicity, and still undergo cultural assimilation: e.g. adopting the English language instead of Danish, primarily engaging in cultural cultural activities otherwise characteristic of core society, and otherwise acting like a non-ethnic organization, while still being structurally separated from core society on the bases of ethnicity. Those organizations are examples of *structural pluralism*[16] rather than cultural pluralism.

Some ethnic organizations are undoubtedly cultural pluralists, however. If an organization works to preserve a strong and separate ethnic community, even for the descendants of immigrants, what the organization is essentially doing is attempting to prevent assimilation of its members. That is cultural pluralism.

13 Ibid., 80.
14 Ibid., 84-114.
15 Ibid., 10.
16 Ibid., 159.

3 General History

3.1 European Mass Immigration to America

America has in a way always been a country of immigrants. Everyone in America who is not either Native American or a descendant of slaves can be said to descend from immigrants.[17] It isn't until the 19th century, though, that mass immigration became an integrated part of American history.

According to the U. S. census, no more than 9,625,734 people lived in America and its territories in 1820. 1,531,436 of those people were slaves, and only 53,635 were non-naturalized foreigners.[18] During the next 100 years of increasing immigration, 33,654,803 immigrants came to the country, and the population was now 105,710,620. Out of those, 13,920,692 were reported as foreign born, 15,764,366 with foreign-born parents and 7,030,880 of "mixed parents", i.e. with one foreign born parent and one from native born. Thus in 1920 alone, 36,715,938 were either born in another country or had at least one foreign-born parent.[19] Important to note is that the 1920 census only reported foreign-born people and people with foreign-born parents. Third generations and later were thus simply reported in the statistics as native born.

America, in other words, changed dramatically during the period of European mass immigration in the 19th and early 20th century. The post-1800 immigration to America can be divided into four stages, as done by Danish historian Torben Grøngaard Jeppesen:[20]

- 1820-1890: Free immigration and expansion to the West
- 1890-1920: Qualitative restrictions
- 1921-1965: Immigration pause
- From 1965: Modern immigration

The first phase, free immigration and expansion to the West, refers to a period where at least white Europeans had practically no legal restrictions regarding immigration to America and where part of the immigration contributed to the westwards expansion of the American frontier. The expansion of the frontier, in which immigrants took part, often meant people settling on prairie land that had never been cultivated before. Breaking in the prairie in order to make farming possible was often very hard work, but provisions like the first Homestead Act of 1862, which granted between 160 and 640 acres of land to anyone over the age of 21 as long as they made improvements on the plotted land for 5 years, made it interesting for many immigrants, rarely having any significant wealth to purchase land for. In the 1890 census, the end of the American frontier was proclaimed by the United States Census Bureau.[21]

17 Although it can be argued that the first white settlers in America were not immigrants, but rather colonizers or occupiers.
18 United States Census Bureau, *Census for 1820.* (Washington, 1821), 18. http://www2.census.gov/prod2/decennial/documents/1820a.zip Retrieved 15/2 2016.
19 United States Census Bureau, *Abstract of the Fourteenth Census of the United States, 1920*. (Washington, D. C. 1923), 96. http://www2.census.gov/prod2/decennial/documents/001718111.zip Retrieved 15/2 2016.
20 Jeppesen, *Danske i USA 1850-2000*, 42-66. The following description of the individual phases is based on this if nothing else is noted.
21 United States Census Bureau, *Report on the Population of the United States at the Eleventh Census: 1890. Part I.* (Washington D. C., 1895), xxxiv. http://www2.census.gov/prod2/decennial/documents/1890a_v1.zip Retrieved 15/2 2016.

The second phase was characterized by qualitative immigration restrictions. It started with the Immigration Act of 1891 which set up the Bureau of Immigration, thus centralizing American immigration policy and its enforcement under a federal authority. It also tightened the regulation of the American border as well as increased the list of people who to be refused entrance in America from being mainly Chinese workers to now also a number of moral or health-related "undesirables".[22]

The third phase began with the Emergency Quota Act of 1921. This limited the number of immigrants allowed into America from each country annually to 3% of the number of people in America with that country of origin as reported in the 1910 census. Immigration was thus significantly limited when the Emergency Quota Act was approved by Congress on May 19, 1921.[23] Due to the way the quotas were calculated, though, the quotas for northern European countries were significantly higher than many other regions of the world since northern Europeans dominated early mass immigration, thus favoring immigrants from Ireland, United Kingdom, Scandinavia and the like. Due to the significantly lower rate of immigration from Denmark to America, Danish immigrants were favored less so than immigrants from Norway and Sweden though, it is worth to note. The Emergency Quota Act was made permanent with some adjustments in 1924.[24]

'European mass immigration' refers to the period from roughly the 1840s to the 1920s where there was a dramatic increase in immigration to America, mostly from Europe. European mass immigration thus spanned both the first and second immigration phase.

Year	*All immigrants*	*European immigrants*	*Share of European immigrants*
1820-1829	128,502	99,618	77,5%
1830-1839	538,381	422,853	78,5%
1840-1849	1,427,337	1,369,423	95,9%
1850-1859	2,814,554	2,622,617	93,2%
1860-1869	2,081,261	1,880,389	90,3%
1870-1879	2,742,137	2,252,050	82,1%
1880-1889	5,248,568	4,638,684	88,4%
1890-1899	3,694,294	3,576,411	96,8%
1900-1909	8,202,388	7,572,569	92,3%
1910-1919	6,347,380	4,985,411	78,5%
1920-1929	4,295,510	2,560,340	59,6%
1930-1939	699,375	444,404	63,5%
Total	**38,219,687**	**32,424,769**	**84,8%**

Table 2. European immigrants vs. all immigrants to America, 1820-1939.[25]

22 *The Statutes At Large of the United States of America from December, 1889 to March, 1891 and Recent Treaties, Conventions, and Executive Proclamations*, volume 26, chapter 551. (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1891), 1084-86. http://www.constitution.org/uslaw/sal/026_statutes_at_large.pdf Seen February 15, 2016.

23 *The Statutes At Large of the United Statess of America from April, 1921 to March, 1923. Concurrent Resolutions of the Two Houses of Congress and Recent Treaties, Conventions, and Executive Proclamations*, volume 67, chapter 8. (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1923), 5-7. https://www.loc.gov/law/help/statutes-at-large/67th-congress/c67.pdf Seen February 15, 2016.

24 *The Statutes At Large of the United States of America from December, 1923 to March, 1925. Concurrent Resolutions of the Two Houses of Congress and Recent Treaties, Conventions and Executive Proclamations*, volume 68, chapter 190. (Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1925), 153-169. https://www.loc.gov/law/help/statutes-at-large/68th-congress/c68.pdf Seen February 16, 2016.

As shown in Table 2, immigration rose dramatically in the 1840s and decreased just as significantly after the 1920s. It also shows that European immigration to America dominated the immigration during those years. Between the 1840s and 1920s, 36,853,429 immigrants came to America. Of those immigrants, a total of 31,457,894 emigrated from Europe, or 84,8%. In the 1920s, the share had dropped below 60%, and besides a slightly increased share in the 1930s, people of European origin would gradually constitute less and less of the overall immigration to America, making up only 35% in the 1960s and 19% in the 1970s, and in much smaller numbers.[26]

Different regions of Europe dominated the European mass immigration at different times. From the 1840s and for the rest of the 19th century, northern European countries like Germany, Ireland, and the United Kingdom produced most immigrants to America. Early 20th century immigration was dominated by south and eastern European immigration, e.g., from Italy and Russia. The Emergency Quota Act effectively put an end to European mass immigration and mass immigration to America in general, at least until it rose again significantly with a new immigration phase in the 1950s, now dominated mainly by Asian and Mexican immigration.[27]

3.2 Danish Immigration to America

Danes were among the many nationalities that immigrated to America in the 19th and early 20th century. According to the 2013 *Yearbook of Immigration Statistics*,[28] 296,899 people immigrated from Denmark to America between 1820 and 1919. The numbers reported in the censuses and immigration records are not always accurate, though. According to Torben Grøngaard Jeppesen's calculations, about 400,000-450,000 Danes have immigrated to America in the 19th and 20th century,[29] contrasted to the total of 383,585 Danish immigrants as reported in the 2013 Yearbook of Immigration Statistics for 200 years. Most of the Danish immigrants arrived in America between 1880-1920 with around 300,000 immigrating to America just in those decades, according to Torben Grøngaard Jeppesen.[30]

Compared to countries like Sweden and Norway, Danish immigration to America was very small.

Year and country of origin	*Denmark*	*Norway*	*Sweden*
1820-1829	173	-	91
1830-1839	927	-	1,149
1840-1849	671	-	12,389
1850-1859	3,227	-	22,202
1860-1869	13,553	-	82,937[31]

25 United States Department of Homeland Security, *Yearbook of Immigration Statistics 2013*. (Washington D.C: US Department of Homeland Security, Office of Immigration Statistics, 2014), 6-11. https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/ois_yb_2013_0.pdf Retrieved 20/2 2016.
26 Ibid.
27 Ibid.
28 Ibid.
29 Torben Grøngaard Jeppesen, *Danske i USA 1850-2000*, 186-189.
30 Ibid., 23.

1870-1879	29,278	88,644	90,179
1880-1889	85,342	185,111	401,330
1890-1899	56,671	96,810	237,248
1900-1909	61,227	182,542	244,439
1910-1919	45,830	79,488	112,957
1920-1929	34,406	70,327	100,002
Total	**331,305**	**702,922**	**1,304,923**

Table 3. Number of Danish, Norwegian and Swedish immigrants to America.[32]

In 1921, 3,267,831 people lived in Denmark,[33] 5,954,316 people lived in Sweden[34] and 2,649,775 people lived in Norway.[35] Thus about one tenth of the Danish population had immigrated to America in 1930 compared to about one fifth of the Swedish and a quarter of the Norwegian population. Mass immigration of Swedes and Norwegians also began about 20 years earlier than the Danish mass immigration.

A variety of factors made hundreds of thousands of Danish people immigrate to America, both push and pull factors. The main push factors, i.e. factors leading the people to emigrate from Denmark, were a population boom, modernizations in the agricultural sector, and economic reforms in the 19th century. Combined, those three factors resulted in the social marginalization of many people in Denmark who could then not get a satisfying job or acquire a farm of their own. Rather than lose social status by work as e.g. regular farm workers or other low status jobs, many people migrated to the nearest big city looking for work. Because the Danish industry was still rather small, and because some areas had no large cities to absorb the marginalized group, some people decided to looks further away in their pursuit of happiness.[36]

That development was supplemented by several pull factors attracting the people who could not get a satisfying livelihood in Denmark to immigrate to America instead. An important pull factor was the Homestead Acts that made it possible for immigrants to acquire a plot of land in America for practically nothing; very tempting for some Danish citizens for whom it was impossible to obtain a farm in Denmark. Another important pull factor was the so-called "chain migration" where Danish people who had already immigrated inspired friends and family in Denmark to join them in America, particularly through letters.[37] As Erik Helmer Pedersen also demonstrated, emigration was particularly strong in areas where other people had formerly emigrated from.[38] This is because immigration to America was generally stronger where information about America was available – either through letters from

31 For the years 1820-1869, Norwegian immigrants are included under 'Sweden', as Norway and Sweden wasn't reported separately until 1961.
32 United States Department of Homeland Security, *Yearbook of Immigration Statistics 2013*, 6-11. https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/ois_yb_2013_0.pdf Retrieved 20/2 2016.
33 Danmarks Statistik, "Folketal efter hovedlandsdele (summariske tal fra folketællinger", 1930. http://www.statistikbanken.dk/10021 Retrieved 14/2 2016.
34 Statistics Sweden, "Population and Population Changes 1749-2014".http://www.scb.se/en_/Finding-statistics/Statistics-by-subject-area/Population/Population-composition/Population-statistics/Aktuell-Pong/25795/Yearly-statistics--The-whole-country/26046/ Retrieved 14/2 2016.
35 Det Statistiske Centralbyrå, *Statistisk årbok for kongeriget Norge, 42de årgang. 1922*. (Kristiania: H. Aschegoug & Co., 1923), 3. https://www.ssb.no/a/histstat/aarbok/1922.pdf Retrieved 14/2 2016.
36 Kristian Hvidt, *Flugten til Amerika*, 481-487.
37 Torben Grøngaard Jeppesen, *Danske i USA* 1850-2000, 29.
38 Erik Helmer Petersen, *Drømmen om Amerika*, 11-20.

relatives or friends in America or through propaganda from both American officials and travel agents hired by shipping companies or American railroad companies. All these factors, as also argued by Kristian Hvidt, explained why, due to a combination of push and pull factors, an internal Danish migration sometimes turned into trans-atlantic immigration to America.[39]

There were some outliers in Danish immigration to America, i.e., groups of people who had significantly different reasons for immigrating than the majority. The immigration from Denmark to America during the 1840s and 1850s were predominantly religiously motivated, dominated by Mormons and Baptists emigrating from Denmark in order to escape poor treatment because of their religion. Half the immigration to America from Denmark between 1852-1857 consisted of Mormon immigrants, and part of the remaining were Baptists – although it is unclear how many as baptists were not registered as a separate group.[40]

Another group of Danish immigrants often claimed to be outliers are immigrants from a border-region of Denmark and Germany called Schleswig. The region has historically been populated by both Danes and Germans, and both sides have controlled the region at different times in history. When Germany won the Second Schleswig War against Denmark in 1864, Denmark lost the Duchies of Schleswig, Holstein and Saxe-Lauenburg to Germany. Many Danes from Schleswig left the now German-controlled areas, and around 60,000 Schleswig Danes immigrated to America.[41] The most common explanation has been that the Danish Schleswigers fled persecution and particularly left to avoid the required 3 years of military service in the German army. In 1985, though, Hans Schultz Hansen argued that the issue of nationality had been exaggerated in Danish emigration research, and economic factors had conversely received far too little attention.[42] In his 1993 thesis "*Den nordslesvigske udvandring*", Leif Hansen Nielsen argued that generally, potential military service for Germany was not the determining factor for the vast majority of emigrants from the area, and that the issue of nationality may have played a role, but did not result in significantly larger amounts of emigrants.[43] A point that Hvidt did not necessarily disagree with, as he noted that 6,465 Danes from Schleswig immigrated to America via Copenhagen, likely because they had tried to get a foothold in Denmark after the loss of their home region to Germany, but later decided to emigrate instead.[44] Frederik Forrai Ørskov has argued, though, that the nationality issue was probably used by travel agents in the Schleswig area for advertisement purposes, thus using nationality and the prospect of living under German rule to generate an increased interest in immigrating to America among Danes in Schleswig.[45] It is thus possible that both sides of the argument are partly right; while the issue of German rule and military service was not the determining factor for most Danish emigrants from Schleswig, it did contribute to an increased immigration because travel agents used in their advertisement.

39 Kristian Hvidt, *Flugten til Amerika*, 481-487.
40 Erik Helmer Petersen, *Drømmen om Amerika*, 73-75.
41 Kristian Hvidt, *Flugten til Amerika*, 263-270.
42 Hans Schultz Hansen, *Det nordslesvigske landbrug of den danske bevægelse 1880-1914*. (Åbenrå: Historisk Samfund for Sønderjylland, 1985).
43 Leif Hansen Nielsen, *Den nordslesvigske udvandring. En analyse af drivkræfterne bag den nordslesvigske udvandring i perioden 1860-1900*. (København: Historisk Institut Københavns Universitet, 1993).
44 Kristian Hvidt, *Flugten til Amerika*, 263-270.
45 Frederik Forrai Ørskov, "Udvandringsannoncernes rolle i den Nordslesvigske udvandring – en analyse" in *Rubicon*, issue 2, 2014. (Odense: Historienævnet for på Syddansk Universitet, 2014), 23-39.

Danish immigrants assimilated rather quickly.[46] The late and comparably small Danish immigration is an important reason for why that happened. The later beginning of mass immigration compared to e.g. Norwegian and Swedish immigrant meant that it was harder for Danish immigrants to get affordable land or accommodation in a concentrated area than Norwegian and Swedish immigrants. The later an immigrant came, the more expensive land was in the established states of America. Thus the Danish immigrants were forced to spread out further across America. The importance of this is further strengthened by the influence that the Homestead Acts had for immigration: the later an immigrant arrived in America, the fewer option for homesteading was available, meaning that the immigrants could not be to as selective in their places to settle.[47]

Danish immigrants to America spread out across America more than e.g. Norwegian and Swedish immigrants. In 1870, there were Danish citizens in every state in America.[48] Still, certain areas dominated the Danish immigration more than others. The Midwestern states were by far the most popular states for Danish immigrants to settle in: three quarters of Danish immigrants thus settled in the Midwest. Other popular states were Utah, particularly during the early Mormon immigration, and California.[49] Danish immigrants mostly preferred rural and less densely populated areas.[50]

Ethnic concentration influenced assimilation of immigrants greatly in a number of ways. Most importantly, less ethnic concentration meant that Danish ethnics had more primary group relations with non-Danish ethnics. Primary group relations with American core society resulted in friendships with Americans as well as intermarriage. One of the key factors regarding assimilation, as described in the chapter "Assimilation Theory", is marital assimilation, i.e. who people chooses to marry. If immigrants primarily married people within their own ethnic group, it is a strong indicator of a lack of assimilation. It is also easier for two parents of the same ethnicity to pass ethnic culture and traditions on to their children. Even if there were no such motivation and deliberate decisions to marry within their own ethnic group, a lack of intermarriage still shows that the immigrants mostly had primary group relations with people of their own ethnicity. It also increases the chance of an ethnic culture to be passed on to the children if both parents are of the same ethnic background, even if it is not deliberately instilled in the child as a way of cultural preservation.[51]

According to Torben Grøngaard Jeppesen, Danish immigrants generally searched for a Danish-born spouse. For the Danish immigrants who married after immigrating to America, in 1900 77,5% of men and 85,9% of women had a Danish-born spouse. For second generation men, however, in 1900 only 15,5% had a Danish-born wife while 66,3% had an American-born wife – 35% of whom were Danish American women. For second generation women, 32,1% had a Danish-born spouse and 52,8% had an American-born spouse in 1900 – 30% of who were Danish American men. While over three quarters of Danish immigrants married fellow Danish immigrants, less than half of Danish Americans married fellow Danish

46 E.g., Jeppesen, *Scandinavian descendants in the United States;* Jette Mackintosh, "'Little Denmark' on the Prairie: A Study of the Towns Elk Horn and Kimballton in Iowa" in *Journal of American Ethnic History*, vol. 7, no. 2. (1988); and Hvidt, *Flugten til Amerika*.
47 Torben Grøngaard Pedersen, *Danske i USA 1850-2000*, 113.
48 Ibid., 142-144.
49 Ibid., 191.
50 Ibid., 197.
51 Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life*, 80.

ethnics.[52] That it only took one generation for intermarriages to become the norm suggests the speed of marital assimilation, and consequently assimilation in general, of Danish ethnics.

