



Between Pluralism and the Melting Pot: Identity Formation among Danish Immigrants in the United States in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries

Jørn Brøndal

Between 1860 and 1930, some 330,000 Danes migrated to the United States, forming their relatively modest part of a total Scandinavian exodus of about 2.2 million people. Even so, Danish migration was still of such proportions that by 1930 the 529,000 Danish Americans—the immigrants and their U.S.-born children—made up what corresponded to 15 percent of Denmark's population of then 3.6 million people. Whereas many of the 1.1 million Swedish and almost 730,000 Norwegian migrants clustered together into ethnic settlements, that tendency was somewhat less pronounced among the Danes. They gained a reputation for being good at “Americanizing” or “assimilating.” Still, they and their U.S.-born progeny did coalesce in sufficiently large numbers to form a distinct Danish-American culture that flourished between the 1870s and World War I.¹ If the overall Danish-American ethnic trajectory during those years was toward assimilation, a pluralist dream still remained alive. That dream has received only limited attention within Danish-American migration historiography.² Its interplay with its symbolic opposite, the melting pot, is the main focus of this essay.

During those years, Danish-American identity was continually negotiated and re-negotiated through practical action and home-spun theory. The practical action consisted of the migratory experience itself and of meeting and sometimes interacting with people that at a first glance came across to the Danish Americans as strange because they did not master the Danish language, or eccentric because they had looks that from a Danish ethnocentric perspective came across as peculiar. For the same reasons, participation in ethnic networks of kith and kin was usually of special importance during the early phase, just after reaching the New World and before breaching the language barrier.

The practical action consisted, moreover, in establishing Danish-American institutions, such as churches, mutual-aid associations, and a press. In turn, those institutions contributed to maintaining ethnic cohesion—and the Danish language—as well as to occasionally putting ethnicity on display through picnics, parades, festivals, and other types of collective activities.

Practical action based on specific historical circumstances aside, Danish-American identity formation also drew sustenance from speculation in writing. It is this “theoretical” dimension in attempting to construct a Danish-American identity that we shall focus on here. Even though most Danes could read and write—with reams of letters across the Atlantic at the same time attesting to the importance of chain migration—it was mainly pastors, reporters, and writers who stepped up to the task of offering theories of identity. Most of those theorists lived in the United States, and by far the majority had made the journey from Denmark to America on at least one occasion. Their outlook was invariably transnational, with Lutheran pastors oftentimes looking to Denmark for theological inspiration, editors and reporters sometimes taking an extremely critical view of Danish politics, and writers of fiction typically glorying in romantic and nationalistic ideas about their native country.³

To some extent, the theories that these writers proposed simply rationalized lived Danish-American experiences: No wonder that migrants struggling to get ahead in the United States practiced a type of cultural pluralism that allowed them to keep and maintain—

if oftentimes also imperceptibly change and unwittingly Americanize—important dimensions of their Danish heritage; and thus perhaps no wonder that several writers argued in favor of degrees of cultural pluralism.⁴

As noted by Philip Gleason, cultural pluralism is a slippery concept, as is that of the melting pot. Both were coined in the early twentieth century. The latter term appeared first and is associated with the English playwright Israel Zangwill (1864-1926), of Russian Jewish background, whose play “The Melting-Pot” came out in 1908 and became a major success in the United States. To be sure, the use of metaphors verging on melting-pot imagery go back to the eighteenth century, to J. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur who in 1782 famously posed the question, “What then is the American, this new man?” and suggested, “Here individuals of all nations are *melted* into a new race of men, whose labors and posterity will one day cause great changes in the world” (italics added). Also Ralph Waldo Emerson and Frederick Jackson Turner came close, with the latter in 1893 describing the westward-moving American frontier, if not as a melting pot then as a “crucible.” But the concept was slippery. As Gleason points out, it remained unclear whether the idea was that everyone, including native-born white Americans, should melt into “a new race of men” or whether, rather, the immigrants should give up their own heritage to become old-style Anglo-Saxon Americans. Moreover, was there a place for, say, African Americans, Native Americans, and Asian Americans inside the melting pot? Zangwill suggested as much, having David, his main protagonist—exclaim, “Ah, what a stirring and a seething! Celt and Latin, Slav and Teuton, Greek and Syrian—*black and yellow* [...] the glory of America, where *all races* and nations come to labor and look forward!” (Italics added).⁵

