



2016

Prohibition Among Danish American Lutherans

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 (2016) "Prohibition Among Danish American Lutherans," *The Bridge*: Vol. 39 : No. 2 , Article 7.

Available at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/thebridge/vol39/iss2/7>

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.

Prohibition Among Danish American Lutherans

by Nick Kofod Mogensen

On January 17, 1920, a major change took place in American society. The Eighteenth Amendment went into effect and started the Prohibition Era, banning the sale of alcohol in the United States from 1920 to 1933. Prohibition was not a uniquely American idea. Under pressure from temperance movements, most Nordic countries banned or severely restricted the sale of alcohol around the same time as the United States did. The Faroe Islands, Iceland, Norway, and Finland all banned alcohol during the first few decades of the twentieth century. Although a narrow majority of the Swedish people refused an outright ban in a referendum in 1922, the Swedish government instigated a state monopoly on alcohol. The only Scandinavian exception was Denmark—almost. A brief ban went into effect on February 27, 1917, but it was very short-lived. Instead, the tax on alcohol was increased so severely that consumption fell significantly.

Due to these circumstances, a study of the attitudes toward Prohibition among Danish American immigrants could be interesting. Did the Danish Americans bring along a skeptical view of an alcohol prohibition in their suitcases when they stepped aboard the ship to America? What factors influenced their views on Prohibition?

One place to find the answer is the many Danish-language newspapers that appeared in the United States. Danish immigrants were quick to integrate into American society and adopt the American culture as their own. Still, a Danish community survived in America through Danish churches, organizations, newspapers, etc. The institutions were not just a product of nostalgic longing for their old home in Denmark, however, but were a part of their present, new society. American news appeared alongside Danish news, and the political issues of the time, including Prohibition, were debated. What did they write about Prohibition, then?

Methodology and Sources

This article looks at Danish American views on Prohibition through a study of primary sources, specifically Danish American newspapers. It is by no means a comprehensive study, either of Danish

American attitudes in general, or their expressions in newspapers in particular, and it does not claim to be. It examines the Lutheran portion of the Danish American immigrant community. Although the vast majority of people in Denmark were Lutherans, as that was the religion of the state church, many converted to other religions both before and after they immigrated. The findings of a study of the environment around Danish Lutheran churches would therefore not necessarily correspond with what a similar study of other Danish American religious groups, or the entire Danish American immigrant population would show.

It also examines only a few of the newspapers with a larger distribution that were published for the Danish American population. Many such newspapers have appeared over the decades, and studying them all would be more time consuming than resources would allow. The online source used to access digitized historical newspapers for this article is The Digital Library of Danish American Newspapers and Journals, created and hosted by the Museum of Danish America in Elk Horn, Iowa.¹ Elk Horn is located in a tri-county area in southwestern Iowa which encompasses what is probably the largest non-urban concentration of Danish Americans in the country. The newspapers, of course, do not contain an exhaustive compendium of the attitudes of the Danish American society, but they offer an interesting look into a range of Danish American positions in the debate over prohibition. As they are among the newspapers of their type with the largest circulation during the Prohibition Era, they provide a representative view of the Danish American debate in general.

The four newspapers available in the library, and thus used in this article, are *Bien*, *Den Danske Pioneer*, *Dannevirke*, and *Danskeren*. *Bien* and *Den Danske Pioneer* are the only two newspapers that are still published today, although Danish is no longer their main language of publication. Both were started independently from other Danish American institutions—*Den Danske Pioneer* in 1872 and *Bien* in 1882. *Dannevirke* was founded in 1880 as a reaction against *Den Danske Pioneer* and was published until 1951, first in Elk Horn and later in Cedar Falls, Iowa. Even though it was privately owned, it was unofficially tied to the Danish Grundtvigian churches in America.² *Danskeren* was published from 1892 to 1920 and belonged to the more conservative United Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church.