Another important factor in assimilation was language use, with adoption of the language of core society being a strong indicator of assimilation. Here, Danish immigrants also assimilated rather quickly. In 1900, e.g., 5,3% of Danish immigrant children could not speak English. For all immigrant children, in 1900 12,8% could not speak English.[53] For all Danish immigrants, 5,4% could not speak English in 1900 and only 2,8% in 1920. This was also significantly below the average for all immigrants in America.[54]

Generally, assimilation was slower in rural and less densely populated areas. Intermarriage was more common in big cities than in rural areas.[55] Jeppesen also found out that the amount of Danish ethnics who could not speak English was inversely proportional to population in the area where they lived, unless there was a Danish immigrant population large enough in a big city to constitute a separate ethnic community with churches, schools, etc., which was rare for Danish immigrants.[56]

To recap, Danish immigrants came as the result of a variety of push and pull factors, but most came to have a better life, e.g. by getting a farm of their own. Danish immigrants came to America in relatively few numbers and assimilated at a faster pace than the average immigrant in America. Both regarding language and marital assimilation, Danish ethnics quickly assimilated. Danish immigration to America was also characterized by a low ethnic concentration, another important factor in assimilation. Overall, then, Danish immigrants assimilated quickly and extensively. Still, some efforts to keep a Danish ethnic community alive in America were done. Ethnic organizations were important in that effort.

3.3 Danish Ethnic Organizations

Despite the wide dispersion of Danish immigrants and the fast assimilation that ensued, Danish ethnic organizations in America were quite common. The various organizations had quite different objectives and visions for the Danish ethnic community. Despite the many differences, though, ethnic organizations arose for the same reason: to solve a problem or meet a need that a specific ethnic group experienced or was perceived to experience by the organization, whether it was financial stability, material needs, religious reasons, political issues, athletics, or other needs.[57]

One of the first attempts to unite the Danish immigrants was made in October 1869 when a small group of Danish pastors met in Odense in Denmark. Reacting to a request from some Danish immigrants who wanted a Danish church in America, three delegates were send to America on account of the group. Together with immigrants in America, in 1872 they founded "*Church Mission Society*",[58] renaming it in 1874 to The *Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America*,[59] also known as *the Danish Church*.

52 Jeppesen, *Danske i USA 1850-2000*, 202-203.
53 Ibid., 203.
54 Ibid., 283.
55 Ibid., 233.
56 Ibid., 196-197.
57 Gordon, *Assimilation in American life*,133-134.
58 *Kirkelig Missionsforening* in Danish.
59 *Den Danske Evangelisk-Lutherske Kirke i Amerika* in Danish.

From the very first meeting, a theological disagreement that came to be a defining characteristic of the Danish Lutheran movement in America was apparent. From the first meeting, the Danish Church expressed a desire to emulate the state church in Denmark from which they came as much as possible, and in fact the Danish Church consisted entirely of pastors educated in Denmark.[60] The founders of the church had not just brought along pastors. With them came the theological conflict between the Inner Mission and Grundtvigians which had been roaring in Denmark during the 19th century.

The Inner Mission is a conservative religious movement which in Denmark operates within the structure of the Danish state church. The Inner Mission believes in the Bible as the literal word of God, and a close adherence to the Bible is an important component of Inner Mission theology. Grundtvigians are quite the opposite. Based on the ideas of N. F. S. Grundtvig, Danish pastor and poet, Grundtvigians disagree with the idea that the Bible is the literal word of God, instead arguing that it was written by human beings and should thus not be followed too closely. Their basic theology can be explained by a famous quote from N. F. S. Grundtvig:

"*Human first, then Christian*."[61]

In Denmark, the two religious movements coexist somewhat peacefully as parts of the Danish state church. In America, where a state church framework was not in place to keep the disagreeing parties together, keeping peace was apparently much harder. In 1894, just 20 years after the Danish Church started, a group of Inner Mission and conservative pastors broke out of the Danish Church, and in 1896 they merged with another conservative church created by Danish immigrants and formed The *United Evangelical Lutheran Church in America*,[62] also known as *the United Church*.[63] Besides the differences in theology between the Inner Mission and Grundtvigians, the two groups also represented vastly different visions for Danish ethnics in America and assimilation, as will be described later in the thesis.

In 1877, the Danish Church expressed interest in creating schools for children as well as Danish folk high schools[64] – a Danish type of adult education rooted in Grundtvigian ideas that did not offer academic degrees or diplomas, but aimed at offering a form of higher education to the lower classes that would often not otherwise have access to such. Folk high schools in Grundtvigian environments in the Danish ethnic community adhered to the traditional cultural and historical focus of folk high schools, while Inner Mission folk high schools to a much larger extent changed into giving the students practical skills and preparing them for college education. Inner Mission folk high schools often had significantly more students than Grundtvigian folk high schools.[65]

A number of attempts were made to support Danish culture and the cultural activities of Danish immigrants, but the organization to take that effort the furthest was in no doubt

60 Peter Sørensen Vig (ed.), *Danske i Amerika*, vol. 2. (Minneapolis, Minnesota: C. Rasmussen Publishing Company, 1907), 31-45.
61 N. F. S. Grundtvig, *Menneske først og Christen saa*. (1837).
62 *Den Forenede Danske Evangelisk-Lutherske Kirke i Amerika* in Danish.
63 Jørn Brøndal, "Danes and Danish Americans, 1870-1940" in Elliott Robert Barkan (ed.), *Immigrants in American History: Arrival, Adaption and Integration*. vol. 1. (Santa Barbara, California: ABC-CLIO, 2013), 328.
64 Vig (ed.), *Danske i Amerika*, vol. 1, 448.
65 Henrik Bredmose Simonsen, *Kampen om danskheden, tro og nationalitet i de danske kirkesamfund i Amerika.* (Aarhus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag, 1990), 205-206.

Danish People's Society[66]. Danish People's Society was founded on the idea that in order to preserve Danish culture in America, the Danish language needed to be preserved and actively spoken in everyday life. In order to ensure that, the most culturally aware Danish immigrants needed to create an ethnic environment that incentivized the use of the Danish language and minimized the instances where English was needed. Although also part of their tasks, that went far beyond simply creating schools and social clubs. What was needed was Danish colonies in America, ethnically Danish towns created with the explicit goal of preserving the Danish language and culture. Danish People's Society's most important achievement was thus arguably the creation of Danish colonies as far apart as Danevang, Texas and Dalum in Alberta, Canada. Danish People's Society did not describe itself as a Grundtvigian organizations, but it was still founded on Grundtvigian ideas.[67]

It is important to note that Danish People's Society, although wanting to stop or slow down assimilation, were not anti-American or advocates of complete isolation from American core society. The preservation of a separate ethnic community and culture was instead seen as a prerequisite for contributing to America as an immigrant. Danish People's Society can thus be seen as early representatives of cultural pluralism.

Not all ethnic organizations wanted to go quite as far or had the idealistic approach that Danish People's Society had. The ethnic fraternal benefit society *Danish Brotherhood in America* also had the cultural preservation as one of its goals, but under vastly different circumstances. Besides offering "*mutual moral and material assistance*"[68] such as assurance and practical help to immigrants, it functioned as an ethnic framework for social and cultural activities, as well as a place where members could discuss their memories of Denmark in their mother tongue, thus keeping their cultural heritage alive. In other words, cultural preservation was also a part of the Danish Brotherhood's identity from its founding, but with a vastly different and far less idealistic understanding of and approach to cultural preservation.

Ethnic organizations thus covered a wide spectrum: practical and social organizations like the Danish Brotherhood, religious societies that occasionally undertook cultural activities like the Danish Church and United Church, and idealistic, cultural pluralist organizations like the Danish People's Society. Each dealt with the immigration experiences differently and had different priorities regarding Danish culture, Americanization, and assimilation – and fought sometimes fierce public fights about who represented the right path.

4 Danish Brotherhood in America

4.1 Origin and Objectives

Some of the Danish immigrants in America were veterans from the 1848 and 1864 wars between Denmark and Germany. Perhaps inspired by the Danish veterans' organization *De*

66 *Dansk Folkesamfund* in Danish.
67 Tina Langholm Larsen, *Når grundtvigianismen flytter*. (Aarhus: Religionsvidenskab, Aarhus Universitet 2016), 3.
68 Michael G. Karni, "Ethnic Benefit Associations: An Introduction" in Susan H. Shreve and Rudolph J. Vecoli (ed.), *Records of Ethnic Fraternal Benefit Associations in the United States: Essays and Inventories*. (St. Paul, Minnesota: Immigration History Research Center/University of Minnesota, 1981), 3.

danske Vaabenbrødre[69], many Danish immigrant veterans formed local veterans' organization during the 1870s. Besides social functions, the organizations often had assurance policies and other offers economic and material benefit. Unfortunately, because the organizations were often local, moving away from the area where it was based could cause problems. For this and other reasons, Mark Hansen from Omaha had the idea that a national consolidation of the many local Danish immigrant veterans' organizations was a good idea, and in 1881 *Danish Brothers in Arms in America*[70] was founded.[71]

As a veterans organization, it was initially strictly Danish veterans that could become members of Danish Brothers in Arms in America. For that reason, some members feared for the organizations' future in the long term, as veteran immigration was decreasing. Particularly younger members of Danish Brothers in Arms in America were losing interest as a direct consequence of the militaristic character of the organization.[72] Thus already at the organization's first national convention in 1882, J. P. Paulsen proposed to change the name of the organization to *the Danish Brotherhood in America*[73] and allow all Danish-born men in America of a certain age and respectability as members. As expected, such a radical change in identity as an organization was opposed by some. Led by founder Mark Hansen, a group of opponents left the convention with all the organizations' money in their possession. With the departure of the opponents, J. P. Paulsen's proposition won with a big margin, and a new set of laws were set in place. Eventually, the angry group led by Mark Hansen accepted the changes and returned with the money.[74]

350 Danish Brotherhood lodges have existed in the history of the organization.[75] Its number of members increased steadily until the 1920s, from which point it started to decrease again:

Year	Lodges	Members
1891	40	1,473
1902	145	8,347
1906	237	15,465
1907[76]	255	17,173[77]
1910	272	19,589
1919[78]	290	21393
1922[79]	284	20,336
1934[80]	-	About 17,000
1940[81]	About 250	About 15,000

Table 4. Number of lodges and members in the Danish Brotherhood.

69 "Danish Brothers in Arms".
70 *Danske vaabenbrødre i Amerika* in Danish.
71 *Translation of the manuscript concerning the beginnings of the Danish Brotherhood in America*, DAAL, DBL-2000, Nebraska, Omaha Headquarters, Box 31, "DBIA History".
72 J. P. Paulsen, "Dansk Brodersamfund i Amerika", in Vig (ed.), *Danske i Amerika*, vol. 1, 214.
73 Its original Danish name was *Dansk Brodersamfund i Amerika*.
74 *"The Danish Brotherhood",* DAAL, DBL-2000, Nebraska, Omaha Headquarters, Box 31, "DBIA History"; and Vig, *Danske i Amerika*, vol. 1, 214-215.
75 Museum of Danish America, "Danish Brotherhood Lodges by Number". http://www.danishmuseum.org/pdfs/danish-brotherhood-sisterhood/danish-brotherhood-lodges-by-number.pdf Seen February 19, 2016.
76 J. P. Paulsen, "Dansk Brodersamfund i Amerika", in Vig (ed.), *Danske i Amerika*, vol. 1, 219.
77 As of November 1, 1907.
78 Carl Mygind, "Dansk Brodersamfunds 50 Aars Jubilæum" in *Bien*, 1/1 1932, 4.
79 "De danskfødte i Amerika" in *Dannevirke*, 29/11 1922, 3.
80 "Dansk-Amerikansk Interview" in *Bien*, 27/9 1934, 1.
81 "Det Danske Brodersamfunds Formaal" in *Dannevirke*, 20/11 1940, 5.

Judged by where in America the Danish Brotherhood was represented by local lodges in 1907, the organization followed the overall trend in Danish immigration regarding where immigrants settled. The five states with most members were all from the Midwest – Nebraska, Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin and Minnesota in that order – with California in 6th place,[82] the regions of America with most Danish immigrants.[83]

The Danish Brotherhood was a so-called ethnic fraternal benefit society, a type of organization that existed in a wide range of ethnic communities in America. As cited earlier, according to Michael G. Karnis, ethnic fraternal benefit societies were formed to offer "*mutual moral and material assistance*".[84] The societies also had an important social and cultural function, as seen in a Danish Brotherhood description of its objectives:

> "*The purpose is life assurance and benefits in cases of illness as well as national and sociable interests."*[85]

Apart from the practical and economic benefits, the most important purpose of the Danish Brotherhood was probably serving as a social community based on a shared Danish ethnicity. Many of these societies hoped to combine that with preservation of ethnic culture and facilitating Americanization at the same time.[86] The Danish Brotherhood thus welcomed assimilation and Americanization of the Danish immigrants. By using an ethnic identity and creating a separate ethnic social community, however, they created a structure that increased primary group relations with other Danish ethnics and thus preserved a certain ethnic identity for its members.[87]

Danish Brotherhood as it was created in 1882 was in other words an organization that was mainly targeted at immigrants, and as long as a steady flow of immigrants came from Denmark, the Danish Brotherhood had an increasing amount of potential members. When the Danish Brotherhood became aware of the decreasing immigration, some of the members began considering whether another re-evaluation of the Danish Brotherhood's identity and objectives was needed, just as when the Danish Brothers in Arms in America was changed to the Danish Brotherhood. Needless to say, those considerations once again started a heated and divided discussion within the organization: was a fundamental change in identity needed to survive as an organization in the changing times? And regardless, was such an identity change wanted? Before that problem arose, however, another problem had to be dealt with: the criticism against them that came from particularly Danish Church pastors when they were founded.

82 J. P. Paulsen, "Dansk Brodersamfund i Amerika", in Vig (ed.), *Danske i Amerika*, vol. 1, 219.
83 Jeppesen, *Danske i USA 1850-2000*, 171 and 333-334.
84 Karni, "Ethnic Benefit Assosications: An Introduction", 3.
85 "*Formaalet er Livsassurance og Understøttelse i Sygdomstilfælde samt nationale og selskabelige Tarv.*" Michael Salomon (ed.), *Salomons Almanak for 1916: De Forenede Staters Danske Almanak, Haand- og Aarbog.* (Seattle, Washington: Danish Publishing House of the Pacific Coast, 1916), 69.
86 John Bodnar, "Ethnic Fraternal Benefit Associations: Their Historical Development, Character and Significance" in Shreve and Vecoli (ed.), *Records of Ethnic Fratenal Benefit Associations in the United States*, 7.
87 Simonsen, *Kampen om danskheden*, 191.

4.2 Criticism

Despite being "*by far the strongest and most influential secular organization about the Danes in America*" as O. N. Nelson reported in 1897,[88] the Danish Brotherhood was not equally popular everywhere in the Danish immigrant community. Some pastors were particularly critical of the organization.

Among the earliest and sharpest critics of the Danish Brotherhood was F. L. Grundtvig, youngest son of N. F. S. Grundtvig and a leading figure in the Grundtvigian community in America. In 1887, F. L. Grundtvig wrote a harsh criticism of organizations like the Danish Brotherhood.[89] Grundtvig criticized it as being an example of "*idol worshipping societies*". It used religious terminology and rituals, but at the same time refused to specifically name the Christian God. Therefore, they were actually doing the Devil's work, F. L. Grundtvig argued.[90] Although the Danish Brotherhood refused that it had anything to do with religion, Grundtvig noted that the members recited the Lord's Prayer and the organization had a person it called its "chaplain".[91]

In order to become a member of a secret fraternal organization like the Danish Brotherhood, one had to swear an oath of loyalty and secrecy. For some, it was simply wrong for a Christian to swear an oath to a secular organization. Particularly a secret organization where you could not, by definition, know everything about the organization before you had sworn an oath and become a full member. You thus risked swearing an oath to serve an organization that would later proof to have un-Christian beliefs, which could be seen as very likely considering their "*idol worshipping*" character as F. L. Grundtvig described it.[92] Membership in secular organizations could be okay, Grundtvig argued, but advocating a "brotherhood" with non-Christians was wrong:

"*The only brotherhood for Christians is the church of our Lord Jesus Christ.*"[93]

The criticism of the Danish Brotherhood corresponded with experiences of other ethnic fraternal benefit societies in America. Both the Polish and Slovak ethnic communities were divided between Catholic and nationalist organizations. The Polish ethnics had two separate ethnic fraternal benefit societies: *Polish Roman Catholic Union* and *Polish National Alliance*, the latter allowing non-Catholic members and had a more ethnic focus than the former. Religious criticism of secular ethnic fraternal benefit societies was thus a common phenomena in ethnic communities in America.[94]

The Danish Brotherhood was obviously well aware of the allegations against them, as it was discussed in both the Danish ethnic newspapers in America and the Danish Church. In the member publication Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad, it was proposed to make the organization less secretive,[95] e.g., by passing Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad on to non-members to give them an insight into the organization's activities and ideas,[96] or by

88 O. N. Nelson (ed.), "Social Characteristics of the Danes and Their Societies" in *History of the Scandinavians and Successful Scandinavians in the United States*, vol. 2, second edition.(Minneapolis, Minnesota: O. N. Nelson & Company, 1901), 45.
89 Grundtvig, *Jesu Kristi Kirke og de Afgudsdyrkende Foreninger*.
90 Ibid., 3.
91 Ibid., 12.
92 "Den Danske Kirkes 7de Aarsmøde i Clinton, Iowa (Fortsat)" in *Dannevirke*, 30/9 1884, 5-6.
93 F. L. Grundtvig, "Svar til Hr. G. Elborg og Fremstilling af 'Forholdene i Clinton', 21/5 1885" in *Dannevirke*, 2/6 1885, 5.
94 Bodnar, "Ethnic Fraternal Benefit Associations", 9.
95 Waldemar M. Larsen, "Fra Rutland, Ia." in *Dansk Brodersamfunds Blad*, 1/2 1917, 1.
96 Hans N. Odgaard, "Vor Pligt" in *Dansk Brodersamfunds Blad*, 1/5 1916, 1.

cooperating more closely with Danish churches and schools in America.[97] The goal was to prevent further criticism and make the organization more attractive to potential new members, particularly after the mass immigration came to a stop and the organization struggled with attracting young Danish Americans. Less secrecy was not the only change that was proposed, though.

4.3 Identity Negotiation Through Language Debate

Since one of the Danish Brotherhood's main objectives was creating a social framework through which the memories from Denmark could be preserved and where members could socialize in the Danish language, the Danish ethnicity and culture have always been in the core of the Danish Brotherhood's identity. By studying the identity discussion in Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad, it is thus possible to understand how the Danish Brotherhood understood its own role in not only preserving Danish culture in America, but also the assimilation of Danish immigrants.

