



2017

Ethnic Preservation or Americanization: A Study of Language and Ethnicity in the Danish Brotherhood in America

Nick Kofod Mogensen

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/thebridge>

 Part of the [European History Commons](#), [European Languages and Societies Commons](#), and the [Regional Sociology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mogensen, Nick Kofod (2017) "Ethnic Preservation or Americanization: A Study of Language and Ethnicity in the Danish Brotherhood in America," *The Bridge*: Vol. 40 : No. 1 , Article 11.

Available at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/thebridge/vol40/iss1/11>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Bridge by an authorized editor of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

Ethnic Preservation or Americanization: A Study of Language and Ethnicity in the Danish Brotherhood in America

by Nick Kofod Mogensen

This article is based on A Bodtker Grant-funded article "Colonist or Citizen?," a master's thesis written by the author of this article.¹ The thesis was made possible by a Bodtker Grant from the Danish American Heritage Society, which financed the author's archival research at the Museum of Danish America and Danish American Archive and Library (DAAL) in the fall of 2015.

Introduction

Once European mass immigration to America began in the mid-nineteenth century, roughly 400,000-450,000 Danish immigrants made their way to the United States,² with approximately 300,000 of them arriving between 1880-1920.³ Immigrant historians agree that Danish immigrants assimilated rather quickly into American core society, i.e., the white Protestant majority population of Anglo-Saxon descent.⁴ One of the main reasons for this ease of assimilation was the relative scarcity of concentrated settlements of Danish immigrants compared to other immigrant groups, as Danes often settled in areas in America with few other Danish immigrants.

Many Danish immigrants still wanted to retain some contact with their fellow Danish ethnics, however. Some defied the overall trend and settled in towns either designated for or dominated by Danish immigrants, often called "Danish colonies," while others simply joined a few of the many Danish ethnic organizations that emerged in America wherever Danish immigrants lived. "Ethnic organizations" refers to organizations that target people of a specific ethnicity as members. Such organizations can take many forms and have widely varying objectives: social or entertainment activities, economic benefits, cultural or ethnic issues, etc. What ethnic organizations have in common is the focus on bringing people together in organizations reserved strictly for people of a specific ethnicity. They thereby create separate ethnic social communities, which are isolated, at least as long as the meetings last, from other ethnic immigrant groups and American core society.

Participation in such communities tends to reduce the chances of primary group relations, such as friendships and marriages, with core group Americans or members of other immigrant groups. This is because ethnic organizations meet certain—especially social—needs of their members within a strictly ethnic framework, which might otherwise draw immigrants into groups or organizations outside their ethnic community. By reducing primary group relations with other ethnic groups, ethnic organizations cause what Milton M. Gordon calls “structural separation.” Structural separation, according to Gordon, “denotes a situation in which primary group contacts between various ethnic groups are held to a minimum, even though secondary contacts on the job, on the civic scene, and in other areas of impersonal contact may abound.”⁵ This is particularly important to understanding the influence of ethnic organizations on assimilation since structural assimilation is, in Gordon’s view, “the keystone of the arch of assimilation,” and “[o]nce structural assimilation has occurred, [...] all of the other types of assimilation will naturally follow.”⁶

If Gordon’s analysis of ethnic organizations in relation to assimilation is correct, the existence of Danish ethnic organizations in America worked counter to the general trend among Danish immigrants in America toward rapid assimilation. While the average Danish immigrant assimilated rather quickly, a number of Danish ethnic organizations—made up of Danish immigrant members—worked in different ways to slow that assimilation. The existence of ethnic organizations can thus be seen as an indication that the assimilation of Danish immigrants was not a consensually agreed-upon priority within the Danish immigrant community. To fully understand Danish American culture, the effect of ethnic organizations on the assimilation process needs to be studied further. How did ethnic organizations affect the assimilation of Danish immigrants to America, and which role did the ethnic organizations themselves want to have in that process? It is the purpose of this article to answer those questions.