The two private, secular newspapers *Den Danske Pioneer* and *Bien* were strongly opposed to Prohibition. *Den Danske Pioneer* in particular was very blunt about its position—so much so that some of its readers hid the newspaper under more “appropriate” literature when the pastor visited. *Dannevirke* was also against Prohibition. Even though it had religious ties, the ties were to the Grundtvigian church, which had a more expansive interpretation of Christianity. In the opposite camp was *Danskeren*, owned by the United Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. In this camp, alcohol and binge drinking were seen as sinful, so a good Christian could not do anything but support a ban on the sinful behavior and its cause, they believed.

Even though *Danskeren* is the only newspaper in the study that was for Prohibition and ceased publication in 1920, the tendency during its entire coverage of the Prohibition debate in the years prior to Prohibition is so clear and consistent that it is an invaluable example of the political and religious group it represented. A more thorough study including additional newspapers, such as another title affiliated with the United Danish Evangelical Church in America, *Luthersk Ugeblad*, would likely give the same results.

A Battle Against Sin

Danish American Lutheran congregations were generally divided into two groups, one more liberal and the other more conservative. The Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (hereafter the Danish Church) was started in 1874 and formally organized in 1878. However, in 1894 conservative members of the Danish Church left and formed the United Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church (hereafter the United Church) in 1896.³ The Danish Church was made up of Grundtvigians, called after the famous nineteenth-century Danish church reformer N.F.S. Grundtvig who emphasized the Apostle’s Creed and the sacraments, with less interest in the exact words of the Bible. The United Church, on the other hand, aligned itself with the Inner (Home) Mission faction of the Danish State Church. They emphasized biblical authority, repentance, and a personal faith. The two groups have sometimes been called “Happy Danes” (the Danish Church) and “Holy Danes” (the United Church). “Happy Danes” were more liberal and enjoyed folk dancing, aquavit, etc., whereas the

“Holy Danes” frowned upon many of these things or even considered them sinful.

Danskeren's prohibitionist point of view was, in other words, a natural extension of its religious affiliation. Alcohol was seen as an evil that all good Christians should fight. As expressed in a column on church affairs on April 2, 1919, the opponents of Prohibition—the “enemy”—would just “ignore the bootleggers and other lawbreakers” and allow the sinful behavior to continue.⁴ The perception of the Prohibition question as a battle between temperance and binge drinking is seen throughout *Danskeren's* entire coverage of the discussion. In an article about a referendum on Prohibition in Iowa, opponents of Prohibition were called “friends of the saloon.”⁵ Saloons were typically the seedier bars where binge drinking and alcoholism were common. The entire “no” side of the Prohibition referendum was characterized as either drunks or supporters of such behavior. By characterizing the measure's opponents as supporters of binge drinking, the newspaper made the anti-prohibitionists' case look weaker and immoral—a defense of a sin that destroyed lives.

In the New Year's Day issue in 1919, *Danskeren* published a rare critical opinion piece on Prohibition by H. P. Andersen. It was originally published in Danish, but has been translated into English for this article. The same is the case with the rest of the quotes. Andersen wrote: “There could be a discussion about this question based on the Bible.... Why should the entire people be banned from using beverages because a few drink themselves into pigs? Is that the way to force them into Heaven? I think not. If the preaching of the word of God can't do it, it can't be done.”⁶

Considering the views and audience of the newspaper, it is not surprising that a response to H. P. Andersen's piece appeared in the paper two weeks later:

Mr. Andersen [says] that Prohibition is a question that you can discuss based on the Bible. Yes, why not? But why not take the situation exactly as it is? Mr. Andersen admits that there are some who turn into pigs by drinking.... If it was a question of removing something that could help humans as a whole, then yes, there is reason to protest; but to take away an evil that has marred humanity ever since the days of Noah and has caused sorrow, need, and despair in millions

of homes, that such an evil can be defended by someone who has spent more than a lifetime in God's congregation on Earth "that [sic] the limit."⁷

The final line of the article is particularly interesting. The writer says that it is wrong for a Christian man to defend drinking himself "into a pig," a claim that H. P. Andersen would of course not let him get away with. "It is not at all the drinking I am defending," Andersen replied. "It is the freedom. I think there is another way to regulate it."⁸ In other words, he simply disagreed with how the alcohol problem was handled and appealed to preaching the word of God instead of prohibitions and force.