In the founding constitution of the Danish Brotherhood, Danish was decided to be the language used at Brotherhood meetings and activities. That members spoke Danish at meetings in the beginning was thus not a coincidence, but a deliberate decision. By writing the use of the Danish language into the constitution, the Danish Brotherhood showed that wanted its use to be continued even if the preferred language of Danish ethnics changed to English, since if it was not for the language criteria, the language would probably simply have automatically changed into English in that instance.

The language policy fit well with the organization's target group in the beginning, i.e., immigrants. For the Danish Americans, however, it was quite different: many could not speak or understand Danish, and even some of those who could were more comfortable in English. This was illustrated by Sophus Neble, who described a visit to a folk high school in 1912. The leaders of the folk high school proudly showed him around during the school hours to show how well the students spoke Danish, but Neble added that as soon as school was over, the Danish American students automatically changed into speaking English to each other.[98] Just a few years later, it was first proposed to start teaching in English at Grand View College, a Danish college and later university in America.[99] In the United Church, most Sunday schools taught in English by 1920,[100] and in the mid-1930s so did Danish Church Sunday schools.[101] In the first few decades of the 20th century, then, the Danish ethnic community began acknowledging that it was necessary to adapt to the changing language patterns of the Danish American generations. Requiring its members to speak Danish thus made the Danish Brotherhood less attractive for Danish Americans. Another goal for the Danish Brotherhood was to create a space where immigrants could share and recollect their memories from their lives in Denmark. This made the organization even less relevant for Danish Americans, having lived their entire lives in America.

97 Frank Tellesen, "Til Overvejelse" in *Dansk Brodersamfunds Blad*, 1/4 1916, 1.
98 Simonsen, *Kampen om danskheden*, 205-206.
99 Ibid., 208.
100 Ibid., 195.
101 Ibid., 210.

A third goal of the organization was economic support. This could, on the other hand, still be relevant and useful for Danish Americans. Therefore, some Danish Americans might have become members of the Danish Brotherhood simply for economic reasons even if they were not particularly interested in their Danish heritage. The likelihood of that is weakened, however, by the fact that non-ethnic benefit associations existed for non-ethnics or people uninterested in their ethnicity.[102]

The Danish Brotherhood was thus an organization that mostly appealed to immigrants, particularly those who had recently arrived. In the early 20th century, decreasing immigration combined with a decreasing inflow of new members of the Danish Brotherhood created a concern in parts of the organization. As seen in the membership statistics in the chapter "Origin and Objectives", membership of the Danish Brotherhood continuously rose up to over 21,000 until the 1920s where it decreased significantly. Thus, the Danish Brotherhood grew for when Danish immigrants still came America, but as soon as mass immigration stopped, the organization lost more and more members.

As soon as the First Wold War stopped, a discussion about language appeared in Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad. Members discussed whether the Danish Brotherhood should adapt to the changing demographics of the Danish ethnic community in America, with fewer immigrants and more Danish Americans, and as a consequence allow members to use the English language.

Proponents of the adoption of English were afraid that decreasing immigration and the inability or unwillingness of young Danish Americans to speak Danish would mean that new members of the organization would continue to drop. For that reason, they felt that the Danish Brotherhood had to adapt in order to make sure that young Danish Americans could take over when the older immigrant generations died.[103] If the organization failed to do that, Brotherhood member Christien Nielsen argued, the Danish Brotherhood would simply cease to exist, also noting that the Danish Brotherhood originally was founded when the Danish Brothers in Arms in America realized that few veterans immigrated and the organization thus decided to change significantly.[104] That worry was shared by the leaders of the Danish Brotherhood. On the cover of Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad on April 1, 1919, the president of the Danish Brotherhood, T. P. Nielsen, recommended all members to vote for a proposal to allow the use of English in the organization.[105]

Those who wanted to adopt, e.g., by allowing the use of English in the Danish Brotherhood thus feared that lack of change would result in having to close the organization due to a lack of members. Opponents of a language change feared the opposite: that allowing English would mean that the Danish Brotherhood would actually cease to exist. They pointed out that the Brotherhood was not just founded to provide economic and practical help for Danish immigrants, but also to serve as a social organization where people could speak Danish and keep the memory of Denmark and the Danish heritage alive. If Danish was no longer spoken, the Danish Brotherhood might as well remove the word "Danish" from its

102 E.g. Woodmen of the World, a benefit association, like the Danish Brotherhood based in Omaha, that the Danish Brotherhood merged with in 1995.
103 James Westergaard, "Fra Denver, Colorado" in *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, 1/5 1919, 3.
104 Christien Nielsen, "Sproget." in *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, 1/6 1919, 2.
105 T. P. Nielsen, "Meddelelse til alle Loger" in *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, 1/4 1919, 1.

name, as Arthur London argued.[106] How, then, would the Danish Brotherhood distinguish itself from other, non-ethnic fraternal benefit societies?[107] Opponents also warned people not to see the Danish Brotherhood as solely an assurance company and not make big changes just because it made sense as a business decision; by doing that, e.g., through removing some of the Danish ethnic components of the organization, "Danish" might as well be removed from the organization's name.[108] If young Danish Americans would not even bother to learn Danish, they were not worthy to become members anyway, some added.[109]

A change in the immigration pattern as well as an increasingly assimilated Danish ethnic community, particularly Danish Americans, thus started a debate within the Danish Brotherhood about the fundamental goals and character of the organization. In the center of the debate was the question of how Danish and how American the organization was – and what "Danishness" at all meant for Danish ethnics in America. The debate was roughly divided into two groups: one who wanted to Americanize by adopting the English language and focusing more on Danish Americans; and another for whom the use of the Danish language and an adherence to Danish heritage was the main thing that legitimized the Danish Brotherhood, and removing the special status of the Danish language would thus render the organization meaningless.

The language debate was thus also an identity negotiation: should the Danish Brotherhood resist adaptation and fight for the preservation of Danish culture as it existed for the immigrants, including spreading the Danish language to Danish American generations; or was it both natural and desirable to embrace an American identity and only preserve parts of Danish culture if it was useful in American society? That question became even more important over time, as Danish Americans dominated the ethnic community yet more.

At first, the opponents of the language and identity change won: the proposal put forth in 1919 to allow the use of English was not passed, although individual members could now be allowed to speak English if absolutely necessary.[110] In the longer run, however, proponents of adaption came to lead the evolution of the Danish Brotherhood.

5 Danish People's Society

5.1 Origin and Objectives

As described earlier, Danish People's Society[111] was founded in 1887 by Frederik Lange Grundtvig. Danish People's Society had a wide range of tasks it wanted to undertake or support, as explained in the invitation published in 1887 encouraging people to join:

> "*Gather Danes on a few places in order for a strong Danish spiritual life to thrive, establishing and supporting Danish schools, also an extended folk high school, organizing folk meetings, creating Danish book collections, publishing Danish books,*

106 Arthur London, "Sproget." in *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, 1/8 1919, 5.
107 A. Fonnesbæk, "Til Over-Præsidenten." in *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, 1/5 1919, 2; Julius E. Larsen, "Sproget." in *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, 1/5 1919, 3; and J. P. Jørgensen, "Hvor bærer det hen?" in *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, 1/6 1919, 2-3.
108 "Sproget." in *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, 1/6 1919, 1.
109 Peter P. Scott, "Mere om Sproget." in *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, 1/6 1919, 3; and N. Jørgensen, "Et Vagt i Gevær." in *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, 1/6 1919, 1.
110 "De Nye Love.", *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, 1/11 1919, 2.
111 Typically referred to by its Danish name, "Dansk Folkesamfund"

> *creating a home for the young people in the cities, forming mutual benefit societies without secondary purposes, and cooperation with our Nordic kin when such can be done without abandoning our own.*"[112]

Although one of Danish People's Society's goals in other words was gathering Danish immigrants, he organization never achieved a particularly high number of members:

Year	**Members**
1888	560
1889[113]	782
1892[114]	1,036
1899[115]	369
1903[116]	170
1904[117]	250
1920[118]	565

Table 5. Number of members of Danish People's Society.

The tasks that Danish People's Society wanted to be involved with were mostly something that had been attempted earlier by other Danish immigrants, e.g., the creation of Danish colonies as explained in the next chapter, "Danish Colonies in America". The founders of Danish People's Society were aware of this:

> "*There are already a large number of Danish organizations with different purposes; but we believe to have learned that there is a need for an organization than can gather all those here in America who agree to want to preserve what is Danish and make or support a serious effort to enhance the spiritual heritage of our fathers and make it fruitful, not just for ourselves and our old fatherland, but also for the country to which we have now build so strong ties.*"[119]

This quote makes several important points regarding the founding ideas of Danish People's Society.

First of all, it wanted to support the already existing efforts to preserve Danish culture in America and create a framework under which the cultural work in the Danish ethnic community could continue. In the invitation from April 13, 1887, Danish People's Society acknowledged that the wide range of tasks it hoped to work with could justifiably be seen as too much for an organization its size.[120] Rather than a realistic list of short-term goals, it was a way of expressing the main objective of Danish People's Society: gathering everyone who wanted to preserve Danish culture in America, and supporting all steps taken in that direction.

---

112 "*Samling af Danske paa enkelte Steder som betingelse for, at et stærkt dansk Aandsliv skal kunne trives, Oprettelse og Understøttelse af danske Skoler, ogsaa en udvidet Højskole, Afholdelse af folkelige Møder, Oprettelse af danske Bogsamlinger, Udgivelse af danske Bøger, Indretning af Hjem for de unge i Byerne, Dannelse af gensidige Hjælpeforeninger uden Biformaal, og Samarbejde med nordiske Frænder, naar dette kan ske uden Opgivelse af vort eget.*"
F. L. Grundtvig, "Indbydelse til at indtræde i 'Dansk Folkesamfund'" in *Dannevirke*, 13/4 1887, 6.

113 L. Henningsen, *Dansk Folkesamfund i Amerika 1887-1912. 25 Aars Virksomhed Jubilæumshefte* (Aarhus: S. Jensen Sort, 1914), 16.

114 Ibid., 17.

115 Simonsen, *Kampen om danskheden*, 173.

116 Ibid., 175-176.

117 Ibid., 177.

118 "De danskfødte i Amerika" in *Dannevirke*, 29/11 1922, 3.

119 "*Der er jo allerede her i Amerika et stort Antal af danske Foreninger med forskellige Formaal; men vi mener at have erfaret, at der er trang til en Forening, som kunde samle alle dem, der er enige om, her i Amerika at ville bevare det danske, og gjøre eller støtte et alvorligt Arbejde for at øge Fædrenes aandelige Arv og gjøre den frugtbringende, ikke blot til Gavn for os selv og vort gamle Fædreland, men for det Land, hvortil vi nu er knyttede med saa stærke Baand.*"
Ibid.

120 Ibid.

F. L. Grundtvig's motivation for founding Danish People's Society was perhaps expressed most clearly in an article written a few months later when it was clear that the members of Danish People's Society wanted to re-elect him as the leader of the organization, something he only did hesitantly as he, probably rightfully so, thought that part of the criticism aimed at Danish People's Society was actually meant as criticism of him. He chose to end the article with the following:

> "*Now or never! seems to be the message to our people in America. Who wants to take part?*"[121]

The message is clear: if Danish culture was to survive in America, a collective and intensified effort towards preserving it was necessary. Hence the consciously optimistic and extensive list of tasks: every available tool needed to be used if Danish culture and language was to survive in America, something Danish People's Society feared was in danger of not happening.

Secondly, the quote from earlier in the chapter shows that Danish People's Society did not intend Danish immigrants to isolate themselves completely within their own ethnic group or ignore the surrounding American society. Quite the contrary, it was an expression of how the organization defined America. Danish People's Society argued that what made America unique was that it was a country of immigrants. The immigrant nature meant that many different ethnic groups and cultures met and shared ideas. Only by preserving their own ethnic culture could ethnic groups contribute to American society with the best each individual ethnic culture had to offer. F. L. Grundtvig called America "*Folkestævnets Land*" – a phrase that is difficult to translate into English, but may be translated as "the country where peoples meet."[122] That is an important phrase in the understanding of Danish People's Society's vision for the Danish ethnic community and America as a whole.

According to Danish People's Society, working towards preserving Danish culture in America, e.g., in exclusive Danish colonies was thus not contrary to the ideals of America, and was not an indication that they opposed any kind of integration into American society. As Tine Wanning has also argued, Grundtvigians in America in general did not want complete ethnic isolation, but e.g. accepted English as a necessary business language.[123]

In the list of tasks which the Danish People's Society wanted to undertake, "*an extended folk high school*" is mentioned.[124] That refers to the idea that folk high schools should not just teach culture and history, but teach practical, useable skills for young Danish ethnics to use as farmers, teachers, etc. Part of an extended folk high school curriculum was also typically English classes. In short, proponents of extended folk high schools thought that folk high schools should teach the young immigrants and Danish Americans skills that they could use in American society.

The same willingness to adapt to the surrounding American society can also be seen in the changes that happened to the "*Songbook for the Danish People in America*", published by

121 "*Nu eller aldrig! tror jeg det lyder til vort folk i Amerika. Hvem vil være med?*"
F. L. Grundtvig, "Dansk Folkesamfund" in *Dannevirke*, 31/8 1887, 7.

122 Henrik Bredmose Simonsen, "Grundtvigian Danish-Americans – a story of preservation and renewal of cultural and religious traditions" in *The Bridge*, vol. 32, no. 2. (2012), 9-36.

123 Tine Wanning, "Danish-American Grundtvigians" in Steffen Elmer Jørgensen, Lars Scheving, and Niels Peter Stilling (ed.), *From Scandinavia to America: Proceedings from a Conference Held at Gl. Holtegaard.* (Odense: Odense University Press 1987), 242.

124 Henningsen, *Dansk Folkesamfund i Amerika 1887-1912*, 4.

Danish People's Society. The songbook became very popular and extensively used, but also gave F. L. Grundtvig the – not overly friendly – nickname "the Trimmer". The nickname referred to his practice of editing many of the Danish songs, sometimes quite extensively, before they were printed in the songbook. The purpose was to clean out the phrases and verses that particularly Danish Americans could not relate to: detailed descriptions of the Danish countryside, Danish events that were of no significance in America, etc. At other times a traditional Danish melody was changed if the Danish ethnic community had begun singing the song to a new melody.[125]

Despite F. L. Grundtvig's ideas about the importance of the Danish language, the uniqueness of Danish culture, and the need to preserve both, he and Danish People's Society were thus not immune to change or refused to adapt to the changing Danish ethnic community. This was needed in order to appeal to particularly Danish Americans. Danish culture needed to appeal to people if they were to keep it alive, and culture was worth nothing if it was not alive, they thought. At the other hand, although Danish People's Society did not advocate complete isolation or refuse to take part in the surrounding American society, their first priority was making sure that the Danish immigrants did not lose their ethnic culture. Certain degrees of Americanization and integration into American society was accepted, but it had to happen on the immigrants' own terms, and there were clear limits to how far it could go. E.g., the loss of the Danish language was unacceptable.[126]

F. L. Grundtvig and Danish People's Society were thus early advocates of cultural pluralism. According to Milton M. Gordon, the goal of cultural pluralism is:

> "*to maintain enough subsocietal separation to guarantee the continuance of the ethnic cultural tradition and the existence of the group, without at the same time interfering with the carrying out of standard responsibilities to the general American civic life. In effect, this demands keeping primary group relations across ethnic lines sufficiently minimal to prevent a significant amount of intermarriage, while cooperating with other groups and individuals in secondary relations areas of political action, economic life, and civic responsibility.*"[127]

That was exactly Danish People's Society's goal: to create separate ethnic structures, e.g.. colonies, that automatically meant that Danish ethnics' primary group relations were with other Danish ethnics rather than, e.g., members of core society. Danish People's Society was not the first American immigrant group to attempt this. In 1818, Irish immigrants petitioned Congress to allocate a piece of land reserved exclusively for Irish immigrants to settle in. Congress denied the petition, fearing that it would inspire other ethnic groups to do the same, with a far too fragmented nation as the result. This decision was particularly important, Gordon says. It meant that if "*ethnic communality was to be achieved* [it] *must be achieved through voluntary action*". And several ethnic groups tried just that, among them immigrants from Denmark's neighbors Norway, Sweden and Germany.[128]

Danish People's Society, in other words, walked in the footsteps of ethnic groups who had immigrated earlier. As one example, John A. Hawgood argued that: "[t]*o a large extent, the*

125 Marianne Stølen, *The Story of Den Røde – A Danish-American songbook*. (København: Vartov, 2010).
126 Simonsen, *Kampen om danskheden*, 100-101.
127 Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life*, 158.
128 Ibid., 133-134.

Germans used their language as a weapon to ward off Americanization and assimilation, and used every social milieu, the home, the church, the school, the press, in the fight to preserve the German language, even among their children and grandchildren."[129] This is also an apt description of the Danish People's Society's vision.

Danish People's Society was thus an excellent example of a cultural pluralist ethnic organization. While acknowledging civic duties as American citizens, their goal was to create separate ethnic structures in order to minimize primary group relations with people outside of the Danish ethnic community, thus minimizing assimilation and thereby hopefully making sure that the Danish language and culture survived, not just among immigrants, but through the children and grandchildren of the immigrants as well.

5.2 Danish Colonies in America

Danish People's Society wanted to support cultural activities and work wherever Danish ethnics were already living, but perhaps most important, and certainly most interesting for this thesis, was their wish to "[g]*ather Danes on a few places in order for a strong Danish spiritual life to thrive*"[130]. In other words, Danish People's Society wanted to create a number of Danish colonies in America so that Danish cultural preservation would have better conditions for surviving.

In 1894, Danish People's Society founded the colony of Danevang, Texas – a rarity in America as few Danish immigrants in that period settled in the southern states.[131] In 1905, the Danish People's Society formed the settlement of Askov, Minnesota[132], and in 1917, it started its only colony outside of the United States with Dalum in Alberta, Canada.[133] Danish People's Society founded other settlements as well.

As explained by Milton M. Gordon, primary group relations with people of other ethnicities or American core society was one of the most common causes of assimilation.[134] The more interaction an immigrant had with people outside of their own ethnic group and therefore people who were unable to speak the immigrant's native language, the faster language assimilation, i.e., adopting the language of the core group, happened. Conversely, immigrants who lived in an area with a high concentration of people with the same ethnicity as their own were much less likely to assimilate. This was the idea that Danish People's Society based their colonial activities on: the best way to preserve Danish culture and language was to create parallel ethnic communities and structures that minimized primary group relations with people outside of the Danish ethnic community, thus minimizing assimilation.

The idea to keep Danish culture alive in America by founding Danish colonies was not an idea invented by Danish People's Society. Rather, it had been attempted several times before, occasionally also by founders of Danish People's Society.