This article will study one ethnic organization in depth, the Danish Brotherhood in America. The Danish Brotherhood is the largest Danish ethnic organization ever to have existed in the United States, with members spread across most of the country, and it continues to exist today in modified form. Furthermore, whereas primary source material regarding the Danish immigrant community can sometimes

be both scarce and sporadic, an excellent collection of Danish Brotherhood material exists, particularly at the Danish American Archive and Library (DAAL) in Blair, Nebraska, which makes an in-depth study of the Danish Brotherhood possible. Based primarily on sources found in DAAL, this paper examines, through an analysis of the discussion of the organization's language policy in the member publication *Det Danske Brodersamfund's Blad*, the Danish Brotherhood's role in shaping perceptions of Danish ethnicity and culture in America. This language discussion is indicative of the ethnic character of the Danish Brotherhood and can be used both to describe how the organization perceived its own influence on Danish ethnicity and culture in America and to offer an objective measurement of its actual effect on Danish assimilation. Since this article focuses on only one ethnic organization and is mostly based on the first few years of said organization's member publication, its findings cannot of course be taken as conclusive evidence with regard to the entire Danish immigrant population.⁷ Given the importance of the Danish Brotherhood as a Danish ethnic organization in the United States, however, this article's findings are nonetheless indicative of important trends in the assimilation patterns of Danish immigrants.

Danish Brotherhood in America

The Danish Brotherhood in America was formed in 1882 in Omaha, Nebraska as an ethnic fraternal benefit association.⁸ Ethnic fraternal benefit associations typically combine objectives such as economic activities, preservation of ethnic culture, and Americanization of its members.⁹ Describing ethnic fraternal benefit associations' role in ethnic communities, Michael G. Karni wrote that such associations "took it far beyond a simple economic function. It assumed a vital role in the new ethnic communities. Along with the church and the newspaper, it served to create and sustain group identity and cohesion."¹⁰

By preserving an ethnic group identity, such organizations aimed to ease the immigrant experience and function as a "cultural bridge" between the homeland of the immigrants and America.¹¹ The Danish Brotherhood wanted to utilize familiar elements of Danish culture and ethnic community to create a sense of stability in the immigrants' lives that would enable them to focus on settling in America and adapt to the core culture in a manageable way and pace. This explains why

ethnic fraternal benefit associations like the Danish Brotherhood had both cultural preservation and Americanization as their objectives, which might otherwise seem paradoxical.

The Danish Brotherhood's self-perception as an agent of Americanization challenges Gordon's theory of structural assimilation as outlined in the introduction of this article. Ethnic organizations create or uphold a primary group relation between their members based on a shared ethnicity and thus counteracts structural assimilation, which Gordon identifies as the most important catalyst of assimilation. If Gordon is right, the Danish Brotherhood must consequently have failed in its intention to facilitate "Americanization" and instead, whether by design or accident, slowed down assimilation of its members. By creating a separate ethnic social community, the Danish Brotherhood may even have inhibited the assimilation of its members, despite certain attempts by the Danish Brotherhood to promote the opposite effect.

The Danish Brotherhood in America was originally called *Danske Våbenbrødre i Amerika* (Danish Brothers in Arms in America), an ethnic organization for Danish immigrant veterans of the First and Second Schleswig Wars against Germany (1848-50 and 1864) and the American Civil War. The objective of Danish Brothers in Arms in America was two-fold: to provide life insurance policies and similar economic benefits for its members, and to serve as a social community where veterans could share memories from their military service in their native language. It was formed in 1881 as a national organization intended to consolidate five regional Danish ethnic veterans' organizations in America into one nationwide organization. Already in 1882, it was reorganized as the Danish Brotherhood in America and welcomed all Danish-born men regardless of military experience. The change happened mainly because some members feared that it would otherwise be difficult if not impossible to attract new members to the organization since few new veterans immigrated.¹² The people who pushed for reform seem to have had a point, as the Danish Brotherhood quickly grew in members under the new name and structure.

Year	Lodges	Members
1891	40	1,473
1902	145	8,347
1906	237	15,465
1907 ¹³	255	17,173 ¹⁴
1910	272	19,589
1919 ¹⁵	290	21,393
1922 ¹⁶	284	20,336
1934 ¹⁷	-	About 17,000
1940 ¹⁸	About 250	About 15,000

Table 1. Number of Danish Brotherhood in America lodges and members.

The membership statistics in Table 1 point to an important characteristic of the Danish Brotherhood with regard to assimilation. Its membership and number of lodges increased steadily from its founding until the 1920s, when membership levels began to gradually decrease. This is because the Danish Brotherhood initially appealed primarily to Danish immigrants, not Danish Americans. When mass immigration from Europe stopped as a result of the Emergency Quota Act of 1921, which significantly restricted the number of immigrants allowed into America, the number of new members in the Danish Brotherhood declined correspondingly.