Union leader Samuel Gompers opposed Prohibition on similar grounds; according to him, it had actually caused the labor riots of the day: "We have knocked over this man [the working man]. By uprooting one habit, it just manifests itself in another way."⁹ The journalist ended the article by writing: "You would think that an excellent labor leader such as Gompers would have seen enough of the former saloon habits of the workers to want it uprooted."¹⁰

Violation of Personal Freedom

Danskeren characterized the opponents of Prohibition as "friends of the saloon" or people who did not recognize alcohol consumption as a problem. That is not the picture you get if you read the Danish newspapers that were against Prohibition, however. They just disagreed with how the prohibitionists wanted to solve the problem. One of the key reasons for their opposition was that they saw it as a violation of their personal freedom. Reverend Aage Møller outlined this view in *Den Danske Pioneer* in 1926: "Prohibition is related to all that which wants to go back to the feudal baron who saw every adult besides himself as a minor who could only function through commands. Must we go back to that condition or should we continue with the reformation?"¹¹

This comparison to the formerly authoritarian and oppressive societal structure in Europe echoes the description used in a report on a meeting of the Association Against The Prohibition Amendment in 1924, where "FTH" wrote: "The meeting was inspiring and witnessed the fact that there are still men and women among us who are imbued with 'the Spirit of '76' and dare openly challenge the apostles

of fanaticism and intolerance to a fight of life and death when it concerns defending the principles that are written down in America's immortal Declaration of Freedom or Independence."¹² Many of the opponents of Prohibition were, in other words, unhappy with what they saw as a limitation of their personal freedom—and, by extension, the spirit and foundation of America. The discontent was not caused by a craving for alcohol. That was what H. P. Andersen pointed out in *Danskeren*, as quoted above. The workers in general did not want any strong alcoholic beverages either, if one believes the president of the construction workers' branch of the Labor Federation, who told the Senate Committee on Prohibition in 1926, as reported in *Den Danske Pioneer*: "You won't hear cries for wine among the workers, but give us beer and we will be happy."¹³ This moderate view prevailed in *Den Danske Pioneer* throughout Prohibition. In 1929 a front-page article proclaimed: "The opposition to Prohibition isn't simply constituted of people who want to get drunk.... Let us not commit the mistake of believing that the country is made up of two classes—the dry who want the country bone-dry, and the wet who want the country dripping wet. Between those two are the large temperate middle class that neither want to be ruled by wet nor dry fanatics."¹⁴

Increased Consumption of Alcohol

In reality, most opposition to Prohibition was motivated primarily—apart from a concern for personal freedom—by the opinion that Prohibition did not actually work; on the contrary, its opponents argued, many problems only got worse during Prohibition. *Dannevirke* reported on an anti-Prohibition demonstration on July 4, 1921. One of the banners at the demonstration described the anti-prohibitionists' opinion on how Prohibition affected the consumption of alcohol: "Prohibition took the 'sunshine' out of our homes and brought 'moonshine' in."¹⁵ In a letter published in *Bien* the same month, Georg Axen shared his conviction that Prohibition had made the alcohol problem in America even worse.¹⁶ Drinking increased, and since it could now only be acquired from bootleggers, the quality of the alcohol was often bad. The poor conditions in production caused many people to get sick or even die from toxins like methanol.¹⁷

The behavior of congressmen during this time is a good example of how the consumption of alcohol did not seem to decrease during

Prohibition. Danish American newspapers frequently pointed out that even the politicians who voted for Prohibition were drinking. As the Republican congressman Manuel Herrick said: "I have seen members of Congress bring alcohol into the Capitol, and I have seen them drunk in the dressing room. It was all charades—you voted for Prohibition, and yet you drank."¹⁸ F. T. Hansen criticizes the same hypocritical behavior among politicians in the article "Use and Abuse of Alcohol" in *Den Danske Pioneer* in June 1924: "But what do you say about the senators and congressmen who voted for the impossible law and at the same time filled their cellars with the best wine and spirits at the reasonable prices of the day, and likewise how cunningly they had the Volstead Act¹⁹ written so that it did not ban people from drinking, which would at least have made it equal for all?"²⁰