129 John A. Hawgood, *The Tragedy of German-America*. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1940), 39.
130 "Samling af Danske paa enkelte Steder, som Betingelse for, at et stærkt, dansk Aandsliv skal kunne trives" F. L. Grundtvig, "Indbydelse til at indtræde i 'Dansk Folkesamfund'" in *Dannevirke*, 14/4 1887, 6.
131 Henningesen, *Dansk Folkesamfund i Amerika 1887-1912,* 25-30.
132 *Ibid.*, 33.
133 Bethlehem Lutheran Church, *The History of Dalum*. (Drumheller, Alberta: Big County News, 1968), 5-6.
134 See the chapter "Assimilation Theory".

One of the earliest attempts to gather the Danish immigrants in a Danish colony in America was done by Lars Hannibal in 1871. Lars Hannibal immigrated to Wisconsin in 1856 from the Danish island of Lolland. In 1871, he received an offer from a railroad company that wanted to build a railroad through Nebraska, which had only been a state for four years at that time and was therefore mostly empty except for a few native American groups who had refused to abide by the 1867 forced displacement of Native Americans when Nebraska became a state. Under the name *The Danish Land and Homestead Co.*, a group of Danish immigrants led by Lars Hannibal settled in Howard County, Nebraska and founded the city Dannebrog, named after the Danish flag. Eventually, several Danish ethnic organizations were represented in Dannebrog, among them both the Danish Brotherhood and Danish People's Society. Three years after Dannebrog, another Danish colony called Dannevirke emerged close by, and in 1883 Nysted joined the two others.[135]

During a Danish Church meeting in Clinton, Iowa in 1884, Rasmus Hansen from Elk Horn, Iowa suggested that the Danish Church should prepare the formation of a colony for Danish immigrants who were living in the cities but would rather live in the countryside. The others agreed, and a committee consisting of pastors, among whom were F. L. Grundtvig, was appointed to find a suitable place. In 1885, the committee bought what would become the Danish colony of Danebod, Minnesota.[136] On July 14, 1885, F. L. Grundtvig wrote an article in Dannevirke about the colony. Mostly centered on the quality of the soil in the area, the article ended on an interesting note. He wrote:

> "*Moreover, I do not wish others to purchase land in the Danish colony than those who – if it was necessary – were willing to sacrifice something in order to live in a large and vigorous Danish people's society.*"[137]

In 1885, two years prior to the formation of Danish People's Society, F. L. Grundtvig thus actually used the very phrase that would become the organization's name as a way to describe what he saw as the ultimate goal of the Danish colony of Danebod. It is likely experiences like this that inspired F. L. Grundtvig to form the Danish People's Society, as he saw that it was possible to gather Danish immigrants interested in making an effort to preserve the Danish culture in America.

The harsh criticism against the Danish Brotherhood can also be seen as part of the motivation for Grundtvig to create Danish People's Society. In 1885, Grundtvig wrote an article in Dannevirke where he disagreed with certain critics of the Brotherhood who he said argued that creating a benefit association for all Danish immigrants, including those who were not members of the Danish Church, was wrong. That exclusivist opinion was potentially very harmful to the Danish ethnic community, he warned:

> "*Let us use all available, honest means against certain enemies that are very harmful to Church life; but one of the most effective will be supporting the creation of other Danish benefit associations and the initiated unification of these.*"[138]

135 Salomon (ed.), *Salomons Almanak for 1916*, 159-163.
136 Vig, *Danske i Amerika*, vol. 2, 346.
137 "*For øvrigt ønsker jeg ikke, at andre skal kjøbe Land i den danske koloni end de, der - om saa skulde være - var villige til at ofre noget, for at komme til at leve i et stort og livskraftigt dansk Folkesamfund.*"
F. L. Grundtvig, "Den danske Koloni i Minnesota" in *Dannevirke*, 14/7 1885, 7.
138 "*Lad os endelig bruge alle de forhaandenværende ærlige Midler mod visse for Menighedslivet saa farlige Fjender; men et af de virksomste vil være at støtte Oprettelsen af andre danske Hjælpeforeninger og den paabegyndte Sammenslutning af disse.*"
F. L. Grundtvig, "Kirken og Hjælpeforeningerne" in *Dannevirke*, 7/4 1885, 5.

The Danish Church had also been involved in Danish folk high schools, children's schools and other institutions that supported Danish cultural life in America, and things that the Danish People's Society wanted to create and support. The list of tasks that Danish People's Society hoped to work with thus had a certain overlap with activities the Danish Church was involved with. None of those activities had exclusively been done by the Danish Church, however. Rather than being an attempt to co-opt Danish Church activities and thus an attack on the Danish Church, it was an attempt to create a framework under which work for the benefit of Danish culture in America could be done in order to strengthen the entire Danish ethnic community. It was also an attempt to outcompete certain groups Danish People's Society saw as harmful, though, most notably the Danish Brotherhood.

5.3 Criticism

Just as F. L. Grundtvig attacked the Danish Brotherhood harshly, some Danish immigrant pastors attacked Danish People's Society when they were founded. Reasons for criticism varied, but it was usually Inner Mission pastors who disagreed with the vision of actively preserving Danish culture in America.

Reacting to a private letter sent to him shortly after the founding of Danish People's Society, editor of Dannevirke and member of Danish People's Society M. Holst invited critics of the organization to speak out publicly instead of doing it in private.[139] Pastor Søholm accepted the invitation and wrote the first public criticism in Dannevirke, the newspaper also used by the Danish People's Society for publishing messages. Under the modest title "*Lidt Kritik*"[140] – "A little criticism" – he criticized the Danish People's Society for two things, points that generally corresponded with most of the criticism against the organization:

1. They worked in secret and operated by infiltrating the Danish Church.
2. It could lead only to splitting the Danish Church.

His first point referred to Grundtvig's way of finding support for the organization up to its founding. Since he only wanted the most dedicated and enthusiastic supporters of Danish culture in America to join Danish People's Society, he contacted the people he thought would most agree with the idea. In the initial preparatory work, then, he did not declare it publicly and did not work through the Danish Church, but contacted individuals privately who he thought might be interested. This, Søholm argued, was in reality working in secret against the Danish Church. Søholm thought that the only right way to have done it would be to go through him as the pastor in the area. It could only be because Grundtvig feared too much opposition from parts of the Danish Church that he chose to circumvent it. Pastor A. S. Nielsen repeated this point the following week. Why did Danish People's Society go behind the backs of some of the pastors by working in secret?[141]

The second point added to the first, arguing that the activities of Danish People's Society could only be seen as a way to rally Grundtvig's supporters and create a structure through which he could give the supporters orders and thus increase his power within the church. Therefore, what Søholm actually argued was that Danish People's Society was a secret,

139 M. Holst, "Et Par Ord i Anledning af Dansk Folkesamfund' og den 'stille' Kritik" in *Dannevirke*, 29/6 1887, 6.
140 A. L. J. Søholm, "Lidt Kritik" in *Dannevirke*, 13/7 1887, 6.
141 A. S. Nielsen, "Dansk Folkesamfund" in *Dannevirke*, 20/7 1887, 5-6.

sectarian group for Grundtvigians, and such an attempt to strengthen the Grundtvigian part of the Danish Church could only result in splitting the church.

Danish People's Society accepted neither point. Replying to Søholm, M. Holst refused to accept the premise of his criticism. Danish People's Society could not be said to have gone behind the back of him as a pastor in the area as it was not a church matter, he argued. Since Grundtvig did not ask the congregation as a group to join Danish People's Society, Søholm had no special right to be informed when Grundtvig contacted a member of his congregation regarding a matter not related to the church.[142]

Holst also did not accept that Danish People's Society could be blamed for a possible splitting of the church. If the church was to split, it was certainly not Danish People's Society that was the root of the disagreements, he remarked,[143] probably alluding to the fact that a fundamental disagreement on a wide range of religious and cultural issues between the Inner Mission and Grundtvigians had been part of the Danish Church since its was founded. If the church was to split, which it eventually did in when Inner Mission and conservative pastors left the Danish Church in 1894, is was likely a consequence of that old disagreement. F. L. Grundtvig also argued that Danish People's Society was not an attempt to rally his Grundtvigian supporters by simply referring to the list of members of the organization which included non-Grundtvigians, even Inner Mission pastors.[144]

Another point of criticism was that Søholm sa it was problematic that Danish People's Society accepted all who were "*not enemies of the Christian church*" as members.[145] If "not enemies" was the same as "friends" of the Christian church, Søholm argued, Danish People's Society was working against the Danish Church by trying to recruit its members into another own religious organization, i.e., Danish People's Society.[146]

Then, of course, there was the discussion of the role of Danish culture in America, and whether preserving it was possible or even right. Danish People's Society obviously thought that it was both possible and right. Søholm wrote in "Lidt Kritik" that the only reason he could think of for Grundtvig to work in secret was to avoid opposition.[147] And perhaps rightly so: the fundamental idea of Danish People's Society was to gather all those who were most enthusiastic about working to preserve the Danish culture in America. Grundtvig himself wrote that if it was clear that a certain individual would be against e.g. trying to preserve the Danish language in America, it would be pointless to ask him to join the effort, and being as urgent a matter as Grundtvig thought it was - "*Now or never!*"[148] – the delay caused by going through the church was potentially disastrous for the survival of the Danish culture in America.[149] Since many of the leading critics did not want to take part in the cultural preservation work anyway, and since the tasks undertaken by Danish People's Society were

142 M. Holst, "Vort Kirkesamfund og 'Dansk Folkesamfund'" in *Dannevirke*, 20/7 1887, 6.
143 M. Holst, "Et Par Ord i Anledning af Dansk Folkesamfund' og den 'stille' Kritik" in *Dannevirke*, 29/6 1887, 6.
144 F. L. Grundtvig, "Aabent Brev til Pastor Søholm" in *Dannevirke*, 20/7 1887, 6.
145 F. L. Grundtvig, "Indbydelse til at indtræde i 'Dansk Folkesamfund'" in *Dannevirke*, 13/4 1887, 7.
146 A. L. J. Søholm, "Lidt Kritik" in *Dannevirke*, 13/7 1887, 6.
147 Ibid.
148 "Nu eller aldrig"
149 F. L. Grundtvig, "Dansk Folkesamfund" in *Dannevirke*, 31/8, 1887, p. 7.

not of a religious but rather a cultural nature, disapproval of handling the issues outside of the Danish Church seemed out of place, he argued.[150]

Using language as a way to discuss Danish culture in America in general, Th. Lyngby argued in the Dannevirke-article "*Det danske Sprogs Fremtid i Amerika*"[151] that while the immigrants should not actively try to eradicate Danish culture in America or consciously speed up americanization, they should accept americanization and not actively try to slow it down. While it was natural for immigrants to feel attached to the Danish language, there was no reason to believe that Danish Americans would speak it unless they had to. Continuing to speak Danish as long as immigrants still arrived was important in order to give them a voice in the Danish ethnic community, but a transition towards the use of English was still necessary.[152]

Søholm repeatedly tried to make the Danish Church dissolve Danish People's Society. At the 1887 national convention in the Danish Church, the first national convention to take place after the founding of Danish People's Society, Søholm repeated the criticism: by not going through Søholm, Grundtvig had acted inappropriately when preparing for the founding of Danish People's Society. Other pastors criticized Danish People's Society for accepting non-Christians as members, or were even critical of the practice of accepting Baptists and other non-Lutheran, non-Danish Church Christians. Despite the criticism, only 5 people voted for Søholm's proposal while 255 voted against it.[153] While the proposal was not passed, Grundtvig admitted a year later that the criticism had limited the Danish People's Society's growth.[154] In 1889, the critics actually persuaded a discouraged and pessimistic Grundtvig to give up Danish People's Society – although Danish People's Society members soon convinced him to stay anyway.[155]

F. L. Grundtvig's delusion in 1889 was a foreshadowing of things to come. While Danish People's Society had 1,036 members in 1892, in 1899 it had just 369 members. In 1900, F. L. Grundtvig wrote that Danish People's Society was "worth nothing" and should be closed as it was actually harmful to the Danish ethnic community. In June the same year, he left America and returned to Denmark where he died three years later. In 1902, after holding the position for just two years, leader of Danish People's Society, J. Chr. Bay, resigned. The same year, a majority of members favored a proposal to close Danish People's Society, although the proposal failed to achieve the required two-thirds majority to succeed. In 1903, only 170 people were members of the Danish People's Society and the newly elected leader, A. Th. Dorf, actually recommended closing the organization, although the proposal failed with 47 against and 38 for. The disillusion in Danish People's Society reflected a general phenomena in the Grundtvigian environment in America. In the beginning of the 20th century, Danish American generations amounted to about half of the Danish ethnic population, and more and more people began to doubt whether preserving a separate Danish ethnic community and culture was possible. In 1904, though, a new leadership was elected that actually believed in

150 F. L. Grundtvig, "Den danske Kirke og dansk Folkesamfund" in *Dannevirke*, 27/7 1887, 6.
151 "The future of the Danish language in America"
152 Th. Lyngby, "Det danske Sprogs Fremtid i Amerika" in *Dannevirke*, 7/9 1887, 5-6.
153 Henningsen, *Dansk Folkesamfund i Amerika 1887-1912*, 11-15.
154 Ibid., 16.
155 *Ibid.*, 20-25.

the cause of the Danish People's Society. The optimism attracted more members, now 250, and the success of Askov, Minnesota, a Danish colony that the new leaders founded in 1905, added to that optimism.[156]

Repeated attempts at shutting Danish People's Society down were thus averted, and several proposals by members to abolish the organization were also not successful. The persistent harsh criticism likely inhibited the growth of the organization, though. They even succeeded in making Grundtvig himself lose hope in the survival of Danish culture in America in 1889, returning home to Denmark a year later. During its history, Danish People's Society never had more than 1,036 members at the same time. A relevant question to ask then is whether that was entirely because the criticism scared Danish immigrants away from the organization, or if Danish People's Society maybe advocated a vision for Danish culture in America that only few Danish immigrants share. That will be analyzed later in the thesis.

6 Analysis

6.1 Danish Brotherhood Americanization

What the gradual americanization of the Danish Brotherhood says about the organization cannot be determined if the cause behind the change is not understood fully. Was the Danish Brotherhood americanized due to a conscious wish to facilitate assimilation among Danish immigrants, or did the organization simply adapt to the gradually more assimilated and americanized Danish ethnics in order to survive as an organization?

Once again, it is relevant to study Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad. From the very beginning of the magazine's publication in 1916, some members wanted to allow English at meetings, and there were hints of a wish to change the identity of the organization from an immigrant organization to an organization open for all Danish ethnics. Only a few years later, the language debate was properly unfolded and dominated the debate in the magazine.

Yet, it was not until 1941, 25 years later, that Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad adopted the English language and was renamed Danish Brotherhood Magazine; long after members had pointed out that the Danish immigrants and particularly their Danish American descendants mainly used English, or in the case of many Danish Americans did not understand Danish at all, and at least 25 years after the first expressions, e.g., by leaders of the Danish Brotherhood that change was needed if the Danish Brotherhood were to survive and grow. During that time, opinions were very divided, with some even opposing a language change although they accepted the notion that the organization would eventually have to close if the change did not happen.

Changing from an immigrant organization where only Danish was spoken to a Danish American organization where English was allowed was not the last time changing conditions in the Danish ethnic community led to changing policies in the Danish Brotherhood. Describing its own history in a centennial folder celebrating its 100 year anniversary in 1982, the Danish Brotherhood claimed to be an organization that was "[*c*]*hanging to meet changing needs"*. First, they went from allowing only Danish immigrants to also welcoming Danish

156 Simonsen, *Kampen om danskheden*,174-188.

Americans as members, then daughters, and in 1961 wives were accepted as members, effectively making them a "*family organization*" as the centennial folder described it. Later, everyone with an interest in Denmark and Danish culture was accepted as members regardless of their ethnic heritage,[157] technically meaning that they were no longer an ethnic organization, although few non-Danish ethnics likely actually joined the Danish Brotherhood.

The gradual americanization of the Danish Brotherhood can thus be concluded as being a, sometimes reluctant, reaction to pressure from the gradually more assimilated Danish ethnic community rather than as an active attempt to assimilate and americanize the Danish immigrants. That the change was reactive rather than an attempt to further assimilation for Danish ethnics was also expressed repeatedly by the proponents of the change themselves, arguing that attracting Danish Americans had to become first priority due to the end of European mass immigration, and that significant changes were needed if what was to be possible. The Danish Brotherhood underwent several significant changes at different times in its history that were directly meant as attempts to adapt to a changing demographic and changing conditions among the Danish ethnic community in order to appeal to Danish ethnics and continue as an organization.

At the same time, one of the Danish Brotherhood's objectives was helping Danish immigrants become American citizens. In that respect, they may have intensified the Americanization they later had to adapt to. John Bodnar has countered claims that the Polish ethnic fraternal benefit societies primarily slowed the assimilation down, arguing that such claims missed the americanizing work they also did.[158] Yet one cannot deny that significant parts of the Danish Brotherhood were very reluctant to adapt to the gradually more assimilated immigrant and Danish American population. Helping immigrants become American citizens is in itself not enough evidence to characterize the Danish Brotherhood as working towards assimilation if at the same time there were significant attempts to counter the assimilation on other factors in assimilation, language being among the most important. Simply becoming citizens of America does not mean assimilation into American core society.

In analyzing the gradual assimilation of the Danish Brotherhood, it is useful to relate developments of the organization to Gordon's 7 types of assimilation. Of the 7 types, 3 are of primary interest in relation to ethnic organizations: cultural assimilation, structural assimilation and identificational assimilation.

As an ethnic organization, by definition the Danish Brotherhood counteracted structural assimilation as it organized the Danish immigrants in a separate ethnic social and cultural community. By creating an organization where social and cultural activities were done in a community exclusively reserved for people of a certain ethnicity, that meant lesser primary group relations with people of other ethnicities as well as core society, and thus less structural assimilation.[159]

By emphasizing the shared Danish heritage of its members, the Brotherhood also resisted identificational assimilation. Helping its members become American citizens and acknowledging the civic responsibilities that came with such citizenship – i.e. also identifying

157 Danish American Archive and Library, DBL-2000, Nebraska, Omaha, Headquarters, Box 23, Centennial Files 1982.
158 Bodnar, "Ethnic Fraternal Benefit Associations", 13.
159 Simonsen, *Kampen om danskheden*,191-193.

as American – is not advocating identificational assimilation. According to Gordon, identificational assimilation requires a "*sense of peoplehood based exclusively on host society*".[160] An organization does not have an exclusively American identity if they also identify as Danish, e.g., by naming the organization the *Danish* Brotherhood in America.