Identity Negotiation through Language Debate

An important objective of the Danish Brothers in Arms in America was to give Danish immigrant veterans a place to share their memories. That objective was retained in the Danish Brotherhood: a key part of the organization's appeal, apart from economic benefits, was that it provided Danish immigrants with a community where they could discuss memories from Denmark in the Danish language. It was written into the Danish Brotherhood constitution that members could only speak Danish at meetings. The use of the Danish language was thus not coincidental, but a deliberate attempt to preserve the Danish language and create a community where people whose native language was Danish felt at home. This dual emphasis on both the

Danish language and memories from Denmark, was likely appealing to some Danish immigrants who had grown up and perhaps lived a part of their adult lives in Denmark, but much less so to the immigrants' American-born children who had no personal experience of Denmark. Therefore, as mass immigration from Europe stopped in the 1920s, there was an increasing concern in the Danish Brotherhood that changes had to be made if new members were to be attracted in the future. As noted above, the decrease in membership evident from the 1920s statistics in Table 1 suggest that such concerns were valid.

Those concerns were articulated in *Det Danske Brodersamfund's Blad* [The Danish Brotherhood Newspaper] in 1916, the first year it was published. Since such concerns were seen in the very first year of *Det Danske Brodersamfund's Blad*, it is very possible that the issue had been discussed in the Danish Brotherhood even earlier. In 1916, Danish Brotherhood member Anders Christensen argued that since no one came from Denmark to the area where he lived, and since young Danish Americans could rarely speak or understand Danish, it was necessary to abolish the Danish language requirement. If not, he argued, membership would decrease as the immigrant generation died out.¹⁹ The language debate continued over the next few years, but because many felt it was inappropriate to discuss such ethnic matters during the First World War while American soldiers risked their lives for their country, the language debate only fully unfolded after the First World War ended in 1919. The language debate reflected two primary orientations within the Brotherhood: a pro-English camp that wanted to adapt to the changing language patterns of Danish Americans by using English; and a pro-Danish camp that wanted to preserve the Brotherhood's official language as Danish regardless of the consequences that such a refusal to change could potentially have for the organization.

The pro-English group generally used similar arguments to those put forth by Anders Christensen in 1916. N. C. Carlson wrote in 1917 that it had become hard to attract young people to the Danish Brotherhood, because the younger generations preferred different forms of entertainment, but also due to the strict Danish-only language policy. Danish is difficult to learn, he argued, particularly with all of its different and distinctive dialects, and young Danish Americans had little use for the Danish language in America. The organization should have room for the Danish language as long as people continued to

immigrate, but even those people should learn English as soon as possible, and the Danish Brotherhood should thus also adapt as an organization.²⁰ James Westergaard and Christien Nielsen argued the same thing in 1919, noting that since few new immigrants came and few Danish Americans wanted or were able to speak Danish, allowing English to be spoken was necessary if a younger generation was to take over once the older immigrant generation died. If the Danish Brotherhood failed to adapt, it would eventually disappear.²¹ For that reason, an editorial recommendation was printed on the front page of the April 1, 1919 issue of *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, asking all members to vote for a proposal that would allow the use of English in the Danish Brotherhood.²²

Brotherhood members disagreed on this issue, however. For pro-Danish members, the Danish ethnicity and cultural heritage was the single most defining characteristic of the Danish Brotherhood. Attempts to water down that element of the organization were thus an attack on the fundamentals of the organization and the legitimization of the organization's existence. Whereas the pro-English advocates feared that refusing to reform the language policy would result in the disappearance of the Danish Brotherhood, some pro-Danish advocates conversely believed that a language change would mean the end of the organization. If nobody spoke Danish in the Danish Brotherhood, Danish might as well be removed from its name, Arthur London argued.²³ How, then, would the Danish Brotherhood differ from non-ethnic fraternal benefit associations that were often much bigger as they targeted a much wider audience across ethnic divides?²⁴ The Danish Brotherhood was not just an insurance company and should not be run solely according to what was the best business decision. It was also an ethnic organization, and the ethnic component should thus be preserved as an integral part of the character and objective of the Danish Brotherhood, it was argued. If young Danish Americans would not bother to learn the Danish language, they were not worthy to be members of the organization anyway, in some members' opinion.²⁵