Just as the hypocrisy caused a lack of respect for politicians, according to the anti-prohibitionists it also caused a lack of respect for the law.²¹ This went directly against one of the main arguments of the prohibitionists before Prohibition was enacted, as described in *Den Danske Pioneer*:

Before Prohibition was enacted, its proponents promised that if just the booze was banned there would no longer be a need for prisons; most crimes came from drinking. Now you see how wrong that claim was. In Lorain, O., for instance, the prison is so full that the other day, a member of the prison board appealed to the judge to suspend the convictions of a number of Prohibition violators because there was not room for them in the prisons. But the judge dismissed him saying: "If there isn't enough room, then expand. If people want Prohibition, then let them have the consequences."²²

Moderation, Not Forced Temperance

What did *Bien*, *Den Danske Pioneer*, and *Dannevirke* propose in place of Prohibition, then? They recognized that excessive consumption of alcohol was a problem that should be dealt with. It was not alcohol restrictions exclusively that they necessarily balked at, either. Prohibition banned intoxicating beverages, and that was interpreted as all beverages with an alcohol content over five-tenths

of a percent. Under the headline, “Vejen ud” (The Way Out), an article in *Den Danske Pioneer* proposes that Congress simply change that definition: “What we want is not free and unrestricted access to intoxicating ourselves.... The constitution bans intoxicating drinks, but Congress says what is intoxicating, says it with a simple majority, and if there even was a president who was sympathetic to the majority, then change could happen.”²³

This quote fits well with the one from the construction workers’ union president, mentioned above, in proposing a modification of Prohibition so that certain types of alcohol were still banned—e.g. the stronger, distilled types of liquor—but the worker could still relax after a hard day’s work with a cold beer. In an election advertisement in *Dannevirke* for the Democratic presidential candidacy in 1928, the governor of New York, Alfred E. Smith, wrote: “Prohibition—For modification of the Volstead Act, for Temperance, but against the return of the Saloon.”²⁴

Moderation was part of the political program for many opponents of Prohibition. That was also the case for the majority of the critics who not only disagreed with the interpretation of Prohibition, but wanted the Eighteenth Amendment outright repealed. Voluntary moderation was the slogan, and the focus was upon dialogue and information rather than prohibition and punishment. Samuel Gompers’ warning that uprooting one problem would lead to others reveals a similar kind of thinking. This was also H. P. Andersen’s point when he wrote that preaching the word of God should be the way to tackle it. *Bien* articulated the point: “It is also about time that you realize that human progress doesn’t come by removing what is tempting, but [is] in a constant battle against and victory over the ever present evil.”²⁵ A poem published in *Bien* the year before Prohibition ended captures this position: “Now the country’s girls and guys don’t want secrecy and spies: / Now the freedom song of the nation is voluntary moderation!”²⁶

Exaggerations On Both Sides

Of course it was not only the prohibitionists who exaggerated and oversimplified things. If one thing is sure in politics, unfortunately it seems to be hyperbolic rhetoric and fearmongering. In the early days

of Prohibition, *Bien* published an article about the negative effects the ban on alcohol could have on individual freedom:

You must suffer for freedom, and we kept that after all, as they let us keep the water. Coffee and tea will probably also go away with time; there are plenty of weak people in this country who can't handle these beverages, so prohibiting them can one day make a fitting campaign for those who have nothing better to do than bother other people in the normal pleasures of life.... If we are not careful, the day might come where there is nothing left of the republic but the name.²⁷

There were some legitimate reasons for the fear. In 1921, *Bien* mentioned a leaflet from the Anti-Tobacco League which called for banning tobacco as "Prohibition's next step."²⁸ But one prohibition movement is not necessarily the same as another, and simplifying the prohibitionists' message into the desire to make life boring and remove all of its pleasures is not much different than calling all anti-prohibitionists binge-drinking friends of the saloon.