Since the Danish Brotherhood was neither based on structural nor identificational assimilation, it is tempting to classify the organization as cultural pluralists, at least when it was founded. E.g. the Danish Brotherhood consciously chose to use the Danish language, thereby preserving the native language of the immigrants. Language is an important factor in acculturation, and adopting the language of core society, in this case English, is usually the first process to occur for immigrants, often even for people living in ethnic colonies with minimal primary group relations with core society.[161]

Some indications of at least a partial acculturation was visible already at the organization's founding, however. Most notable was the fraternal structure of the organization. Describing the Danish Brotherhood in 1897, Danish journalist Henrik Cavling called it "*peculiar*" and wrote that while it had "*externally a strong national tone, internally it organized with the secret American Masonic organizations as a role model*"[162]. Influence of American culture is thus visible from the beginning, e.g., by structuring the organization in a way that was popular in America, as a fraternal society. Henrik Bredmose Simonsen argued that already in the immigrant generation, the social functions of the Danish Brotherhood were by far most important and according to him, the cultural issue was not much more than an adherence to a poorly defined 'Danishness".[163]

Over time, as the changing demographic and gradual assimilation of Danish ethnics in America made the Danish Brotherhood change accordingly to attract new members, the Danish Brotherhood became increasingly acculturated. An obvious change was when the Danish Brotherhood changed from publishing their member magazine in Danish to doing it in English and allowed the use of English at meetings. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the adoption of the language of core society is a clear indication of acculturation. When the Danish Brotherhood allowed English and changed the language of its member magazine, what happened was thus a significant step in the direction of acculturation.

Furthermore, a point that has not been discussed in the thesis so far is the many American cultural activities that took place within the Danish Brotherhood, e.g. Danish Brotherhood bowling leagues.[164] This was usual for ethnic fraternal benefit associations, particularly from the 1920s and 1930s when immigration halted. From this period, ethnic fraternal benefit associations like the Danish Brotherhood were increasingly involved in cultural activities and sports rather than the assurance and other economic activities that were more dominating earlier.[165] That development culminated in 1995 when the national organization of the Danish Brotherhood, along with its assurance policies, merged with the non-ethnic fraternal benefit society Woodmen of the World. What was left of the Danish Brotherhood was a number of

160 Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life*, 71.
161 Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life*, 77-78.
162 "*udadtil […] en stærk national Tone, indadtil organiserede det med de hemmelige amerikanske Frimurerforeninger som Forbillede*" Henrik Cavling, *Fra Amerika. Del 2*. (Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandels Forlag, 1897), 145-146.
163 Simonsen, *Kampen om danskheden*, 193.
164 Addison Erwin Sheldon (ed.), *Nebraska: The Land and the People*, volume 2. (Chicago: The Lewis Publishing Company, 1931), 32.
165 Bodnar, "Ethnic Fraternal Benefit Associations", 10-11.

individual lodges that decided to continue without the national organization and the assurance policies embedded in it.[166]

It is more precise, then, to classify the Danish Brotherhood as an example of what Gordon called "structural pluralism". This was increasingly the case the more acculturated the Danish Brotherhood became. The Danish Brotherhood did not become structurally assimilated when they became acculturated. As Gordon pointed out, structural assimilation automatically leads to cultural assimilation, but not necessarily the other way around.[167] As the organization changed, then, culturally it became increasingly like American core society, but it still remained structurally separated along ethnic lines, e.g, by discussing Danish cultural issues in the English language, or organizing Danish ethnic tournaments in a quintessentially American sport like bowling.

The changes were not always welcomed positively by all members. The language debate is an example of a proposed change that was very controversial, and the proposals to allow or change completely to English were met with strong opposition from at least part of the members of the organization who argued that adapting too much – e.g., abandoning the Danish language and thus part of the Danish cultural heritage – would effectively eliminate the specifically Danish character of the organization, and thus make the organization pointless. Yet, the organization eventually changed its language to English and proposed other changes on issues that were seen by some as crucial for the Danish ethnic character of the Danish Brotherhood.

The Danish Brotherhood often adapted to American society much later than the Danish ethnic community generally, e.g., only changing its language after many years of discussions where Danish ethnics as well as many other ethnic organizations had increasingly adopted the English language. The adaptations of the Danish Brotherhood were often compromises based on necessity rather than conscious and proactive steps towards assimilation. Yet, many of those changes happened eventually, and thus the Danish Brotherhood gradually became acculturated, adapting to the general Danish ethnic community's trend in the same direction. Overall, the Danish Brotherhood can be said to have not contributed significantly to the assimilation of Danish immigrants and Danish Americans, but rather to have been forced to americanize their organization in response to assimilation among the Danish ethnics; an assimilation that happened faster in the general Danish ethnic community than within the Danish Brotherhood. In that respect, immigrants and Danish Americans influenced the Danish Brotherhood much more regarding assimilation than the other way around. This influence particularly showed in the acculturation, however reluctant and slow it was, of the Danish Brotherhood.

6.2 Idealism and Pragmatism

When membership peaked in 1892, Danish People's Society had 1,036 members,[168] which is very few in relation to the more than 400,000 Danish immigrants who have come to

166 Jørn Brøndal, "Danes and Danish Americans, 1940-Present", 878.
167 Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life*, 81.
168 Ibid., 30-33.

America, and the over 21,000 members the Danish Brotherhood had when it peaked.[169] If one concludes the impact of an organization solely on account of the amount of members they attracted, then, Danish People's Society can clearly be determined as a marginal group in the Danish ethnic community.

Such a conclusion is far too simplistic, though, as many other factors than membership statistics is relevant regarding an organization's impact. An important factor relevant to this thesis is how the activities and projects undertaken by Danish People's Society were received by the Danish ethnic community. Taking part in colonies, folk high schools, or other projects started by Danish People's Society did not necessarily require a membership of the organization, and the influence of the could thus extend far beyond the few who were members.

In a description of the Danish colonies Nysted and Dannebrog, Nebraska in *Salomons Almanak for 1916*, it is mentioned that the Danish immigrants in the two colonies did not fully understand the need for a folk high school in Nysted when it was founded in 1887, although it is claimed that they gradually came to appreciate the folk high school.[170] Scholars, however, tend to conclude that Danish immigrants did not generally see folk high schools as of particular importance. Sociolinguist Donald K. Watkins made an interesting point when he mentioned that while Danish immigrants in and around Nysted were reluctant to support the folk high school, they were quick to support a dairy cooperative when it was formed in the area. Other institutions such as banks also had strong support among Danish immigrants. In other words, Watkins did not think that folk high schools came to play a particularly important role in the Danish ethnic community because the immigrants simply saw no practical use for it. According to Watkins, the cultural and ethnic goals of folk high schools did not appeal to the mainly practically minded Danish immigrants.[171] Other historians mention that most folk high schools continuously struggled with a very poor economy threatening their existence,[172] and they were thus often rather short-lived.[173]

It is difficult to determine with certainty why Danish immigrants decided to settle in the Danish colonies founded by Danish People's Society. Some probably supported Danish People's Society and their goals for the Danish ethnic community. Some might have thought that it would have advantages to live near other Danish immigrants without having strong idealistic visions about cultural preservations. Others probably did like many other Danish immigrants did: settled wherever jobs or fertile farmland was available and took advantage of the special opportunities Danish immigrants had regarding land purchase in the beginning of most colonies' existence, where purchases were often reserved for Danish ethnics for a few years.

169 Carl Mygind, "Dansk Brodersamfunds 50 Aars Jubilæum" in *Bien*, 1/1 1932, 4.
170 Salomon (ed.), *Salomons Almanak for 1916*, 159-163.
171 Donald K. Watkins, "Danes and Danish on the Great Plains: Some Sociolingustic Aspects" in *Languages in Conflict: Linguistic Acculturation on the Great Plains,* Paul Schack (ed.). (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1980), 70-72.
172 Enok Mortensen, *Schools for Life: A Danish-American Experiment in Adult Education*. (Solvang, California: Danish-American Heritage Society, 1977).
173 D. C. Larson, "The movement to preserve Danish cultre in North America" in R. G. Paulston (ed.), *Other dreams, other schools: Folk colleges in social and ethnic movements*. (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University Center for International Studies, University of Pittsburgh, 1980), 173-197.

It is also difficult to determine why people became members of Danish People's Society, whether it was for idealogical or practical reasons. What is clear, though, is that F. L. Grundtvig was perceived as an elitist: his relative wealth and university education meant that he did not just fit in poorly in the general Danish ethnic community, but even among Grundtvigians specifically.[174]

Watkins did not just argue that the ideals of folk high schools were out of touch with the average Danish immigrant, but also that the same was the case with Danish colonies in general. Although the product of idealism among leading figures in the ethnic community, most of the settlers in the Danish colonies were primarily motivated by the cheap farmland made available to the immigrants by the founders of the colonies.[175] That also explains why they were reluctant to support folk high schools, but instantly supported dairy cooperatives and banks: motivated by what could benefit them in practice in their daily lives, the highly idealistic folk high schools were not relevant to many Danish immigrants.

Idealistic attempts at transplanting the Danish idea of folk high schools into the Danish ethnic community were thus generally not successful, many of the immigrants who settled in Danish colonies in America were likely motivated by cheap, fertile farmland and not idealistic ideas about cultural preservation. F. L. Grundtvig, leader of the organization which initiated the most ambitious attempt at reaching the highly idealistic goal of preserving Danish culture in America, was seen as an elitist who did not fit in with the rest of the Danish immigrants.

All this is evidence to support the idea that preserving Danish culture and avoiding acculturation, the cornerstone of Danish People's Society, was not generally shared by the average Danish immigrant in America. A conclusion that is not surprising given the overall trends in Danish immigration to America and the relatively quick assimilation of Danish immigrants.

Grundtvigianism in Denmark was dominated by a social and cultural elite and was much less represented in the lower classes. In the Danish ethnic community in America, such class distinctions were rare. Many pastors in the Danish Church, particularly Grundtvigians, had formerly been teachers or attended folk high schools in Denmark and were the best educated among the Danish immigrants, though. Although they were relatively few in numbers, Grundtvigian pastors to a large extent dominated the cultural debate and agenda in the Danish Church.[176] Even in the quite equal Danish immigrant community, then, Grundtvigians can be said to have been a cultural elite, subscribing to strong ideals about preservation of the Danish culture in America and thus avoidance of at the very least acculturation, but also to a large extent other forms of assimilation as well, as e.g. Danish People's Society saw it as necessary to create separate ethnic structures to ensure preservation of Danish culture in America.

Herein lies a major reason why Danish People's Society never had more than 1,036 members. Danish People's Society and their founders represented an idealism that the

174 Wanning, "Danish-American Grundtvigians", 242-246; and Lars Scheving, "Dannevirke – a Religious Newspaper of a Minority 1884-1904" in Jørgensen, Scheving and Stilling (ed.), *From Scandinavia to America*, 324-325.
175 Donald K. Watkins, "Danes and Danish on the Great Plains", 71.
176 Simonsen, *Kampen om danskheden*, 96-98.

average Danish immigrant did not share or saw as relevant to their lives. Naturally, this meant that the organization's appeal to Danish immigrants was weak.

Danish People's Society blamed the harsh criticism against the organization for the lack of success and few members.[177] Naturally, criticism on that scale might very well have had consequences for the organization, e.g., by scaring off people who would have otherwise been potential members. That effect can be seen from the very beginning, where several of the signers of the founding document left the organization within the first few weeks or months, seemingly due to pressure from the critics, particularly the case for Inner Mission pastors.

The harsh criticism alone cannot explain the lack of success of the Danish People's Society, however. Other organizations were criticized just as much or even more, but had far more members, most notably the Danish Brotherhood. The Brotherhood was also a victim of harsh criticism, perhaps most severely by F. L. Grundtvig himself. Yet, they managed continuously to have many times more members than Danish People's Society, and at least 90,000 people had been members during the organization's first 100 years of existence.[178]

Whereas Danish People's Society was based on idealism, the Danish Brotherhood was primarily based on pragmatism: providing assurance as well practical help and social activities to its members. Although both organizations, as ethnic organizations, were based on a shared ethnicity and aiming to secure a certain degree of cultural preservation, it was not the main goal of the Danish Brotherhood and not based on the same idealistic approach to Danish culture as Danish People's Society.

The Danish Brotherhood provided its members with economic offers and assurance which made the members less economically vulnerable. The Brotherhood also functioned as a community where they could seek help in times of need as well as receive other kinds of practical help. More importantly, it provided an ethnic community that did not require much of them in the terms of separation from core society. Members could thus engage in an ethnic community even if they did not live in a Danish colony. It also had an important social function, i.e., creating a community where they could socialize and engage in various forms of entertainment and cultural activities. Thus, the Danish Brotherhood provided the immigrants with a community that did not require them to be idealistic or have certain idealogical beliefs. The Danish Brotherhood, however, still had an inherent ethnic component. Through the organization, immigrants could fraternize with other people from Denmark, speak the Danish language, and celebrate Danish traditions and customs. It was thus a combination of a practical, non-idealistic benefit society and an ethnic community which was particularly appealing for immigrants who might not have had high hopes and ideals of a long-lasting ethnic community for many generations to come, but still would, or could, not completely abandon their Danish heritage.

To recap, Danish People's Society's troubles with attracting members can to a large extent be explained by its idealistic approach to the preservation of Danish culture in America. The idealism was not shared by many people in the Danish ethnic community, and thus the

177 Henningsen, *Dansk Folkesamfund i Amerika 1887-1912*, 16 and 30-33.
178 Danish American Archive and Library, DBL-2000, Nebraska, Omaha. Headquarters, Box 23, Centennial Files 1982.

Danish People's Society thus seemed elitist and less appealing for many immigrants. The Danish Brotherhood's objective of offering economic and practical help, on the other hand, meant that they had a much greater appeal to Danish immigrants who were primarily concerned with practical issues and economic benefits than idealistic ideas of cultural preservation.

6.3 Views on Assimilation

Another key cause for disagreement in the Danish ethnic community was whether preserving Danish culture in America was at all realistic or positive. Many Inner Mission pastors did not agree with the efforts to preserve Danish culture in America, particularly not passing it on to Danish Americans. As pastor Lyngby argued in Dannevirke, he saw "*an effort to assert the survival of the Danish language for a longer time as useless and wrong*".[179] Useless because Danish Americans either did not learn or cherish it, and wrong because it hurt their chances of success in America. Danish immigrants had no special rights in America, he argued, adding that such behavior would never be accepted in Denmark.[180]

A key factor in the assimilation debate in the Danish ethnic community was the question of language: whether Danish Americans should learn the Danish language. When significant amounts of Danish immigrants came to America, preaching, publishing, and organizing in Danish made sense. Having grown up in Denmark, it was often significantly easier for the immigrants to communicate in Danish than in English, if they could speak English at all. But as described earlier, even the Danish Americans who understood Danish often preferred English. Thus, many organizations and newspapers gradually adopted the English language or ceased to exist because they were no longer seen as relevant.

For Inner Mission pastors in the Danish Church and later the United Church, the consequence of such a language shift was obvious. The United Church generally saw the Danish language as a tool it could use to preach Christianity, and that tool was only useful as long as Danish was the preferred language of the Danish ethnic community. If the Danish ethnics started preferring English instead, the pastors should switch to English as well. They acknowledged the need to speak Danish as long as new immigrants came from Denmark, but americanization should be embraced as a good thing when time was right for the change to happen.[181] The Danish Church, and particularly Grundtvigian pastors, were of the opposite opinion: the Danish language was an important part of the Danish cultural heritage and should thus be preserved for as long as possible, while of course also learning English.[182]

In 1899, P. S. Vig gave a good description of the differences of opinion in the Danish ethnic community:

> "*The Danes in America! Does one actually have the right to say that? If we are in America, then we are not in Denmark – and are we then Danes? Yes, some say, of course we are Danes wherever we come in the world; that we are born to be, and that we will continue to be, we are happy to be.*

179 "*en Bestræbelse for at hævde det danske Sprogs Bestaaen for længere Tider for at være unyttig og urigtig*" Th. Lyngby, "Det danske Sprogs Fremtid i Amerika" in *Dannevirke*, 7/9 1887, 5-6.
180 Ibid.
181 Simonsen, *Kampen om danskheden*,243-244.
182 Iver Kjær and Mogens Baumann Larsen, "The Spoken Danish Language in the U.S." in Birgit Flemming Larsen og Henning Bender (ed.), *Danish emigration to the U.S.A*. (Aalborg: Danes Worldwide Archive 1992), 118-119.

> *Yes, others say, we are unfortunately Danish and cannot completely avoid partly being that as long as we live, but it is our desire and goal to be as little Danish as possible and become as much American as we possible can; and if it is not achieved by us, then it will be so much better for our children; what we yearned for they will achieve.*"[183]

The quote shows that there was a recognition among the immigrants of the fact that they were Danish and that it affected them whether they liked it or not. Some hoped that it would change for the following generations, though. Thus already in 1899, when *Danske i Amerika* was published, some immigrants were conscious of the possible changes that would happen for Danish Americans compared to Danish immigrants.

Both the Danish Brotherhood and Danish People's Society belonged to the first group as described by P. S. Vig. A defining characteristic of both organizations was the shared Danish ethnicity of its members. In this context, it is interesting to look a bit further into Gordon's definition of cultural pluralism. Cultural pluralism was a common phenomenon early in European mass immigration, Gordon pointed out:

"To a great extend, the Germans used their language as a weapon to ward off Americanization and assimilation, and used every social milieu, the home, the church, the school, the press, in the fight to preserve the German language, even among their children and grandchildren."[184]

That is a perfect description of what Danish People's Society wanted to do. Danish People's Society wanted what Gordon calls *structural separation*: keeping primary contact to people outside of the Danish ethnic community to a minimum, but of course allowing some secondary contact at work, etc.

Danish People's Society wanted to preserve Danish culture as much as possible by creating structures that encouraged the immigrants and perhaps particularly Danish Americans to continue upholding Danish culture. Geographic dispersion and lack of ethnic concentration were some of the main causes of assimilation, and thus Danish colonies were to be created in order to minimize primary group relations with people outside of the Danish ethnic group and thereby minimize the need to speak English in everyday life. Danish cultural associations and educational opportunities were to be created for the same effect. Also, creating Danish colonies and thus facilitating greater ethnic concentration made inter-marriage, i.e. marriages with people outside of the Danish ethnic group, far less likely, further

---

183 "*Danskerne i Amerika! Har man egentlig Ret til at tale saaledes? Ere vi i Amerika, saa ere vi jo ikke i Danmark – og ere vi saa Danskere? Ja, sige nogle, naturligvis ere vi Danskere, hvor vi end komme hen i Verden; det ere vi fødte til at være, og det blive vi ved at være, det ere vi glade ved at være.*
Ja, sige andre, vi ere Danskere desværre og kunne vel ikke helt undgaa at være noget af det, saa længe vi leve; men det er vor Lyst og vor Stræben at være saa lidt danske, som muligt, og blive saa meget Amerikanere, som det efter bedste Evne kan lade sig gøre; og naas det end ikke helt for os, saa bliver det saa meget bedre, hvad vore Børn angaar: det, vi tragte efter, ville de naa!"
Peter Sørensen Vig, *Danske i Amerika. Nogle Blade af den danske Undvandrings historie, særlig den ældre, samt en oversigt Oversigt over Danskernes Antal og Udbredelse i De Forenede Stater.* (Blair, Nebraska: Danish Lutheran Publishing House, 1900), 3.