There was a slight, gradual change in the language use in *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad* after the language debate erupted. Gradually, more English articles and announcements appeared in the publication, although it continued to be rare. This changed dramatically in 1941, when the publication was re-named the *Danish Brotherhood*

Magazine, now written almost exclusively in English. In other words, the language of the publication was not changed into English until twenty-five years after concerns were first raised by members in the member publication, although that discussion likely predates the publication. 1941 was also rather late when compared to the general Danish ethnic community, many of whose members had made similar transitions decades earlier. In 1972, it changed again – this time to *American Dane*, indicating another change in identity and another step in the assimilation process.

Changing immigration patterns and an increasingly assimilated Danish ethnic community, particularly in the second generation, thus started a debate within the Danish Brotherhood about the fundamental goals and character of the organization. At the center of the debate was the question of how Danish and/or American the organization should be—and what “Danishness” meant for Danish ethnics in America. 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 American-born generations; or was it both natural and desirable to embrace an American identity and only preserve parts of Danish culture that were useful in American society?

Through the language debate, then, the Danish Brotherhood essentially faced an identity negotiation, at least in part as a result of changes in the immigration pattern and the relative size of the American-born generations. When debating language policy and the role of Danish in the organization, they were also debating the identity of the Danish Brotherhood, both what identity it had historically had and what identity it should have in the future. There were different perceptions and visions of the Danish Brotherhood, differences that thus manifested themselves in the language debate.

World War I's Effect on Language Debate

It is clear from *Det Danske Brodersamfund's Blad* that World War I had a profound impact on the Danish Brotherhood, as it had on many other ethnic organizations and ethnic communities in general. War can pose a great challenge for immigrants, because war potentially increases suspicions and questions among core group Americans about the loyalty of immigrants. Can American core society trust that immi-

grants are unquestionably loyal to America and not their countries of origin? During World War I, this was particularly the case for German immigrants, since Germans constituted a major immigrant group in America, but America was at war with Germany. In some extreme cases, this wartime suspicion led to strict laws affecting immigrants specifically, e.g., the so-called Babel Proclamation under which Iowa governor William L. Harding, based largely on anti-German sentiments, banned all church services, school education, and even public or phone conversations held in foreign languages in Iowa.

At the same time, war offers immigrants a unique opportunity to prove their loyalty towards America and demonstrate that they have become fully American. This is exactly what happened in parts of the German immigrant community. Many German ethnic organizations adopted the English language, both due to laws like the Babel Proclamation and as a symbolic gesture towards American core society, while some organizations even changed their names in order to decrease suspicion and hostility. Many of these changes, e.g., language usage, became permanent.²⁶ Danish immigrants were also affected by the restrictions concerning language use under the Babel Proclamation, but were not subjected to the same discrimination and widespread mistrust as German immigrants, since the United States was not at war with Denmark.

For the Danish Brotherhood particularly, emphasis on its members' obligation to America was evident in *Det Danske Brodersamfundets Blad* from the very beginning of American participation in World War I. In the first issue published after the American entry into the war on April 6, 1917, the Danish Brotherhood declared that it had "done its full duty as regards patriotism"²⁷ and pointed out that many local lodges had already invested in war bonds, less than a month after the American entry into the war.²⁸ In October the same year, the Danish Brotherhood itself invested \$20,000 in war bonds in addition to the ever increasing number of local lodges that had done so independently.²⁹

Many of the Danish Brotherhood's patriotic activities took place in conjunction with the Jacob A. Riis League of Patriotic Service. The League was founded by Danish immigrants on May 13, 1918³⁰ "[t]o support the United States' war policy" and "act as a clearing house for patriotic activities among American citizens of Danish blood," e.g., through support of campaigns like Liberty Bonds and war savings

stamps.³¹ Organizations like the Jacob A. Riis League were common in many immigrant communities in America, including among German immigrants. Credit for such organizations must be given in part to the Committee on Public Information (CPI), a U.S. propaganda agency that emerged during the first weeks of American participation in World War I to create public enthusiasm and support for the war effort in American society. One of the ways the CPI tried to do that was by enticing ethnic communities to undertake various patriotic activities. Following the CPI's lead, the leadership of the Jacob A. Riis League declared, in *Det Danske Brodersamfund's Blad* in October 1918: "It is the duty of all Americans to do their part to win the war, and Danes should walk in the front. No other immigrant people can be said to have done more."³² Danish immigrants also took part in patriotic parades and had parties on the Fourth of July in support of America and the war effort. In New York, for example, Danish veterans from the Second Schleswig War walked in parades with the message that they had fought Germany once and now did it again.³³