At the demonstration featuring the banner: "Prohibition took 'sunshine' out of our homes and brought 'moonshine' in," there was another banner with a message that also can best be described as oversimplified fearmongering: "Russia became 'dry' in 1919 and 'mad' in 1921."²⁹ That was Samuel Gompers' message in 1921, as well, when he claimed that it was "strict prohibition[s] that caused Bolshevism."³⁰ To claim that it was a ban on alcohol that caused the Russian Revolution is a bit of a stretch, to put it lightly, but it demonstrates the kind of rhetoric being used on both sides of the debate.

Conclusion

Both sides of the Prohibition discussion in the Danish American community used rational arguments and hyperbolic fearmongering. Both sides used straw man arguments, oversimplified views, and distortions when describing their opponents, and *Den Danske Pioneer* even admits that like prohibitionists, alcohol producers relied on lobbying, propaganda, and corruption before—and during—Prohibition. The United Church-owned *Danskeren* believed that Prohibition was the best route because some people could not control

their consumption of alcohol and their sinful behavior, and only by removing the source of the sin—alcohol—from society as a whole could the problem be solved. The secular newspapers *Bien* and *Den Danske Pioneer*, as well as the Danish Church-affiliated *Dannevirke*, recognized the high consumption of alcohol as a problem. They just did not think that Prohibition would solve it and argued that prohibition violated their personal freedom. It did not work, either; they felt that it actually made the problem worse. Finally, they feared that Prohibition could start society down a slippery slope of fanaticism that would eventually devour people's rights.

The attitudes toward Prohibition in the Danish American community were thus highly influenced by people's religious views. Among Danish American Lutherans, attitudes toward Prohibition were highly influenced according to whether you belonged to the Danish Church or the United Church. In general, the Grundtvigian Danish Church perpetuated the skepticism towards Prohibition that prevailed in Denmark, while the United Church followed a more mainline American approach of banning the sources of temptation outright as a means of encouraging better behavior.

Endnotes

¹ The library can be accessed at <http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM>

² Thorvald Hansen, "Church and Life: A Brief History," *Church and Life*, accessed October 7, 2014, <http://www.churchandlife.org/history.htm>; and Marion Tuttle Marzolf, *The Danish-Language Press in America* (New York: Arno Press, 1979), 227.

³ This terminology is used by various historians, e.g., Paul C. Nyholm, *The Americanization of the Danish Lutheran Churches in America* (Minneapolis: Institute for Danish Church History, 1963), 10.

⁴ "Blair, Nebraska," *Danskeren*, April 2, 1919, 8, http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=df3f2cca-75bb-456d-afe5-3ac0d1b9fac1/iaehdim0/20130423/00001379.

⁵ "S. Gompers mod Prohibition," *Danskeren*, November 5, 1919, 1, http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=df3f2cca-75bb-456d-afe5-3ac0d1b9fac1/iaehdim0/20130423/00001410.

⁶ H. P. Andersen, "Denmark, Wis. Til *Danskerens* Redaktion," *Danskeren*, December 31, 1919, 3, http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=df3f2cca-75bb-456d-afe5-3ac0d1b9fac1/iaehdim0/20130423/00001418.

⁷ Hans Hansen, "Denmark, Wis," *Danskeren*, January 14, 1920, 2-3, http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=0ac95ec2-f132-4442-becb-68c1a2ca2e21/iaehdim0/20130423/00001420.

⁸ H. P. Andersen, "Denmark, Wis," *Danskeren*, January 28, 1920, 3, http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=0ac95ec2-f132-4442-becb-68c1a2ca2e21/iaehdim0/20130423/00001422.

⁹ "S. Gompers mod Prohibition," *Danskeren*, November 5, 1919, 1, http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=df3f2cca-75bb-456d-afe5-3ac0d1b9fac1/iaehdim0/20130423/00001410.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Aage Møller, "Forbudet," *Den Danske Pioneer*, April 22, 1926, 4, http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=0d7069c2-833f-46a5-afd5-a41757ac7a80/iaehdim0/20130327/00001685&pg_seq=4&search_doc=.