Of course, to almost all whites in the racist Jim Crow South—and unfortunately also to most white Americans in other parts of the United States—the idea that African Americans should be part of any crucible was abhorrent, and the term used for Black-white biological mixing was “miscegenation” rather than the “melting pot.”⁶ Also, at the time that “The Melting-Pot” play toured the United States, not only had Chinese labor migration been banned

since 1882 but through a series of notes exchanged in 1907-1908 between the administration of president Theodore Roosevelt and that of the Japanese emperor Meiji, a “gentlemen’s agreement” had been reached to deny passports to Japanese laborers wishing to go to the United States.⁷ The point is not, however, whether Zangwill was right or wrong but simply to emphasize that interpretations of the concept of the melting pot varied across time and place, yet with very few people reflecting on this, because the metaphor came across as so deceptively simple as to make discussions about the finer points of its interpretation almost irrelevant.

If the melting pot thus came in various shapes and forms—some more ethnically tolerant than others—so did cultural pluralism. This concept was coined by Harvard philosopher Horace Kallen when his article “Democracy *versus* the Melting Pot,” originally published in *The Nation* in 1915, came out in a slightly modified form in 1924. Writing the first version of his article during the World War I era, Kallen saw a *contradiction* between democracy and the melting pot. Those years saw in short order, first, an intense “anti-hyphenate” campaign aimed at negatively forcing immigrants—especially those of German-American heritage—to break their ties with their land of birth and, second, a drive for “one-hundred percent Americanism” to positively ensure complete loyalty to the United States.⁸ Indeed, the same atmosphere of heated “patriotism” that led Kallen to reject the melting pot in favor of a pluralistic vision inspired Randolph Bourne to dream of a “Trans-National America” (1916) that should acknowledge the “failure of the ‘melting-pot’” and embrace “the evidence of vigorous nationalistic and cultural movements in this country among Germans, Scandinavians, Bohemians, and Poles,” rather than attempt to forcibly assimilate these groups into something that over-zealous publicists “unquestioningly label ‘American.’”⁹

Thus, cultural pluralism was pushed by Kallen as a tolerant—if for now much ignored—alternative to the melting pot with its unpleasant World War I era connotations of one-hundred percent Americanism. Still, as Gleason points out, cultural pluralism was likewise a shifty term open to several different interpretations. At

the one extreme—Kallen’s original viewpoint—was the idea that rather than search for ethnic unity by expecting all population groups to approach each other through assimilatory processes, one should work toward a social harmony—a federation of nationalities—based on retention of ethnic differences. Just like the instruments of an orchestra perform each their part in creating a beautiful symphony but remain distinct—a trombone, after all, will never turn into a violin—the United States should be the staging ground for what Kallen called “a multiplicity in a unity, an orchestration of mankind. As in an orchestra, every type of instrument has its specific timbre and tonality, founded in its substance and form...”¹⁰ This type of harmony—this “symphony of civilization”—presupposed *e silentio* a basic level of societal consensus, to be sure—say, a fundamental reverence for the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution. That type of social harmony, we may add, is often associated with the concept of a basically color-blind civic nationalism and in the U.S. context set in juxtaposition to a mostly white Anglo-Saxon Protestant racial nationalism.¹¹ Over the years, indeed, Kallen emphasized that type of social harmony more and more, by 1956 even writing glowingly of “the American Idea” while still professing to remain a cultural pluralist.¹² As pointed out by Gleason, hidden within Kallen’s original vision of a federation of unchanging nationalities, however, was also a racial idea. After all, if the various nationality groups are to persist in eternity—if the trombone will never turn into a violin—are we not dealing with racialist thought, a type of reasoning that may have been further fortified by the tendency to conflate “nationality” with “race” in the early twentieth century? As Gleason puts it, the original anti-assimilationist version of cultural pluralism was “vaguely racial in its assumptions and open to a segregationist interpretation...”¹³

As already noted, immigrants tended to practice a type of pluralism that allowed them to keep and maintain aspects of their heritage and to get ahead in an often strange New World environment. Milton M. Gordon, the eminent sociologist, even suggested in 1964 that “cultural pluralism was a fact in American society before it became a theory...”¹⁴ This was largely true of the Danish-American

experience. Still, already at an early date, a number of Danish-American writers and ministers attempted to turn at least some pluralist notions into theory.