It is not only what the Danish Brotherhood did, however, but also what it did not do that showed the impact of the war on the organization. In May 1918, Danish Brotherhood member Frank V. Lawson urged members to abstain from using both the Danish language and the Danish flag at public events, but to use only the Danish Brotherhood logo and the American flag. A month later, the Danish Brotherhood asked its members to close all meetings by singing "My Country, 'Tis of Thee," and in July 1918, members were instructed to avoid drawing any attention to the Danish flag and language and preferably to abstain from discussing the role of the Danish language in the ethnic community in general as long as America was at war. This edict was generally respected by Brotherhood members, at least in *Det Danske Brodersamfund's Blad*. The Danish language was already fading in importance for Danish Americans before the war, but "the war has also turned everything upside down,"³⁴ as Brotherhood member P. C. Paulsen noted in a plea to allow speaking English in the organization.

During World War I, the Danish Brotherhood was directly engaged in patriotic activities to support the war effort, and Brotherhood leaders repeatedly pushed for members to refrain from public displays of their Danish ethnicity and to tone down certain Danish cultural traits. This was accompanied by pushes for language reform due to a changing demographic. Based on this, it is fair to suspect that

pro-English parts of the Danish Brotherhood, particularly the leadership of the organization, attempted to use World War I to stifle the pro-Danish wing, in effect “Americanizing” the Danish Brotherhood and pushing for increased assimilation. This caused a backlash among the organization’s pro-Danish members who resisted the calls for a language change by defending the concept of the Danish Brotherhood as an ethnic organization with a distinct, strong ethnically Danish profile. This response helps explain why the leaders’ and other pro-English’s efforts did not immediately succeed.

Conclusion

The fundamental nature of the Danish Brotherhood seems to have been a matter of discussion among members throughout the organization’s existence. This question became particularly critical when mass immigration from Denmark decreased in the 1920s. With fewer native Danes arriving in America, American-born generations began to constitute a far bigger percentage of the Danish ethnic population in America, while foreign-born immigrants as a group dwindled in size and importance. It became increasingly difficult to base an organization or ethnic community exclusively, or even primarily, on immigrants. To survive, the Danish Brotherhood needed to change with the times by adapting to the different interests and conditions of the American-born descendants of Danish immigrants. Due to political and demographic changes at the beginning of the twentieth century, discussions about the Danish Brotherhood’s identity started once again. In *Det Danske Brodersamfundts Blad*, a language discussion erupted, particularly after the end of World War I. In that language discussion the identity question clearly showed its face.

The discussion about whether or not to allow members to speak English thus was not a trivial matter, but essentially a struggle to determine the identity of the Danish Brotherhood. The emergence of demands to allow English and the desire to let changes in American-born generations determine the development of the organization thus indicate attempts to take a further step in the direction of assimilation to American core society. That significant parts of the Danish Brotherhood wanted the organization to play a bigger and more active role regarding assimilation was particularly evident from the repeated attempts made by the society’s leadership to push for increased as-

similation. The Danish Brotherhood leaders capitalized on World War I-era nativism to enhance their own position and push for the assimilative reforms they felt were necessary, and in so doing that they advocated for a more “American” Danish Brotherhood. Calls for reform, particularly regarding the exclusive status of the Danish language in the Danish Brotherhood, were not immediately successful. Although the language debate was successfully silenced during World War I, attempts to prevent the aforementioned assimilative reforms after the war ended show that at least some members of the Danish Brotherhood wanted the organization to work towards a preservation of a distinct Danish ethnicity and community in America, nearly the opposite of what the Brotherhood leadership wanted.

Whatever the original objectives of the Danish Brotherhood were, and whatever reforms members called for or opposed, the analysis of the language discussion as it played out in the membership newspaper shows that the changing demographics resulting from decreased immigration and an increasing assimilation of American-born generations inspired the Brotherhood to adapt and change as an organization. These changes in the Danish Brotherhood were thus not caused by proactive attempts to “Americanize” or assimilate its members or the Danish ethnic community, although such attempts were clearly made. Instead, it was the gradual “Americanization” and assimilation of the Danish ethnic community in America that prompted the Danish Brotherhood to change in order to survive.