184 Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life*, 134.

increasing the chances of the Danish language and culture being passed on to the next generations.

The goal of Danish People's Society, in other words, was to create parallel ethnic structures in America in order to encourage and make Danish cultural preservation more likely. Not to isolate themselves completely from American society, as they also saw themselves as American; but only by preserving Danish culture could Danish immigrants contribute to American society, Danish People's Society thought.[185] Still, it was an activist approach to actively oppose or slow down assimilation, and a counter-reaction to the American "melting pot" as often imagined. In other words, Danish People's Society advocated cultural pluralism.

For the Danish Brotherhood, it is a bit more difficult to determine if they also can be called cultural pluralists. Among the factors Gordon mentioned that explained why ethnic communities emerged in America was the need to go together in "*mutual aid and mutual protection against the uncertainties of a strange and sometimes hostile environment.*" Another factor he mentioned was the desire to create an institutional framework where the immigrants could speak Danish in familiar surroundings.[186] Both of those two characteristics describes the Danish Brotherhood.

The Danish Brotherhood also saw preservation of the Danish language and a Danish identity as one of their goals, but at the same time wanted to help Danish immigrants become American citizens faster and easier. Whereas Danish People's Society wanted to create separate Danish structures to counteract the assimilation process, the Danish Brotherhood simply wanted to support Danish immigrants financially, thus increasing their financial stability, as well as create a social community where the immigrants could interact with fellow Danish immigrants and speak Danish, something that would often not otherwise often happen in their new, American lives. Although the Danish Brotherhood wanted to help immigrants become Americans citizens, that did not mean that the Danish Brotherhood necessarily facilitated assimilation. As an ethnic fraternal benefit society, the Danish Brotherhood was literally an ethnic alternative to non-ethnic American benefit societies. Thus by basing the organization on ethnically Danish members, the Danish Brotherhood in effect counteracted structural assimilation. By creating a social community where immigrants could meet other immigrants, the Danish Brotherhood potentially reduced primary group relations with people of a non-Danish ethnicity, one of the main factors behind assimilation. By speaking Danish and wanting to preserve the Danish language, the Danish Brotherhood also tried to resist acculturation, although it did eventually gradually acculturate, e.g. by adopting the English language.

Danish People's Society and the Danish Brotherhood can thus both be characterized as pluralist organizations, but differences still existed. Danish People's Society had an explicit goal to create separate ethnic colonies and structures to keep the ethnic community alive. That meant that Danish People's Society refused to adapt to the assimilation of the Danish ethnic community unlike the Danish Brotherhood, as it was their primary goal to prevent

185 F. L. Grundtvig, "Indbydelse til at indtræde i 'Dansk Folkesamfund'" in *Dannevirke*, 13/4 1887, 6-7.
186 Gordon, *Assimilation in American life*, 134.

such assimilation from happening. While the Danish Brotherhood also counteracted structural assimilation as a consequence of the closed ethnic community it created, they did not operate under the same idealistic opposition towards acculturation as Danish People's Society, allowing them to adapt to a changing Danish ethnic community and thus, even if it was only by necessity in order to survive as an organization, gradually acculturated as the Danish ethnic community did the same. Whether or not the Danish Brotherhood could be characterized as cultural pluralists when it was founded, then, over time – particularly after European mass immigration ended – they increasingly became a structural pluralist organization.

6.4 Christian Exclusivism

A central theme in the criticism of both Danish People's Society and the Danish Brotherhood was how big a role Christianity and particularly the Danish Church should play in the Danish ethnic community. For some critics, particularly conservative and Inner Mission pastors, their main problem with both organizations was that neither were a part of the Danish Church and that members of the church should therefore avoid the organizations altogether. This position can be called *Christian exclusivism*.

As shown in the two "Criticism"-chapters in this thesis, a key part of the criticism against both organizations was that as organizations existing outside of the Danish Church structure, they were either intended as or risked becoming competitors of the Danish Church. Thus, according to some critics, the success of either organization could easily hurt the Danish Church by diverting Danish immigrants' attention away from it.

The Christian exclusivist critics of Danish People's Society and the Danish Brotherhood thus argued that the Danish Church should have a leading role in the Danish immigrant community. When Søholm complained that F. L. Grundtvig should have gone through him and thus problematized the fact that Grundtvig contacted a member of the congregation without informing Søholm as the congregation's pastor, that fundamental difference of opinion was made particularly clear: Søholm felt that Grundtvig acted in secret; Danish People's Society simply felt that it was none of Søholm's business, as it did not relate to the Danish Church directly. The same criticism was prominent when the Danish Brotherhood was founded. Some critics felt that it was a threat to the Danish Church because it could become a new authority in the Danish immigrant community, thus threatening the Danish Church's status.

In other words, Christian exclusivists argued that the Danish Church should function as the leading institution of the Danish ethnic community, thus also leading the cultural activity and run e.g. schools. P. S. Vig rightfully to the Danish Church's long-standing involvement in schools, folk high schools, cultural activities and even creating Danish colonies, and based on that he argued that Danish People's Society unjustly tried to compete with the Danish Church.[187] By doing that, he really argued that only the Danish Church should undertake Danish ethnic and cultural activities.

187 P. S. Vig, "Lidt om den ny Forening, Forsøg paa en aaben Kritik" in *Dannevirke*, 3/8 1887, 6.

Danish People's Society disagreed. It was founded on the idea that for Danish culture to survive in America, all idealistic and enthusiastic immigrants concerned with cultural preservation should get together to work for that common goal – even if they were not members of the Danish Church. What was also necessary, Danish People's Society argued, was to undertake such ethnic and cultural work unimpeded by the skepticism and opposition towards cultural preservation that was expressed by particularly Inner Mission pastors and Christian exclusivists. That skepticism meant that the Danish Church could not do what Danish People's Society thought was necessary for cultural preservation, because a significant part of the Danish Church did not actually believe that it was necessary or even benefitial to preserve Danish culture in America, as shown earlier in the thesis.

More common was the opinion that the Danish Brotherhood was not an organization fit for Christians to join. As a fraternal organization, the Brotherhood required its members to swear an oath of loyalty and secrecy, and some critics felt that a Christian was only allowed to swear an oath to God and country. The Danish Brotherhood was also criticized for its use of religious terminology and acknowledgement of a non-denominational God – deliberately not naming e.g. Jesus Christ because the organization wanted to promote a brotherhood that transcended religions rather than let religions divide the Danish ethnic community. In fact, all religious and political discussions in the Danish Brotherhood were forbidden for that reason.[188] For the Brotherhood, religion was not particularly important for the objectives of the organization. It was an organization founded to provide economic benefits as well as social and cultural activities for Danish immigrants in America. Ethnicity was thus of primary importance, and refusing some Danish immigrants to join because it did not adhere to a certain religion was thus unthinkable and would limit their growth opportunities. Danish People's Society were slightly more religiously restrictive, but agreed with the general sentiment of the Danish Brotherhood: what should really be important was the ethnicity of its members. They were ethnic organizations, not religious organizations.

If the Christian exclusivist critics of the two organizations had their way and ethnic organizations were only to exist within the a Christian church framework, it would weaken the organizations and thereby the ethnic cohesion and chances of cultural preservation significantly. According to an estimate of Paul C. Nyholm, only 35% of the Danish immigrants were members of any church.[189] If ethnic organizations were to require members to also be members of a church, that would exclude almost two-thirds of the immigrants. An exclusion that was even more impactful by the relatively small size of the Danish ethnic community compared to other ethnic groups in America. Christian exclusivism thus weakened the ethnic organizations and the Danish ethnic community's chances of preserving their culture and heritage.

6.5 First World War and Assimilation

On April 2, 1917, President Woodrow Wilson asked Congress to declare war against Germany and thus enter the United States into the First World War, which Congress did four

188 Nelson, *History of the Scandinavians in the United States*, 45.
189 Paul C. Nyholm, *The Americanization of the Danish Lutheran Churches in America, a study in immigrant history*. (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg Publishing House, 1963), 286.

days later. Perhaps aware of the anti-German sentiments already existing in parts of America, Wilson said that most German ethnics in America were "*as true and loyal Americans*" as any other, but added: "*If there should be disloyalty, it will be dealt with with a firm hand of stern repression*".[190] Some politicians seem to have paid more attention to the call for a "*firm hand of stern repression*" than the expression of full trust in most German immigrants' loyalty, though, as several restrictive laws were passed during the war, motivated mainly by distrust towards German immigrants. Iowa's governor William L. Harding was among the politicians who took the anti-German sentiment furthest when he issued the Babel Proclamation on May 14, 1918, stating that only the English language was allowed in schools, meetings, religious services and even telephone conversations.[191]

The political climate in America during the First World War greatly affected German ethnic organizations specifically and the German ethnic community in general. Some German ethnic organizations, e.g., *Socialier Turnverein* and the *Women's Auxiliary Verein*, attempted to proof its loyalty by adopting English as its official language. Other organizations, e.g., the *Independent Turnverein* and the *German House*, changed its names to *Independent Athletic Club* and *Athenaeum* in an attempt to avoid further suspicion. Generally, the "*nationalist hysteria during the war*" silenced the German ethnic community, meaning that German ethnic organizations effectively lost the battle for preservation of a German ethnic culture in America because the political climate during the war forced them to Americanize faster and in different ways than they had perhaps previously wanted.[192]

Changes brought on by the First World War did not only affect the German ethnic community, but ethnic communities in general. The aforementioned Babel Proclamation did not only restrict the German language, but all other languages than English. Similar laws were passed in other states. The political climate during the First World War thus also affected the Danish ethnic community where Danish ethnic newspapers and ethnic organizations where Danish was spoken were still common.

The aforementioned language debate in Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad began already during the First World War. The debate was partly put on hold, however, because of the ongoing war. Focusing on ethno-specific issues like the Danish language and flag should be avoided, Brotherhood member Frank Lawson argued on May 1, 1918.[193] The Danish Brotherhood leadership agreed, announcing on the front page of Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad on July 1, 1918 that while members could continue to speak Danish at Brotherhood meetings since they were private meetings, members should avoid showing their Danish character, e.g. through language, too much publicly, and discussing the role of the Danish language in America was to be avoided altogether as long as America was at war.[194] A month

190 Woodrow Wilson, "Wilson's War Message to Congress". http://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/Wilson's_War_Message_to_Congress Retrieved 3/2 2016.
191 Stephen J. Frese, "Divided by a Common Language: The Babel Proclamation and its Influence on Iowa History" in *The History Teacher*, vol. 39, no. 1 (Long Beach, California: Society of History Education, 2005), 59-88.
192 Peter C. Weber, "Ethnic Identity During War. The Case of German American Societies During World War I" in *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 31, no. 1. (2014), 185-206.
193 Frank Lawson, "Flaget" in *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, 1/5 1918, 1.
194 "Sproget" in *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad, 1/7 1918, 1.*

earlier, an official announcement was published on the front page proclaiming that all meetings should end with singing the American national anthem, My Country 'tis of Thee.[195]

The careful attitude towards public displays of Danish ethnicity also presented itself in a particular debate regarding the Danish flag. According to a popular national myth, the Danish flag descended from Heaven to the Danish King Valdemar II in what is now Estonia in 1219. If the myth is to be believed, the 700 year anniversary of the flag was in 1919. As the Danish Brotherhood wrote in Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad on March 1, 1919, flag parties were inappropriate as long as America was still at war, and the public flag parties should thus be cancelled.[196]

Even in Danish People's Society, the patriotic fervor of the war pushed some of the ethnic feelings and cultural celebrations into the background. About a month after the declaration of war against Germany, Danish People's Society in the Danish colony of Askov, Minnesota decided that its celebration of Constitution Day on June 5, 1917 should be cancelled. Just two weeks later, they decided to keep June 5 as a holiday, but one dedicated to American patriotism to inspire young people to enlist in the military – with Danish speaking for "*the elder folks who may not understand English*" which "*will not lessen our patriotism one particle"* as the editor of the newspaper *Askov American* wrote.[197]

The explicit emphasis on American patriotism and carefulness regarding public use of the Danish language and flag were not just due to patriotism, but also attempts to prevent suspicion towards the Danish ethnic community from members of American core society. The First World War was thus used by many immigrants to try and proof their loyalty to America.[198] This was done by speeding up parts of the assimilation process, e.g., avoiding the use of their native language and instead using English more. During the First World War, English was already being used increasingly in Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad. Due to laws passed during the war in Nebraska where the Danish Brotherhood had its headquarters, budgets had to be done and reported about in English. Articles related to the war also had to have at least an English summary, and several articles and announcements written by state programs to support the war effort and increase patriotism were printed in Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad and Danish ethnic newspapers.[199] The increased use of English in Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad was thus partly a consequence of laws and governmental initiatives initiated during the First World War. As evident from the chapter "*Identity Negotiation Through Language Debate*", as soon as the First World War ended, the language debate fully unfolded in Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad. This perhaps shows that the First World War had permanently affected the Danish Brotherhood, and that some of the temporary hesitancy and carefulness regarding public displays of ethnicity which the war caused had become permanent, just as the change from German to English had for certain German ethnic organizations. Another permanent effect of the First World War laws restricting language use was seen in churches in the Danish ethnic Lutheran community. Because of laws like the

195 "En Henstilling" in *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, 1/6 1918, 1.
196 "Flagfester" in *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, 1/3 1919, 1
197 Steven James Keillor, *Hjalmar Petersen of Minnesota: Politics of Provincial Independence.* (St. Paul, Minnesota: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1987), 43-44.
198 Simonsen, *Kampen om danskheden*, 192.
199 E.g. "Americanization" in *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, 1/12 1918, *5.*

Babel Proclamation, church services could not be done in Danish during the war. After the war, although many of the restrictive laws were withdrawn, few Danish churches resumed Danish services. Many of those that resumed them only had occasional Danish services with the majority of the services being done in English, or stopped having Danish church services again after a short period of time, exemplified by Jette Mackintosh in a study of Kimballton and Elk Horn, Iowa.[200]

The extent of the influence of the First World War on this development is hard to determine, as other factors were important too, particularly a decreasing immigration from Denmark and a growing number of Danish Americans happening at the same time as the war. It is clear, however, that the First World War did affect the Danish Brotherhood as well as other parts of the Danish ethnic community. The patriotic fervor and suspicion against at least some ethnic communities made parts of the Danish ethnic community focus much more on assimilating, either as the result of honest convictions or strategic attempts to avoid as much suspicion as possible. The political climate in America during the First World War thus increased assimilation and Americanization in parts of the Danish ethnic community, including the Danish Brotherhood.

7 Today

7.1 Symbolic and Institutionalized Ethnicity

Danish-American immigration historian Marcus Lee Hansen wrote a paper in 1938 called "*The problem of the third generation immigrant*". The paper presented the following hypothesis:

> "*what the son wishes to forget the grandson wishes to remember.*"

According to Hansen, the second generation would be so focused on being accepted by American core society in order to increase their chances of success and avoid discrimination that they would rapidly assimilate and forget their Danish ethnic heritage. The third generation, with their status as Americans unquestioned by core society due to the assimilation of the second generation, would then regain interest in their ethnic background and reclaim the lost ethnicity of their parents.[201]

The significance of Hansen's "*principle of the third generation*"[202] is particularly due to the later historians and sociologists who found inspiration in the hypothesis when they formulated the ethnic revival hypothesis. In the 1970s, a variety of scholars and writers argued that, just like Hansen had predicted, in recent years a great revival of interest in ethnicity had happened among the descendants of immigrants.[203] That resurgence in interest was partly caused by the civil rights movement and by the famous mini-series Roots that aired in 1977. Portraying the history of slavery in America and the conscious eradication of the culture and memory of the slaves' African heritage, Roots, just like the civil rights

200 Mackintosh, "'Little Denmark' on the Prairie", 62.
201 Marcus Lee Hansen, *The problem of the third generation immigrant*. (Rock Island, Illinois: Augustana Historical Society, 1938).
202 Ibid., p. 9.
203 See, eg., Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan, *Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians and Irish of New York City*. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1963); and Andrew Greeley, *Ethnicity in the United States*. (New York: Wiley & Sons, 1974).

movement, sparked a discussion about ethnic and cultural heritage in American society. The discussion did not just inspire African Americans to study their roots, but also played a significant role in the resurgence of interest in the ethnic roots of white Americans, thus inspiring descendants of European immigrants who had assimilated completely and joined American core society to study their own ethnic backgrounds.[204]

Both Hansen's hypothesis and the ethnic revival hypothesis of the 1970s have been criticized. According to some critics, what had instead emerged was a symbolic ethnicity rather than an ethnic revival. The phrase 'symbolic ethnicity' was coined by sociologist Herbert J. Gans in 1979, where he described it as:

> "*a nostalgic allegiance to the culture of the immigrant generation, or that of the old country; a love for and pride in a tradition that can be felt without having to be incorporated in everyday behavior.*"[205]

Along the same lines, Mary C. Waters has argued that ethnicity has become an "ethnic option": a voluntary lifestyle and identity choice.[206]

Hansen primarily used the Augustana Historical Society as evidence for his hypothesis[207], and the 1938 paper was actually based on a speech he made to that very society. Proponents of the symbolic ethnicity hypothesis has argued that what emerged was an internalized ethnicity where Americans chose to identify as ethnics and celebrated a few select pieces of their ethnic heritage, or symbols they perceived as being part of their heritage. An internalization that did not require, or create, participation in an ethnic community like earlier forms of ethnicity. What I suggest has also happened, perhaps more relevant to Hansen's original example in "The problem of the third generation", is an *institutionalized ethnicity*.

By 'institutionalized ethnicity', I suggest that as ethnicity grew weaker, a few select institutions emerged to preserve the memory and history of ethnic and immigrant culture in America. Rather than an ethnic revival, indicating a popular movement and an increased ethnic influence on the everyday lives of people, select groups have taken up the task of preserving the memory of a culture that would otherwise have been forgotten in the assimilation process.

Augustana Historical Society was founded in 1930 "*to preserve the history of Augustana College, and its relation to the Lutheran Church and to Swedish-American immigration and culture.*"[208] In its essence, then, it is an academic institution. Augustana Historical Society can thus be grouped together with a number of institutions related to the Danish ethnic community in America. In 1932, Danish immigrant Max Henius founded what was then called the *Dan-America Archives*, today the *Danish Emigrant Archives*. Situated in Aalborg in Denmark, Henius' goal for the archives was to collect material about Danish immigrants all over the world, not just those who came to America.[209] Until the 1970s, it was the only institution created to collect the history of Danish immigrants to America that existed. In

204 Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Roots Too: White Ethnic Revival in Post-Civil Rights America*. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2006).
205 Herbert J. Gans, "Symbolic Ethnicity: The future of ethnic groups and cultures in America" in *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 2, no. 1. (Oxford: Routledge, 1979), 9.
206 Mary C. Waters, *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America*. (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1979).
207 Hansen, *The Problem of the third generation immigrant*, 12-15.
208 MuseumsUSA, "Augusatana Historical Society". http://www.museumsusa.org/museums/info/14188 Retrieved 5/2 2016.
209 Det Danske Udvandrerarkiv, "Det Danske Udvandrerarkiv – en national opgave". http://www.udvandrerarkivet.dk/om-det-danske-udvandrerarkiv/ Retrieved 21/2 2016.