Only on rare occasions, it has to be said, did Danish-American commentators write about matters pertaining to what also in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were viewed as the great racial divides, those constructions supposedly separating white Americans from African Americans, Asian Americans, and Native Americans. Whereas Danish travel writers visiting the United States wrote whole chapters about these groups in their efforts to pique their Danish middle-class audiences while exoticizing aspects of life in the New World—and in the process making frequent use of grotesque racist stereotypes—for the most part U.S.-based Danish-American commentators remained silent about these groups, commenting on them only in passing.¹⁵ When it happened, however, the presupposition was almost invariably that Danes were superior to other groups. In a 1904 op-ed in *Den Danske Pioneer*—by far the largest Danish-American newspaper—on the dangers of socialism, one observer noted that implementation of that ideology would result in equality between “Europeans, Americans, Chinese, Mohammedans, Jews, pagans, Negroes, Indians, cannibals, and God knows how many other groups.”¹⁶ A Lutheran pastor in Denmark whose opinion was printed in the Danish-American paper *Dannevirke* in 1920, claimed that in U.S. cities “highly civilized Englishmen, Frenchmen, Germans, and Scandinavians” met with “half-civilized Italians, Slavs and Spaniards and with Negroes, Chinese, and Japanese—and, finally, with a number of Jews.”¹⁷

Following the end of the Civil War, African Americans found only infrequent mention among Danish Americans, one reason undoubtedly being that whereas by far the majority of Danish immigrants and their children settled in the North, most African Americans remained in the South, at least until the Great Migration of the World War I era came underway. Still, now and then Black Americans were mentioned. Typically, they were portrayed in a pejorative and racist manner. When a group of Danish Lutherans went

on a land-inspection tour to Texas in 1894 with a view to establishing a Danish-American settlement there, they wrote in the little Lutheran paper *Dannevirke*: “Maybe just thinking about the population in the South makes many people fearful—especially because most of the time you are inclined to think of cowboys and negroes.” But as they added reassuringly: “Compared to what you might expect, as far as negroes are concerned, we saw only a few.”¹⁸ In an even more blatantly racist vein, an ad in *Den Danske Pioneer* in 1896 suggested that “as long as land can be had in beautiful and industrious Wisconsin [...] not many are willing to move out onto the Western prairies or down among the dirty and lazy Negroes in the South.”¹⁹ When the Danish Lutheran minister Peder Kjølhede visited the little town of El Campo in Texas in 1898, he found the town uncommonly beautiful: “But no negroes live here, it was said.”²⁰ Kjølhede’s colleague L. Henningsen—whom the former actually ordained as pastor in 1898—suggested in March 1904 that only by congregating in settlements could Danish immigrants retain old patterns of mutual trust and reliance. If they remained dispersed, they risked self-loathing, the worst condition that any person might sink down into. “It is this [self-loathing] that makes work among the negroes almost hopeless; but there are really many scattered Danes who have sunk down to the same level.”²¹

Lynchings of African Americans likewise found mention now and again, including the torture and burning at the stake of Sam Hose in Palmetto, Georgia, in 1901, an agricultural laborer accused of having murdered his white employer and then raped his wife. In *Dannevirke*, Hose was described as a “the crook” but also as “the poor negro.”²² That same lynching, however, caused the little Lutheran paper *Danskeren* to ask, “When will the time arise when the American people will have to learn real civilization?”²³ Generally speaking, the tone of *Den Danske Pioneer* on lynchings was harsher. In an editorial in 1901 on rape and lynchings, the paper suggested, “You have to remember that in this country, even as the negro apes [*eftæraber*] civilization, deep down inside he still remains an utter barbarian, four generations removed from primeval

man.”²⁴ In another editorial two years later, the same paper suggested remarkably noncommittally that even though one might consider the pros and cons of lynchings—this “barbaric manner” of exacting bloody revenge—doing so “will not help in the least.”²⁵ Occasionally, African Americans were also portrayed as strike-breakers. Thus, in discussing Black scabs at a coalmine in Pana in central Illinois, *Den Danske Pioneer* suggested that in reality these people were “a gang of murderers, selected among the negro race’s worst scum in the Southern states.”²⁶