This does not mean that the Danish Brotherhood passively or thoughtlessly followed changing demographics, as the heated debate over language usage shows. The above-mentioned 1919 proposal to allow the use of English at Brotherhood meetings, presented by the Brotherhood leadership on the front page of *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, failed to gain enough support among members, and the proposal was withdrawn. English did not become an official language of the organization or its newspaper until 1941, much later than in the majority of the Danish ethnic community.

This delay illustrates Gordon’s theories of assimilation discussed at the beginning of this article. By creating organizations exclusively for people of a specific ethnicity, ethnic organizations in essence create separate ethnic communities by distancing themselves from the surrounding American society. They set up a social framework for their members through which primary group relations can only happen

with people of a similar ethnicity. A Danish immigrant living in a big city like Chicago, who could otherwise easily go through life without any particular contact with other Danish immigrants, significantly increased his or her primary group relations with fellow Danes by joining an organization like the Danish Brotherhood. It is well established that immigrants who settled in Danish ethnic colonies in America assimilated more slowly than immigrants who settled in areas without the same degree of ethnic concentration. What this article argues is that ethnic organizations have a similar non-assimilative effect since they by definition create separate ethnic communities and thus counteract structural assimilation.

Despite attempts by the organization's leadership to promote assimilation, the Danish Brotherhood was not an important assimilative factor in the Danish immigrant community, but rather the other way around. Since the Danish Brotherhood, whether deliberately or not, effectively functioned as a separate ethnic community, it even slowed down the assimilation process of its members by creating an ethnic coherence that many Danish immigrants often would not have experienced otherwise, particularly in urban areas. This shows how important structural assimilation is in terms of overall assimilation and how ethnic organizations weakened structural assimilation. Even for an organization that repeatedly pushed for further assimilation, the Danish Brotherhood seems to have adopted the use of English more gradually than the Danish American ethnic community in general, while cultural traits like the Danish language and flag appear to have retained importance for a longer period of time

Endnotes

¹ Nick Kofod Mogensen, "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," (Masters thesis, University of Copenhagen, 2016).

² 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), 186-89.

³ *Ibid.*, 23.

⁴ Milton M. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion and National Origins* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), 72-73.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 235.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 81.

⁷ For a more in-depth study, also including the Danish ethnic organization the Danish People's Society, see the aforementioned Master's thesis, "Colonist or Citizen?"

⁸ "The Danish Brotherhood in America: The Story Continues," The Danish American Archive and Library, accessed April 25, 2017, <http://danishamericanarchive.com/the-danish-brotherhood-in-america-the-story-continues/>.

⁹ John Bodnar, "Ethnic Fraternal Benefit Associations: Their Historical Development, Character, and Significance," in *Records from Ethnic Fraternal Benefit Associations in the United States: Essays and Inventories*, eds. Susan H. Shreve and Rudolph J. Vecoli (St. Paul, MN: Immigration Research Center/University of Minnesota, 1981), 5-14.

¹⁰ Michael G. Karni, "Ethnic Benefit Associations: An Introduction," in *Records from Ethnic Fraternal Benefit Associations*, 3.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² "The Danish Brotherhood," Danish American Archive and Library, DBL-2000, Nebraska, Omaha Headquarters, Box 31, "DBIA History;" and J. P. Paulsen, "Dansk Brodersamfund i America," in *Danske i Amerika*, vol. 1, ed. Peter Sørensen Vig (Minneapolis, MN: C. Rasmussen Publishing Company, 1907), 214-15.

¹³ Ibid., 219.

¹⁴ As of November 1, 1907.

¹⁵ Carl Mygind, "Dansk Brodersamfunds 50 Aars Jubilæum," *Bien*, January 1, 1932, 4.

¹⁶ "De danskfødte i Amerika," *Dannevirke*, November 29, 1922, 3.

¹⁷ "Dansk-Amerikansk Interview," *Bien*, September 27, 1934, 1.

¹⁸ "Det Danske Brodersamfunds Formaal," *Dannevirke*, November 20, 1940, 5.