1977, however – the same year Roots aired – the *Danish American Heritage Society* (DAHS) was founded.[210] In 1980, DAHS started a search committee to investigate the possibility of creating a museum about Danish immigrants to America. The preparatory work took a long time, but finally in 1994, the *Danish Immigrant Museum* opened in Elk Horn, Iowa, a Danish colony.[211] In the meantime, the *Danish American Archive and Library* (DAAL) had emerged in nearby Blair, Nebraska in 1986.[212]

As a consequence of the institutionalized ethnicity, the role of organizations and institutions related to the Danish ethnics in America changed. The Danish Immigrant Museum is a good example of the changing roles. In 2013, the museum re-named itself *Museum of Danish America*. As executive director of the museum, John Mark Nielsen, explained:

> "*We recognize that the immigrant experience is changing. In strategic planning meetings beginning in 2004, board members recognized the decline in immigration from Denmark and the need to expand the museum's focus to include documenting the evolving relations between our two countries.*
> *[…] Considering a name change has not been done lightly. We are not just a museum that tells the story of immigrants although this will always be the genesis of our narrative […] We are not just a museum focusing on Danish-Americans. We want to embrace those Danes living and working in our country, and we want to include those Americans who, for whatever reason, have become fascinated by Danish culture and its expression in the United States.*"[213]

The museum thus changed its name due to the new challenges and opportunities that a declining immigration presented. It was an attempt to embrace the Danish Americans in general and not just collect materials and tell the story of Danish immigrants.

The name change, and perhaps even more so the very existence, of the museum reflects the phenomenonon I call institutionalized ethnicity. With European mass immigration no longer a significant factor in America and the descendants of the immigrants being more or less fully assimilated and americanized, some people chose to make an effort to collect and preserve the memory and history of Danish immigration and ethnic culture in America in recognition of the fact that it would otherwise disappear as ethnic communities disappeared. Americans of Danish descent could then, if they wanted, visit the institutions and learn about their ethnic heritage and thus experience it without requiring them to be a part of a distinct ethnic community and without it affecting their everyday behavior.

Since the end of the European mass immigration, then, significant changes have happened to the remnants of Danish ethnic culture in America. Danebod Folk School, founded in 1886 as a full-time folk high school in the Danish colony of Tyler, Minnesota, was forced to close in the 1930s because of economic problems and low attendance. When the school re-opened in 1946, it was now called Danebod Folk Meeting. No longer a full-time folk school, it was instead a summer school, and from 1947 a family summer camp which it still is.[214] Several

210 Danish American Heritage Society, "The Danish American Heritage Society – Historical Overview." http://www.danishheritage.org/dahs-history.html Retrieved 21/2 2016.
211 "The Danish Immigrant Museum Celebrates 25 Years" in *America Letter*, vol. 21, no. 2. (2008), 3-9. http://www.danishmuseum.org/pdfs/america-letters/2009-spring-america-letter.pdf Retrieved 21/2 2016.
212 Danish American Archive and Library, "History". http://danishamericanarchive.com/history/ Retrieved 21/2 2016.
213 Museum of Danish America, "Museum Changes Name". http://www.danishmuseum.org/news/namechange.cfm Retrieved 5/2 2016.
214 Danebod Folk Camp, "What's Danebod?". http://danebodfolkcamp.org/about/ Retrieved 16/2 2016.

old Danish colonies like Solvang, California and Elk Horn, Iowa have made an active effort to display and celebrate their Danish heritage in recent years, although its inhabitants are either not primarily of Danish descent or have assimilated into American core society. With Danish or what is perceived as Danish elements like old-fashioned Danish-style architecture, Danish-inspired food and crafts, and several annual Danish ethnic festivals, they attract thousands of tourists, both with and without Danish roots.[215]

Institutionalized ethnicity is thus not incompatible with symbolic ethnicity. Rather, the two phenomena have happen alongside each other, both reactions to weakening European ethnic communities and cultures in America. As ethnicity has become primarily symbolic, traditional ethnic organizations have become obsolete, as these require an active ethnic community. Instead, select institutions have emerged to collect and preserve memories and artifacts related to the immigrant and ethnic culture and history, allowing Americans to experience their ethnic heritage without being an active part of an ethnic community and without the ethnicity affecting everyday behavior.

7.2 Ethnic Ghettoes

In this thesis, the word "colony" has been used to describe the towns that were created deliberately to be populated by Danish immigrants. This is particularly because that was the word many of the contemporary Danish immigrants involved in the colony projects used, e.g., Danish People's Society. One could also call them ghettoes: areas with a great concentration of a certain ethnic group, by their own accord or because they were forced there.

Since most Danish immigrants in America assimilated as fast as they did in the late 19th and early 20th century, it is interesting to compare it to the current political debate regarding ethnic minorities and assimilation.

Ghettoes have been a common phenomena in American history, particularly as the result of different waves of immigration. Early in the European mass immigration, large groups of German and Irish immigrants arrived in America, many of them settling in the same areas, thus creating vast ghettoes where e.g. German continued to be the primary language. Other famous ghettoes in America are the "Little Italies" and "Chinatowns" in various big cities, most famously New York City. Another type of ghetto in America is the large African American ghettoes, a visible reminder of the long and shameful history of slavery and racial discrimination in America, as well as forced displacements of Native Americans. The same degree of ethnic concentration was, as already described, much rarer for Danish immigrants. A number of Danish colonies, or ghettoes, emerged, though, some of whom exist in some sense until this, or at least commemorate the Danish heritage of the towns.

Despite waves of nativist opposition and particularly widespread suspicion against certain ethnic groups, e.g. during the First World War, ethnic ghettoes in America have been largely

215 See, e.g., Hanne Pico Larsen, "A Windmill and a Vikinghjem: The Importance of Visual Icons as Heritage Tropes among Danish-Americans" in Peter Aronsson and Lizette Gradén (ed.), *Performing Nordic Heritage. Everyday Practices and Institutional Culture*. (Farnham, England: Ashgate, 2013), 73-98.
The phenomena is not only Danish American. For an excellent description of the same phenomena in the Czech-American community, see e.g. Ezra Zeitler, "Creating America's 'Czech Capital': ethnic identity and heritage tourism in Wilber, Nebraska" in *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, vol. 4, no. 1. (2009) 73-85.

tolerated. This is probably explained by the idea of America as a nation of immigrants. Different waves of immigration changed the American demographic and culture.

Denmark is a country with a vastly different immigration history than America. Except for a few unique situations in Danish history where certain ethnic groups immigrated, Denmark has seen very little immigration prior to the 1960s. Since the 1960s though, large numbers of immigrants, particularly from the Middle East, have immigrated to Denmark or come there as refugees.[216] The lack of immigration in Danish history might help explain the strong anti-immigration opinions that have been a big part of Danish politics in recent years. Particularly since the founding of *Danish People's Party* in 1995, anti-immigration reforms have been one of the most important issue in Danish politics. Danish People's Party has often been a key advocate of strict immigration and asylum laws.

A key anti-immigration argument for the Danish People's Party is that the party believes that certain groups are difficult to assimilate into Danish society, particularly Arab and Muslim immigrants and asylum seekers. This is often blamed on cultural and religious factors, i.e., the opinion that Arab culture and Islam is hard to reconcile with Danish culture and values. This opinion was expressed rather bluntly by Søren Espersen, member of the Danish parliament for Danish People's Party, who in 2009 argued that "*democracy and islam are irreconcilable*".[217] Another common anti-immigration argument used by e.g. Danish People's Society is that multiculturalism will inevitably lead to "parallel societies", i.e. settle in a few areas with a high ethnic concentration and thus fail to become a part of the rest of Danish society, and consequences like crime, rape and even murders.[218] What that argument criticizes, then, is a kind of "ghettoization", or the creation "Muslim colonies" in Denmark to adopt the vocabulary of e.g. Danish People's Society

Danish People's Party has repeatedly argued that people who immigrate to Denmark have to assimilate into Danish society. In an article from 2011, then leader of Danish People's Party, Pia Kjærsgaard, called it "*a relief that the word assimilation has replaced the meaningless term 'integration'*." In the same article, she described her view of assimilation:

> "*Assimilation is about liberation from religious and cultural straitjackets. Assimilation is about a fundamental respect for the culture of the host country – and a deeply felt wish to become a part of this and to be included in the community. The more parallel societies, the more mosques and the more satellite dishes turned towards fundamentalist transmitters like the Palestinian al-Aqsa TV, the less assimilation.*"[219]

The conclusion for Pia Kjærsgaard, and thus Danish People's Party, is clearly expressed in this quote: to be included in the Danish society, the immigrants and refugees need to

---

216 Danmarks Statistik, "Indvandrere i Danmark 2015". (2015). http://www.dst.dk/Site/Dst/Udgivelser/GetPubFile.aspx?id=20703&sid=indv2015 Retrieved 21/2 2016.

217 "*demokrati og islam er uforenelige størrelser*"
Søren Espersen, "Søren Espersen: Islam og demokrati er uforenelige". http://www.danskfolkeparti.dk/S%C3%B8ren_Espersen_Islam_og_demokrati_er_uforenelige Retrieved 21/2 2016.

218 Pia Kjærsgaard, "Den svenske løgn". http://www.danskfolkeparti.dk/Den_svenske_l%C3%B8gn Retrieved 21/2 2016.

219 "*Assimilation handler om frigørelse fra religiøse og kulturelle spændetrøjer. Assimilation handler om en grundlæggende respekt for værtslandets kultur – samt et dybfølt ønske om at blive en del af denne og at blive optaget i fællesskabet. Jo flere parallelsamfund, jo flere moskeer og jo flere parabolantenner, rettet mod fundamentalistiske sendere som det palæstinensiske al-Aqsa TV, desto mindre assimilation.*"
Pia Kjærsgaard, "Har regeringen mod til at handle?" http://www.danskfolkeparti.dk/Har_regeringen_mod_til_at_handle_ Retrieved 11/2 2016.

assimilate, not just integrate. Judging by the examples used in the article, it is not difficult to understand which groups should particularly assimilate:

> "*Danish People's Society's assimilation initiatives includes a ban on burqas and niqabs, a ban on Saudi Arabian- or Iran-financed big mosques, a ban on special changing rooms and praying rooms, stopping special treatment in schools on the Muslim Ramadan and a ban on all other religious special treatments.*"[220]

It would be fair to assume that the Danish People's Party's call for assimilation applied to all ethnic minorities. Interestingly, that is not the case, though. In a 2014 article in *Flensborg Avis*, Danish People's Party expressed full support to the Danish minority in northern Germany. Commenting on parts of the Danish minority in Germany that refuse to call themselves specifically Danish, Martin Henriksen of Danish People's Party wrote:

> "*Dare I think the thought that nobody or few have tried, yes, maybe nowadays it is so deeply ingrained in parts of the 'minority' that it is not even unusual for people in the minority to define themselves on the basis of something other than Danishness.*"[221]

Explaining why Danish People's Party supports the Danish minority in Germany in the first place, he wrote that:

> "*there are forces that understand what it means to be a Danish minority. And to those, Denmark is obligated. Therefore there is no doubt for Danish People's Party. It is positive to know multiple languages, and it is positive to know other cultures, but it is only positive as long as you stay rooted in your own culture. If you are a member of a minority, you are Danish and your language and culture is Danish. That parts of the minority disagrees […] is an expression of a dangerous identity crisis.*"[222]

The contrast between the opinions put forth in the two articles is striking. Ethnic minorities in Denmark are expected by Danish People's Party to assimilate into Danish society by stopping cultural and religious practices that is too different from Danish cultural and religious practices, and avoid creating parallel societies. For the Danish minority in Germany, the party expects the opposite: to continue only to identify as Danish and thus avoid assimilation, and continue to exist as an ethnic minority. Compared to American immigration history, then, Danish People's Society agree with nativists regarding ethnic minorities in Denmark, but for the Danish minority in Germany the party sees Danish People's Society's cultural pluralist, anti-assimilation stance as the only rightful position to take.

Of course, it can be argued that the Danish minority in Germany is different from e.g. Turkish immigrants in Denmark or Danish immigrants in America. The Danish minority in Germany exists because the area of northern Germany where the minority lives was once

---

220 "*Dansk Folkepartis assimilationstiltag omfatter stop for burkaer og niqab, stop for saudi-arabisk eller iransk finansierede stormoskéer, stop for særlige omklædningsrum og bederum, ophør med særbehandling på skoler i forbindelse med den muslimske ramadan og stop for al anden religiøs forskelsbehandling.*"
Ibid.

221 "*Det skræmmende er, at mange af dem har gået på en mindretalsskole, deltaget i diverse aktiviteter i mindretallet, men ingen autoriteter, medstuderende, forældre eller andre har åbenbart formået at rive dem ud af denne vildfarelse.*
Tør jeg tænke tanken, at ingen eller få har gjort forsøget, ja, måske ligger det efterhånden så dybt i dele af »mindretallet«, at det slet ikke er unormalt, at mindretalsmennesket definerer sig selv ud fra noget andet end danskheden."
Martin Henriksen, "Det danske mindretal skal passe bedre på sig selv". http://www.fla.de/artikel/Det-danske-mindretal-skal-passe-bedre-paa-sig-selv-174ec.html Retrieved 11/2 2016.

222 "*der er kræfter, som forstår, hvad det vil sige at være et dansk mindretal. Og dem er Danmark forpligtet overfor. Derfor er der ingen tvivl om Dansk Folkepartis opbakning. Det er kun positivt at kunne flere sprog, og det er positivt at kende andre kulturer, men det er kun positivt så længe, man hviler i sin egen kultur. Er man medlem af mindretallet, så er man dansk, og ens sprog og kultur er dansk. At dele af mindretallet mener noget andet – og ligefrem er noget andet – er udtryk for en farlig identitetskrise.*"
Ibid.

controlled by Denmark. The minority is thus not necessarily composed of people who immigrated to a foreign country. Even though the historic context is therefore different for the two kinds of ethnic minorities, Danish People's Party still advocate that the Danish minority in Germany actively resist assimilation, vastly different from what they expect of ethnic minorities in Denmark.

This shows that it is possible to simultaneously hold completely opposite opinions on assimilation and minorities depending on which ethnic and cultural group the specific minority in question belongs to. Studying this phenomenon more closely in the context of American immigration history would be interesting. As cultural pluralism has become more common in America, talks about America as a "melting pot" have increasingly been replaced by likening America to a "salad bowl", where the combination of different ethnic groups and cultures define America. That brings up the question: are all (ethnic) ingredients equally welcome in the salad bowl, or are certain groups treated more negatively than others? If the latter, it might be necessary to take another critical look at "pluralism" of American society and attitudes towards ethnicity.

8 Conclusion

How did ethnic organizations affect the assimilation of Danish immigrants in America? To answer that question, one first needs to understand the ethnic organizations as a phenomena. Ethnic organizations were generally founded to cater to a specific needs among immigrants. The needs of the immigrants had many forms and consequently so did ethnic organizations. Ethnic organizations are not by definition cultural pluralists or against assimilation. Sometimes they were not based on idealistic visions of a long-standing and active ethnic community, but could just as well be of a very practical and pragmatic nature.

The Danish Brotherhood was founded as exactly that: a primarily pragmatic, non-idealistic ethnic organization aiming to support Danish immigrants financially and give them access to a social community of people who spoke the same language and had similar experiences and cultural references as them, thus making it easier to cope with the emotional difficulties that could arise from immigrating to another country. Danish Brotherhood's pragmatic nature is also evident from the organization's development over time. "*Changing to meet changing needs*" as it was proudly proclaimed in its celebration of the 100 year anniversary of the Danish Brotherhood, it has undergone several dramatic changes regarding the identity of the organization in order to adapt to the Danish ethnic population's changing demographics and priorities.

Although pragmatic and non-idealistic, the Danish Brotherhood is in its core pluralist. While also expressing a desire to help its members become American citizens and other americanizing activities, the Danish Brotherhood is based on the shared ethnicity of its members and has thus helped preserve that ethnicity, albeit not to the same extent and with the same approach as Danish People's Society. Rather than being cultural pluralists, then, it is a structural pluralist organization.

Danish People's Society was a very idealistic ethnic organization and an outspoken advocate of cultural pluralism from the beginning. The Danish People's Society intended to

create separate ethnic structures from American core society in order to essentially prevent assimilation. In those separate ethnic structures, it was the hope that Danish immigrants could withstand assimilation and stay as Danish as possible for as long as they desired, hopefully also the case for Danish Americans. This of course while respecting the civic duties as American citizens. They represented a vision for America where distinct ethnic groups were allowed to exist, and thought that separate ethnic groups together formed the patchwork that was American society. They disagreed with the idea of an assimilation process that would homogenize the American population in general, and the immigrant communities in particular.

Shortly put, Danish People's Society lost the battle over the Danish ethnic community. Already in the second generation, many Danish Americans could not or rarely chose to speak Danish, Danish ethnics increasingly intermarriaged with non-Danish ethnics, and Danish ethnics generally assimilated rather quickly. Indicative of Danish People's Society's lack of success is the organization's modest size throughout its existence. An important reason why Danish People's Society never attracted more than 1,036 members was that the idealism they represented resonated poorly with the priorities of most Danish immigrants. The less idealistic, more practical and pragmatic approach of the Danish Brotherhood, on the other hand, was far more appealing to Danish immigrants, which showed in tthe number of members. Both mainly appealed to immigrants, however, and not Danish Americans.

As ethnic organizations, both served as separate ethnic communities. Danish People's Society wanted to actively create and support separate ethnic structures and colonies to minimize primary group relations with non-Danish ethnics in order to avoid assimilation and preserve Danish culture in America. The Danish Brotherhood did not have those intentions, but they still served as a closed community based on ethnicity, thus also decreasing primary group relations with non-Danish ethnics and effectively counteracting at least structural assimilation.

For both organizations, the influence on assimilation was limited. Danish People's Society attracted far too few members to significantly affect the immigrants. Although e.g. the colonies they created likely postponed assimilation, it was rarely for long, as even Danish colonies assimilated as well, although often with a slight delay. The Danish Brotherhood gradually assimilated as an organization, particularly through acculturation, but this cannot be characterized as the Danish Brotherhood having influencing Danish immigrants to assimilate. Rather, the assimilation of the Danish Brotherhood happened as reactive attempts to stay relevant as an organization and was thus conversely the result of the immigrants having an assimilatory influence over the Danish Brotherhood.