¹² FTH, "Philadelphia, PA," *Den Danske Pioneer*, April 17, 1924, 2, http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=0d7069c2-833f-46a5-afd5-a41757ac7a80/iaehdim0/20130327/00001580&pg_seq=2&search_doc=.

¹³ "De Vaades Uge," *Den Danske Pioneer*, April 15, 1926, 1, http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=0d7069c2-833f-46a5-afd5-a41757ac7a80/iaehdim0/20130327/00001684&pg_seq=1&search_doc=.

¹⁴ "Præmieplaner," *Den Danske Pioneer*, January 10, 1929, 4, http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=0d7069c2-833f-46a5-afd5-a41757ac7a80/iaehdim0/20130327/00001827&pg_seq=4&search_doc=.

¹⁵ "Anti-Prohibition Demonstration," *Dannevirke*, July 6, 1921, 1, http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=3429176c-14fe-432a-8ab4-4273b5a32b46/iaehdim0/20130823/00002066.

¹⁶ Georg Axen, "Feriebrev," *Bien*, July 29, 1921, 6, http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=ce419688-2af3-4b8f-b278-172d1ec18af8/iaehdim0/20121204/00001155.

¹⁷ "Pussyfoot Johnson," *Bien*, August 19, 1921, 4, http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=ce419688-2af3-4b8f-b278-172d1ec18af8/iaehdim0/20121204/00001158.

¹⁸ *Bien*, March 16, 1923, 4, http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=ce419688-2af3-4b8f-b278-172d1ec18af8/iaehdim0/20121204/00001240.

¹⁹ The Volstead Act is another name for the Eighteenth Amendment, named after the person who proposed the amendment, Norwegian American Andrew Volstead.

²⁰ F. T. Hansen, "Brug og Misbrug af Alkohol," *Den Danske Pioneer*, June 12, 1924, 2, http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=0d7069c2-833f-46a5-afd5-a41757ac7a80/iaehdim0/20130327/00001588.

²¹ *Bien*, May 20, 1921, 4, http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=ce419688-2af3-4b8f-b278-172d1ec18af8/iaehdim0/20121204/00001145.

²² "Prohibition og Fængsler," *Den Danske Pioneer*, August 2, 1923, 7, http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=0d7069c2-833f-46a5-afd5-a41757ac7a80/iaehdim0/20130327/00001543&pg_seq=7&search_doc=.

²³ "Vejen ud," *Den Danske Pioneer*, October 25, 1928, 4, http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=0d7069c2-833f-46a5-afd5-a41757ac7a80/iaehdim0/20130327/00001816&pg_seq=4&search_doc=.

²⁴ *Dannevirke*, October 31, 1928, 5, http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=3429176c-14fe-432a-8ab4-4273b5a32b46/iaehdim0/20130823/00002443.

²⁵ *Bien*, August 19, 1921, 4, http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=ce419688-2af3-4b8f-b278-172d1ec18af8%2fiaehdim0%2f20121204%2f00001158.

²⁶ "Efterslet," *Bien*, July 14, 1932, 4, http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=dd4fb547-7401-47a9-adfd-28716e775661/iaehdim0/20121204/00001719.

²⁷ *Bien*, June 11, 1920, 4, http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=ce419688-2af3-4b8f-b278-172d1ec18af8/iaehdim0/20121204/00001099.

²⁸ *Bien*, February 18, 1921, 6, http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=ce419688-2af3-4b8f-b278-172d1ec18af8/iaehdim0/20121204/00001133&pg_seq=6&search_doc=.

²⁹ "Anti-Prohibition Demonstration," *Dannevirke*, July 6, 1921, 1, http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=3429176c-14fe-432a-8ab4-4273b5a32b46/iaehdim0/20130823/00002066&pg_seq=1&search_doc=.

³⁰ *Bien*, May 20, 1921, 4, http://box2.nmtvault.com/DanishIM/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=ce419688-2af3-4b8f-b278-172d1ec18af8/iaehdim0/20121204/00001145&pg_seq=4&search_doc=.