¹⁹ Anders Christensen, "Fra Nebraska City, Neb., loge nr. 60," *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, June 1, 1916, 2.

²⁰ N. C. Carlsen, "Ungdommen," *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, March 1, 1917, 1.

²¹ James Westergaard, "Fra Denver, Colorado," *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, May 1, 1919, 3; and Christien Nielsen, "Sproget," *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, June 1, 1919, 2.

²² T. P. Nielsen, "Meddelelse til alle Loger," *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, April 1, 1919.

²³ Arthur London, "Sproget," *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, August 1, 1919, 5.

²⁴ A. Fønnesbæk, "Til Over-Præsidenten," *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, May 1, 1919, 2; Julius E. Larsen, "Sproget," *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, May 1, 1919, 3; and J. P. Jørgensen, "Hvor bærer det hen?," *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, June 1, 1919, 2-3.

²⁵ Peter P. Scott, "Mere om Sproget," *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, June 1, 1919, 3; and N. Jørgensen, "Et Vagt i Gevær," *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, June 1, 1919, 1.

²⁶ Peter C. Weber, "Ethnic Identity During War. The Case of German

American Societies During World War I." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 31, no. 1 (2014): 185-206.

²⁷ "... gjort sin fulde Pligt i patriotisk Henseende." All translations in this article have been made by the author.

²⁸ "Fremtidsudsigter," *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, May 1, 1917, 5.

²⁹ *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, November 1, 1917, 1.

³⁰ "Danish-Americans To Sell War Thrift Stamps," *Daily Capital Journal*, (Salem, Oregon) May 13, 1918, 1.

³¹ "John Ericsson League," *Vestkysten* 22 (May 1, 1918).

³² "Det er alle amerikaneres pligt at gøre deres del for at vinde i krigen, og danskere bør gå forrest. Ingen andre invandrerfolk kan da heller ikke siges at have gjort mere." Det Danske Brodersamfunds Organisationskomite Jacob A. Riis League, "Danskfødte Mænd og Kvinder under Stjernebanneret," *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, October 1, 1918, 1.

³³ "Danskfødte Borgeres Patriotisme," *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, August 1, 1918, 1.

³⁴ "Krigen har også vendt op og ned på alt." P. C. Paulsen, "Et Svar til Broder Marker," *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, July 1, 1918, 5.

Works Cited

- Bodnar, John. "Ethnic Fraternal Benefit Associations: Their Historical Development, Character, and Significance." In *Records from Ethnic Fraternal Benefit Associations in the United States: Essays and Inventories*, edited by Susan H. Shreve and Rudolph J. Vecoli. St. Paul, MN: Immigration Research Center/University of Minnesota, 1981. 5-14.
- "Danskfødte Borgeres Patriotisme." *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, August 1, 1918, 1.
- "De danskfødte i Amerika." *Dannevirke*, November 29, 1922, 3.
- "Det Danske Brodersamfunds Formaal." *Dannevirke*, November 20, 1940, 5.
- Det Danske Brodersamfunds Organisationskomite Jacob A. Riis League. "Danskfødte Mænd og Kvinder under Stjernebanneret." *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, October 1, 1918, 1.
- "Fremtidsudsigter." *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, May 1, 1917, 5.
- Gordon, Milton M. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion and National Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Jeppesen, Torben Grøngaard. *Danske i USA 1850-2000: en demografisk, social og kulturgeografisk undersøgelse af de danske immigranter og deres efterkommere*. Odense: Odense Bys Museer, 2005.
- Karni, Michael G. "Ethnic Benefit Associations: An Introduction." In *Records from Ethnic Fraternal Benefit Associations in the United States: Essays and Inventories*, edited by Susan H. Shreve and Rudolph J. Vecoli. St. Paul, MN: Immigration Research Center/University of Minnesota, 1981. 1-4.
- Mogensen, Nick Kofod. "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."

- Masters thesis, University of Copenhagen, 2016.
- Mygind, Carl. "Dansk Brodersamfunds 50 Aars Jubilæum." *Bien*, January 1, 1932, 4.
- Paulsen, P. C. "Et Svar til Broder Marker." *Det Danske Brodersamfunds Blad*, July 1, 1918, 5.
- Vig, Peter Sørensen. *Danske i Amerika*. Minneapolis, MN: C. Rasmussen Publishing Company, 1907.