Marcus Lee Hansen predicted the rapid assimilation of the second generation, a development he saw as a "*betrayal*"[223] of their Danish heritage. He found solace, however, in his theory – or perhaps more fitting, hope – that the third generation would regain some of what was lost with the second generation assimilation and reclaim their ethnicity. Nothing seems to support his theory today, however: people of Danish descent in America today are by and large fully assimilated Americans, and most of what is left is a kind of symbolic

223 Hansen, *The problem of the third generation immigrant*, 9.

ethnicity, just as it is for many other ethnic groups in America today. What I propose has also happened is that an institutionalization of the Danish ethnicity has taken place, with the creation a few select institutions with the explicit goal of preserving the memory of Danish ethnic history and culture, where Americans of Danish descent can visit and experience what would otherwise have been lost due to assimilation. The Danish cultural heritage in America will probably survive in some form for as long as these institutions exist and continue to inform Americans of Danish descent of their roots. An active, everyday-life Danish ethnic community, however, as visioned by particularly Danish People's Society can probably only be determined as definitively dead, unless a new mass immigration happens.

9 Bibliography

9.1 Literature

- Bethlehem Lutheran Church, *The History of Dalum*. (Drumheller, Alberta: Big County News, 1968).
- Henrik Cavling, *Fra Amerika*. (Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandels Forlag, 1897).
- Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan, *Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians and Irish of New York City*. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1963).
- Andrew Greeley, *Ethnicity in the United States*. (Wiley & Sons, New York, New York 1974).
- F. L. Grundtvig, *Jesu Kristi Kirke og de Afgudsdyrkende Foreninger, skrevet til Overvejelse for Menighederne i den danske evangelisk-lutherske Kirke i Amerika*. (Cedar Falls, Iowa: Dannevirkes Trykkeri, 1887).
- N. F. S. Grundtvig, *Menneske først og Christen saa*, 1837.
- Milton M. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion and National Options*, first edition. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964).
- Hans Schultz Hansen, *Det nordslesvigske landbrug of den danske bevægelse 1880-1914*. (Åbenrå: Historisk Samfund for Sønderjylland 1985).
- Marcus Lee Hansen, *The problem of the third generation immigrant*. (Rock Island, Illinois: Augustana Historical Society, 1938).
- Marianne Hjort Hansen, *Brev fra Amerika, danske udvandrerbreve 1874-1922*. (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1981).
- John A. Hawgood, *The Tragedy of German-America*. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1940).
- L. Henningsen, *Dansk Folkesamfund i Amerika 1887-1912. 25 Aars Virksomhed Jubilæumshefte*. (Aarhus: S. Jensen Sort, 1914).
- Kristian Hvidt, *Flugten til Amerika eller drivkræfter i masseudvandringen fra Danmark 1868-1914*. Doctoral thesis. (Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1971)
- Kristian Hvidt, *Flight to America, the social background of 300,000 Danish emigrants*. (New York: Academic Press, 1975).
- Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Roots Too: White Ethnic Revival in Post-Civil Rights America*. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2006).
- Torben Grøngaard Jeppesen, *Danske i USA 1850-2000, en demografisk, social og kulturgeografisk undersøgelse af de danske immigranter og deres efterkommere*. (Odense: Odense Bys Museer, 2005).
- Torben Grøngaard Jeppesen, *Skandinaviske efterkommere i USA, etniske grupper eller kerneamerikanere?*. (Odense: Odense Bys Museer,, 2010).
- Torben Grøngaard Jeppesen, *Scandinavian descendants in the United States, ethnic groups or core Americans?* (Odense: Odense Bys Museer, 2011).
- Steffen Elmer Jørgensen, Lars Scheving, and Niels Peter Stilling (ed.), *From Scandinavia to America: Proceedings from a Conference Held at Gl. Holtegaard*. (Odense: Odense University Press, 1987).
- Steven James Keillor, *Hjalmar Petersen of Minnesota: Politics of Provincial Independence*. (St. Paul, Minnesota: Minnesota Historical Society Press 1987).
- Tina Langholm Larsen, *Når grundtvigianismen flytter*. (Aarhus: Religionsvidenskab, Aarhus Universitet 2016).

- Enok Mortensen, *Schools for Life: A Danish-American Experiment in Adult Education*. (Solvang, California: Danish-American Heritage Society, 1977).
- O. N. Nelson (ed.), *History of the Scandinavians and Successful Scandinavians in the United States*, volume 2, second edition. (Minneapolis, Minnesota: O. N. Nelson & Company, 1901).
- Leif Hansen Nielsen, *Den nordslesvigske udvandring. En analyse af drivkræfterne bag den nordslesvigske udvandring i perioden 1860-1900*. (Copenhagen: Historisk Institut Københavns Universitet, 1993).
- Paul C. Nyholm, *The Americanization of the Danish Lutheran Churches in America, a study in immigrant history*. (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg Publishing House, 1963).
- Anne Lisbeth Olsen and Niels Peter Stilling, *Et nyt liv, den danske udvandring til Nordamerika i billeder og breve*. (Birkerød: Strandberg, 1985).
- Anne Lisbeth Olsen and Niels Peter Stilling, *A new life, Danish emigration to North America as described by the emigrants themselves in letters 1842-1946*. (Aalborg: Danes Worldwide Archive, 1994).
- Erik Helmer Pedersen, *Drømmen om Amerika*. (Copenhagen: Politikens Forlag, 1985).
- Erik Helmer Pedersen, *Pionererne*. (Copenhagen: Politikens Forlag, 1986).
- Michael Salomon (ed.), *Salomons Almanak for 1916: De Forenede Staters Danske Almanak, Haand- og Aarbog*. (Seattle, Washington: Danish Publishing House of the Pacific Coast, 1916).
- Addison Erwin Sheldon (ed.), *Nebraska: The Land and the People*, volume 2. (Chicago: The Lewis Publishing Company, 1931).
- Susan H. Shreve and Rudoplh J Vecoli (ed.), *Records of Ethnic Fraternal Benefit Associations in the United States: Essays and Inventories*. (St. Paul, Minnesota: Immigration History Research Center/University of Minnesota, 1981).
- Henrik Bredmose Simonsen, *Kampen om danskheden, tro og nationalitet i de danske kirkesamfund i Amerika*. (Aarhus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag, 1990).
- Marianne Stølen, *The Story of Den Røde – A Danish-American songbook*. (Copenhagen: Vartov, 2010)
- Peter Sørensen Vig, *Danske i Amerika*. (Minneapolis, Minnesota: C. Rasmussen Publishing Company, 1907).
- Peter Sørensen Vig, *Danske i Amerika. Nogle Blade af den danske Undvandrings historie, særlig den ældre, samt en oversigt Oversigt over Danskernes Antal og Udbredelse i De Forenede Stater*. (Blair, Nebraska: Danish Lutheran Publishing House, 1900), 3.
- Mary C. Waters, *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America*. (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1979).

9.2 Journal articles and anthology essays

- Jørn Brøndal, "Danes and Danish Americans, 1870-1940" in Elliott Robert Barkan (ed.), *Immigrants in American History: Arrival, Adaption and Integration*, vol. 1. (ABC-CLIO: Santa Barbara, California 2013), 323-331.
- Stephen J. Frese, "Divided by a Common Language: The Babel Proclamation and its Influence on Iowa History" in *The History Teacher*, vol. 39, no. 1 (Society of History Education: Long Beach, California 2005), 59-88.
- Herbert J. Gans, "Symbolic Ethnicity: The future of ethnic groups and cultures in America" in *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 2, no. 1. (1979), 1-20.

- Iver Kjær and Mogens Baumann Larsen, "The Spoken Danish Language in the U.S." in Birgit Flemming Larsen og Henning Bender (ed.), *Danish emigration to the U.S.A*. (Aalborg: Danes Worldwide Archive, 1992), 106-123.
- Karoline Kühl, "'Det er easy at tale engelsk også'. Amerikadansk i 1960'erne og 1970'erne" in *Nydanske Sprogstudier*, no. 47. (2014), 39-64.
- Hanne Pico Larsen, "A Windmill and a Vikinghjem: The Importance of Visual Icons as Heritage Tropes among Danish-Americans" in Peter Aronsson and Lizette Gradén (ed.), *Performing Nordic Heritage. Everyday Practices and Institutional Culture*. (Farnham, England: Ashgate, 2013), 73-98.
- D. C. Larson, "The movement to preserve Danish cultre in North America" in R. G. Paulston (ed.), *Other dreams, other schools: Folk colleges in social and ethnic movements*. (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University Center for International Studies, University of Pittsburgh, 1980), 173-197.
- Jette Mackintosh, "'Little Denmark' on the Prairie: A Study of the Towns Elk Horn and Kimballton in Iowa" in *Journal of American Ethnic History*, vol. 7, no. 2. (1988), 46-68.
- Henrik Bredmose Simonsen, "Grundtvigian Danish-Americans – a story of preservation and renewal of cultural and religious traditions" in *The Bridge*, vol. 32, no. 2. (2012), 9-36.
- Donald K. Watkins, "Danes and Danish on the Great Plains: Some Sociolingustic Aspects" in Paul Schack (ed.), *Languages in Conflict: Linguistic Acculturation on the Great Plains*. (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1980), 58-76.
- Peter C. Weber, "Ethnic Identity During War. The Case of German American Societies During World War I" in *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 31, no. 1, 185-206.
- Frederik Forrai Ørskov, "Udvandringsannoncernes rolle i den Nordslesvigske udvandring – en analyse" in *Rubicon*, no. 2. (Odense: Historienævnet for på Syddansk Universitet, 2014), 22-39.
- Ezra Zeitler, "Creating America's 'Czech Capital': ethnic identity and heritage tourism in Wilber, Nebraska" in *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, vol. 4, no. 1. (2009), 73-85.

9.3 Online resources

- *The Statutes At Large of the United States of America from December, 1889 to March, 1891 and Recent Treaties, Conventions, and Executive Proclamations*. (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1891). http://www.constitution.org/uslaw/sal/026_statutes_at_large.pdf Retrieved 15/2 2016.
- *The Statutes At Large of the United Statess of America from April, 1921 to March, 1923. Concurrent Resolutions of the Two Houses of Congress and Recent Treaties, Conventions, and Executive Proclamations*, volume 67, chapter 8. (Washington, D. C.), pp. 5-7. https://www.loc.gov/law/help/statutes-at-large/67th-congress/c67.pdf Retrieved 15/2 2016.
- *The Statutes At Large of the United States of America from December, 1923 to March, 1925. Concurrent Resolutions of the Two Houses of Congress and Recent Treaties, Conventions and Executive Proclamations*, volume 68, chapter 190. (Washington, D. C.), pp. 153-169. https://www.loc.gov/law/help/statutes-at-large/68th-congress/c68.pdf Retrieved 16/2 2016.
- Danebod Folk Camp, "What's Danebod?". http://danebodfolkcamp.org/about/ Retrieved 16/2 2016.

- Danish American Heritage Society, "The Danish American Heritage Society – Historical Overview." http://www.danishheritage.org/dahs-history.html Retrieved 21/2 2016.
- Danmarks Statistik, "Folketal efter hovedlandsdele (summariske tal fra folketællinger", 1930. http://www.statistikbanken.dk/10021 Retrieved 14/2 2016.
- Danmarks Statistik, "Indvandrere i Danmark 2015". (2015). http://www.dst.dk/Site/Dst/Udgivelser/GetPubFile.aspx?id=20703&sid=indv2015 Retrieved 21/2 2016.
- Det Danske Udvandrerarkiv, "Det Danske Udvandrerarkiv – en national opgave". http://www.udvandrerarkivet.dk/om-det-danske-udvandrerarkiv/ Retrieved 21/2 2016.
- Det Statistiske Centralbyrå, *Statistisk årbok for kongeriget Norge, 42de årgang. 1922*. (Kristiania: H. Aschegoug & Co., 1923), p. 3. https://www.ssb.no/a/histstat/aarbok/1922.pdf Retrieved 14/2 2016.
- Søren Espersen, "Søren Espersen: Islam og demokrati er uforenelige". http://www.danskfolkeparti.dk/S%C3%B8ren_Espersen_Islam_og_demokrati_er_uforenelige Retrieved 21/2 2016.
- Martin Henriksen, "Det danske mindretal skal passe bedre på sig selv". http://www.fla.de/artikel/Det-danske-mindretal-skal-passe-bedre-paa-sig-selv-174ec.html Retrieved 11/2 2016.
- Pia Kjærsgaard, "Den svenske løgn". http://www.danskfolkeparti.dk/Den_svenske_l%C3%B8gn Retrieved 21/2 2016.
- Museum of Danish America, "Danish Brotherhood Lodges by Number". http://www.danishmuseum.org/pdfs/danish-brotherhood-sisterhood/danish-brotherhood-lodges-by-number.pdf Seen February 19, 2016.
- Museum of Danish America, "The Danish Immigrant Museum Celebrates 25 Years" in *America Letter*, vol. 21, no. 2. (2008), 3-9. http://www.danishmuseum.org/pdfs/america-letters/2009-spring-america-letter.pdf Retrieved 21/2 2016.
- Museum of Danish America, "Museum Changes Name". http://www.danishmuseum.org/news/namechange.cfm Retrieved 5/2 2016.
- MuseumsUSA, "Augusatana Historical Society". http://www.museumsusa.org/museums/info/14188 Retrieved 5/2 2016.
- Pia Kjærsgaard, "Har regeringen mod til at handle?" http://www.danskfolkeparti.dk/Har_regeringen_mod_til_at_handle_ Retrieved 11/2 2016.
- Statistics Sweden, "Population and Population Changes 1749-2014". http://www.scb.se/en_/Finding-statistics/Statistics-by-subject-area/Population/Population-composition/Population-statistics/Aktuell-Pong/25795/Yearly-statistics--The-whole-country/26046/ Retrieved 14/2 2016.
- United States Census Bureau, *Census for 1820.* (Washington, 1821). http://www2.census.gov/prod2/decennial/documents/1820a.zip Retrieved 15/2 2916.
- United States Census Bureau, *Abstract of the Fourteenth Census of the United States, 1920*. (Washington, D. C. 1923). http://www2.census.gov/prod2/decennial/documents/001718111.zip Retrieved 15/2 2016.
- United States Census Bureau, *Report on the Population of the United States at the Eleventh Census: 1890. Part I*. (Washington D. C. 1895). http://www2.census.gov/prod2/decennial/documents/1890a_v1.zip Retrieved 15/2 2016.

- Woodrow Wilson, "Wilson's War Message to Congress". http://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/Wilson's_War_Message_to_Congress Retrieved 3/2 2016.
- United States Department of Homeland Security, *Yearbook of Immigration Statistics 2013*. (Washington D.C: US Department of Homeland Security, Office of Immigration Statistics, 2014), 6-11. https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/ois_yb_2013_0.pdf Retrieved 20/2 2016.

9.4 Newspapers

9.4.1 Dannevirke

The newspaper Dannevirke is widely used in this thesis. Dannevirke are available online o n *The Digital Library of Danish American Newspapers and Journals*, created by the Museum of Danish America.[224] The specific articles and other items in Dannevirke used in the thesis are:

- "Den Danske Kirkes 7de Aarsmøde i Clinton, Iowa (Fortsat)", 30/9 1884, 5-6.
- F. L. Grundtvig, "Indbydelse til at indtræde i 'Dansk Folkesamfund'", 13/4 1887, 6.
- F. L. Grundtvig, "Kirken og Hjælpeforeningerne", 7/4 1885, 5.
- Grundtvig, F. L., "Svar til Hr. G. Elborg og Fremstilling af 'Forholdene i Clinton', 21/5 1885", 2/6 1885, 5.
- M. Holst, "Et Par Ord i Anledning af Dansk Folkesamfund' og den 'stille' Kritik", 29/6 1887, p. 6.
- F. L. Grundtvig, "Den danske Koloni i Minnesota", 14/7 1885, 7.
- A. L. J. Søholm, "Lidt Kritik", 13/7 1887, 6.
- A. S. Nielsen, "Dansk Folkesamfund", 20/7 1887, 5-6.
- M. Holst, "Vort Kirkesamfund og 'Dansk Folkesamfund'", 20/7 1887, 6.
- F. L. Grundtvig, "Aabent Brev til Pastor Søholm", 20/7 1887, 6.
- F. L. Grundtvig, "Den danske Kirke og dansk Folkesamfund", 27/7 1887, 6.
- F. L. Grundtvig, "Dansk Folkesamfund", 31/8 1887, 7.
- Th. Lyngby, "Det danske Sprogs Fremtid i Amerika", 7/9 1887, 5-6.
- P. S. Vig, "Lidt om den ny Forening, Forsøg paa en aaben Kritik", 3/8 1887, 6.
- "De danskfødte i Amerika", 29/11 1922, 3.
- "Det Danske Brodersamfunds Formaal", 20/11 1940, 5.

9.4.2 Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad

Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad was studied at the Danish American Archive and Library, where all issues are available. The specific articles and other items in Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad used in this article are:

- Frank Tellesen, "Til Overvejelse", 1/4 1916, 1.
- Hans N. Odgaard, "Vor Pligt", 1/5 1916, 1.
- Waldemar M. Larsen, "Fra Rutland, Ia.", 1/2 1917, 1.
- Frank Lawson, "Flaget", 1/5 1918, 1.
- "En Henstilling", 1/6 1918, 1.
- "Americanization", *1/12 1918, 5.*
- James Westergaard, "Fra Denver, Colorado", 1/5 1919, 3.
- "Flagfester", 1/3 1919, nr. 2, 1.

224 It is available on the following web address: http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM/. Seen February 20, 2016.

- T. P. Nielsen, "Meddelelse til alle Loger", 1/4 1919, 1.
- A. Fonnesbæk, "Til Over-Præsidenten.", 1/5 1919, 2.
- Julius E. Larsen, "Sproget.", 1/5 1919, 3.
- Christien Nielsen, "Sproget.", 1/6 1919, 2.
- J. P. Jørgensen, "Hvor bærer det hen?", 1/6 1919, 2-3.
- "Sproget.", 1/6 1919, 1.
- Peter P. Scott, "Mere om Sproget.", 1/6 1919, 3.
- N. Jørgensen, "Et Vagt i Gevær.", 1/7 1919, 1.
- Arthur London, "Sproget.", 1/8 1919, 5.
- "De Nye Love.", 1/11 1919, 2.

9.4.3 Bien

Bien is a former Danish-language newspaper, now publishing in English. Issues of Bien are also available on *The Digital Library of Danish American Newspapers and Journals.*

- Carl Mygind, "Dansk Brodersamfunds 50 Aars Jubilæum", 1/1 1932, 4
- "Dansk-Amerikansk Interview", 27/9 1934, 1.

9.5 Archival Material

9.5.1 Danish American Archive and Library

Material available in the Danish American Archive and Library in Blair, Nebraska:

- *Translation of the manuscript concerning the beginnings of the Danish Brotherhood in America*, DBL-2000, Nebraska, Omaha Headquarters, Box 31, "DBIA History"
- *"The Danish Brotherhood",* DAAL, DBL-2000, Nebraska, Omaha Headquarters, Box 31, "DBIA History"
- DBL-2000, Nebraska, Omaha, Headquarters, Box 23, Centennial Files 1982.