Asian Americans—usually Chinese Americans—were mentioned even more infrequently than African Americans. True, California, the home of most Chinese Americans, boasted a fairly substantial population of Danish immigrants—in 1900 amounting to 9,040 persons—but their contact with the local Asian Americans appears to have been minimal.²⁷ In 1882, the year that Congress passed the Chinese Exclusion Act, the brand-new San Francisco-based *Bien*—which at that point in time was a weekly illustrated magazine rather than a newspaper—did discuss that city’s Chinese population. Asserting that since the “Chinese question” was not about politics—or at least ought not to be—the paper felt free to publish a story on life in Chinatown, a story that, as it turned out, ran over five issues. Delving into racist stereotypes, *Bien* described the streets as “just terribly dirty” and the dwellings—many of them allegedly underground—as over-populated and stinking. In line with the general descriptions of that age, the Chinese themselves were portrayed as people who could get along on extremely little food, and who preferred opium to drink, the crucial point being that “among them the predominant majority are addicted, whereas among whites drunkards make up only a small minority.” More generally, these people seemed to lack any kind of compassion for other human beings, and the wealthiest Chinese Americans were, frankly, “slave owners.”²⁸ Years later, *Den Danske Pioneer* characterized Chinese smugglers who lured Chinese women to the United States under false promises, only to force them to work as prostitutes, as part of the “yellow slave trade.”²⁹ Discussions of Chinese Americans were almost invariably negative. In 1907, *Bien*

BETWEEN PLURALISM AND THE MELTING POT

noted that a new Chinese bank was being planned in San Francisco. The name of one of the bank managers was Ho Johnson: “We just say: Thank God his name is not Sørensen.”³⁰ In 1917, on the verge of U.S. entry into World War I, *Den Danske Pioneer* warned against importing Chinese labor to Denmark. “Anyone who knows the slightest bit about the yellow race must absolutely resist” that notion.³¹

Apparently, Native Americans were discussed a bit more frequently—but not a whole lot—by Danish-American commentators than were African Americans or Asian Americans. One reason was undoubtedly that early Danish settlers had actively participated in the dispossession of their lands, and that the indigenous population therefore formed part of migration lore. Rasmus Paulson who traveled to Wisconsin in 1867 together with his wife and their two-year-old son remembered confronting “a couple of hundred Indians” near Sparta in western Wisconsin while heading north for Pleasant Valley in St. Croix County: “First, they frightened us terribly; but they only asked for food and other things and did not hurt any of us.”³² In line with so many other U.S.-based commentators and many travel writers, Danish Americans tended to view the indigenous population as part of a “vanishing” race destined to perish, now that “civilization” was replacing the wilderness.³³ Describing the arrival of Danish-born John Smith to the Wisconsin bank of the St. Croix River in 1836, Lutheran minister Peter Sørensen Vig (1854-1929) asserted that Smith “was without a doubt the first white settler in St. Croix County.” When he appeared, the area was “just one large virgin forest, only inhabited by Indians and wild animals.” Similarly, a writer reminiscing on life in Rosholt, Portage County, Wisconsin, in 1867, noted that when the first Danes arrived, everything “was almost just wild forest and Indians.” In both cases, the implication was that since those days the indigenous population had disappeared.³⁴

The same line of thought was represented in the masthead of *Den Danske Pioneer*, as it appeared on each issue of the newspaper from 1888 to 2012. To the right, presumably representing the east, a white, bearded man—undoubtedly a Dane—posed with a plow

in hand in front of a pastoral landscape of tilled fields and quaint houses and a river crossed by a bridge; to the left, likely representing the west, a Native American with spear in hand looked toward a rugged, mountainous landscape with wild animals running across it. The clear implication was that the American Indian was receding west as civilization made its onslaught.³⁵ In 1916, the Danish-American newspaper editor Georg Sophus Strandvold summarized this view: “No Indian prophet, be he ever so discerning of the mysteries of the future, knew that everything was going to change, as has now happened; that the earth was going to be plowed and harrowed; and that immense stretches of it would be cleared, so that homes of stone and iron and steel for millions of white people could be built, or that these ‘pale faces’ would amass in tremendous cities and end up completely wiping out the indigenous people. But that is what happened.”³⁶

Printed at the front and center of the masthead of *Den Danske Pioneer*, and superimposed on the white man and the Native American, so that they were hidden slightly, was a small picture depicting the American eagle, a couple of banners, and the motto, *E Pluribus Unum*. The question remained, however, whether the Native American or the African American and the Asian American should be included in that *Unum*? Judging by the whole idea of the “vanishing Indian,” the Native American would seem to have been excluded. And considering the racist tone used against African Americans and Asian Americans, so would they. If they still belonged in the United States, they were, at most, part of the *Pluribus*, of a harsh type of pluralism characterized by rigid color lines, a “coercive pluralism,” to use Lawrence Fuchs’ term, that, as it seemed, only remained “harmonious” to the extent that these groups accepted a subordinate status under white supremacy.³⁷

Other groups in U.S. society, including notably the Danish Americans themselves, seemed able to move toward the *Unum*. True, even among ethnically “white” Americans, several “racial” dividing lines remained, and whole hierarchies of whiteness were constructed which placed northern and western Europeans at or at near the top, with English-speaking “Americans” of U.S. ancestry

at least two generations back providing the yardstick for most ethnoracial measurement.³⁸ Hardly surprisingly, the tendency among Danish-American commentators was to portray themselves as atop the ethnoracial hierarchies, not far removed from the Yankees. In doing so, like so many other ethnic groups, they invented what Orm Øverland called “homemaking myths.” Even if the Danes could hardly boast as loudly about the Norse Viking Leif Ericson’s “discovery” of America as the Norwegian Americans sometimes did, they could, at least, go one step further back and point to the considerable influence that Danish Vikings had had on the formation of the English people.³⁹ In accordance with this line of thought, a number of “white” groups, some of them dismissed as racial “others,” were viewed condescendingly as ranking far below the Danes. To be sure, most such groups were only mentioned sporadically. When on rare occasions Italian-American Catholics and Jewish Americans of Eastern European heritage were discussed, the tone tended to be negative, as when the Danish-American Lutheran minister Kristian Østergaard in 1904 advised Danish immigrant families that housing in Hartford, Connecticut was prohibitively expensive, at least “if you don’t want to settle among Jews or Italians or similar types.”⁴⁰ Irish Catholics, the male prototypes of whom were frequently portrayed by travel writers as prone to whisky and spousal violence, might likewise be viewed with suspicion by Danish-American commentators.⁴¹ Writing from Omaha, Nebraska, in 1893, Karin Marie Madsen defended a relative who faced criticism because he was to marry a Swedish woman. But as Ms. Madsen wrote: “My neighbor is Danish, and their son is engaged with a Catholic—that, after all, is more pitiful. She is Irish, and we’re at war with them on matters religious.”⁴² In the winter of 1884, Pat Williams, an Irish-American farmer in Rutland in northern Iowa, asked Lars Peter Jensen, his Danish-American neighbor, for water for his horses. Jensen, however, refused to help him because his own access to water depended on melting snow or walking a mile to a neighbor who owned a well. Shortly afterward, the Irishman left the area, the implication being that he didn’t have what it took to be a farmer in Iowa.⁴³ To be sure, there

were also exceptions to these types of description. In eastern Kansas, a writer reported that when Jens Pedersen Lund was caught by a snow storm and suffered frostbite, a local Irishman took him into his shanty and expertly helped him recover by using snow to ease his suffering.⁴⁴

The relationship with German-Americans could have been expected to be tense because Danish Americans associated them with the Three Years' War (1848-1850), with the disastrous War of 1864 that led to the loss of Southern Jutland until 1920 and later with World War I. Sometimes tensions did indeed surface. Hans Peter Christian Hansen, a restless bohemian soul who in 1847 founded *Skandinavia*, the first Scandinavian newspaper in the United States, thus reported about a brawl in a German bar in New York City between a couple of ethnic Danes and one German in April 1849 related to a sea battle in the First Schleswig War.⁴⁵ Also, there were examples of Danish and German Americans attempting to buy each other out of tight-knit ethnic settlements, with German Americans taking the lead in such an effort in Freeborn County in southern Minnesota in 1904 and Danish Americans doing something similar at Partridge in Pine County, Minnesota, in 1906.⁴⁶

One should not exaggerate the degree of negative feelings between ethnic Danes and Germans in the United States, however. Rasmus Sørensen, a Danish proponent of migration to the United States, was infuriated when onboard a ship from Hamburg to New York he heard Danes sing war songs. Shortly afterward, he gave a speech—in German—condemning national hatreds. From the forest settlement in Columbia Valley, Washington, came a report in 1890 that settlers “visit with each other almost as if they were at home, both Danes, Germans, and Americans—and all kinds of nationalities.” Similarly, in Upper Walnut Creek in Kansas around 1916, Danes and Germans had a reputation for being good neighbors.⁴⁷ Indeed, Lutherans from northern Germany had so much in common with their Danish-born neighbors in Hartland, Wisconsin, that just three years after Denmark’s defeat in the War of 1864 they built a church together to accommodate both groups. At Rankin in eastern Illinois during the 1870s, a Danish congregation that in-

cluded many members from German-occupied Southern Jutland was occasionally permitted to borrow the local German-American church.⁴⁸

The relationship between Danish Americans and other Scandinavian Americans was usually good. In Minnesota, one settlement was even named Swenoda, an abbreviated compound of Swedish, Norwegian, and Danish.⁴⁹ Co-settlement among the three groups was hardly the rule, however, even if in the early days of migration they co-founded ethnic institutions, such as the ethnic church and press, until increasing migration enabled them to part ways along national lines.⁵⁰ During the 1870s, tensions sometimes erupted, as when Norwegians and Swedes decided to leave the local Lutheran church after the arrival of Holger Rosenstand, a Danish Lutheran pastor whose relatively High Church, liberal-minded, and not sufficiently pietistic Grundtvigian theology they could not stomach. Danish Americans, on the other hand, might also be disappointed by Norwegian-American ministers for, as one Danish-born colleague noted of a Norwegian-born pastor's sermon, "even though it was Lutheran, it still was not like at home." Similarly, some Danish congregants told a Danish minister in the 1870s that even though they understood the local Norwegian minister's language, they had difficulty fathoming his message.⁵¹ Still, tensions among the Scandinavians should generally not be exaggerated; one Danish minister even suggested that Danes from the island of Zealand had more in common with Swedes than with their compatriots in Jutland.⁵²

Most frequently, relationships with the people invariably dubbed "the Americans," i.e., white English-speaking citizens of U.S. nativity going at least two generations back—were good. Natalie Bering, a Danish-born schoolteacher who after migrating to the U.S. in 1873 lived most of her life in Nebraska, insisted that "wherever she goes, a woman has a protector in an American and is never subjected to any kind of insult." Pastor Holger Rosenstand—who likewise migrated to the United States in 1873 and returned to Denmark in 1878—noted bitterly in 1901 that in the United States you find a "friendliness that, whenever you come

across it at home [in Denmark], is praised to the skies because of its rareness but that you find everywhere over there.”⁵³

True, sometimes the Americans could be arrogant, as one Dane asserted had been the case in Nasonville, Wisconsin, in the late 1860s when other settlers of various immigrant backgrounds visited with each other whereas the “Americans” kept to themselves. Also, their well-known energy and restlessness, noted by many a travel writer, might lead to stupid decisions, as when one Yankee traveling in the company of a group of Danes in Kansas drowned in the Salina River because he didn’t have the patience to wait for the ebb.⁵⁴ Sometimes, a certain sense of inferiority could be detected in this Danish-American skepticism of the Yankee. A Danish entrepreneur who came to Manistee, Michigan, in 1865, urged his fellow nationals not to “yield to the Americans and put up with toiling for them.” Of Jacob Nielsen of Union in eastern Nebraska it was said that for years he was “the best horseman and most skilled cowboy among the Danes, and no American surpassed him either.”⁵⁵

You might even argue that in certain respects the “Danes” were actually *better* than the “Americans.” A writer from the large Danish settlement in Dannebrog, Nebraska, reported that when the grasshoppers came in the summer of 1874 and money and food subsequently got scarce, “many of the Americans ran away from it all and headed home for their families back east, whereas the tough Danes persevered.” Similarly, in Viborg, South Dakota, when the grasshoppers likewise struck there in the 1870s, it was reported that the Americans and the Germans first “lost their courage” whereas the Danes stayed.⁵⁶ Even though the Danish immigrants may simply have been rationalizing about their own imagined hardiness in the face of a lack of alternative resources, this type of reasoning appears to have been widespread. A Danish correspondent in Clarksville, Nebraska, claimed in 1880 that the Americans didn’t have “much inclination to work” because “they are not steady of mind but have a good tongue and can speak and sell and earn money” in all sorts of ways. A former servant girl who had arrived to the United States in 1893 identified what she saw as a basic dif-

ference between Danes and Americans in Racine, Wisconsin: The Danes were “lighter of hue and sturdier” whereas the Americans were “so swarthy and slim that it is pitiful.”⁵⁷

Even though the Danes to some extent saw the “Americans” and non-Danish whites of northwestern European heritage as “different,” still, with these groups the possibility of mingling socially and even biologically nevertheless remained open—much more so than with, say, the Italian Americans, Jewish Americans, African Americans, Chinese Americans, or Native Americans. Patterns of intermarriage confirm this hypothesis. To be sure, in 1900 almost nine out of ten Danish-born women marrying after arriving in the United States had a Danish-born spouse, and almost eight out of ten Danish-born men did so. Most of those who married outside their nationality group, however, had found their spouses among people of Swedish, Norwegian, German, and “American” heritage, along with a sprinkling of Irishmen.⁵⁸

Even though patterns of marriage and of settlement opened up the possibility of becoming part of an *Unum* based on “Americans” and other groups of primarily northwestern European heritage, many Danish ethnic leaders hoped to see their Danishness survive for quite a while yet. That tendency to maintain a sense of *Pluribus* was particularly pronounced among the Grundtvigians, named after the Danish theologian Nikolaj Frederik Severin Grundtvig (1783-1872). As the basis of their faith, these “Happy Danes” largely placed a “living and confessing” church before the Bible. Viewing life optimistically as a gift to be enjoyed, they based their beliefs also on a powerful nationalism rooted in Danish culture and language. Even though a sense of Danishness likewise pervaded the Inner Mission—the other main branch of Danish Lutheranism—this more pietistically minded group of “Gloomy Danes” frowned upon drink and dancing and placed a strong emphasis on repentance and personal faith. In the process, they worried less about retention of the Danish language in the New World.⁵⁹ Whereas these two groups were obliged to co-exist in Denmark within one and the same state church, in the more competitive religious landscape of the United States they went each their way in 1894 after having

cooperated tenuously since the early 1870s; the Grundtvigians remained within the “Danish Evangelical-Lutheran Church in America” that had formally been organized for all Danish Lutherans in 1874, whereas the Inner Mission group found a home in the “United Danish Evangelical-Lutheran Church in America” from 1896.⁶⁰

Among the Grundtvigians, the idea of remaining Danish and not simply “Americanizing as fast as possible,” as one Grundtvigian pastor put it, was particularly pronounced.⁶¹ That sense was strengthened when Frederik Lange Grundtvig (1854-1903), son of the famous theologian, migrated to the United States in 1881. Two years later, he was ordained minister in Clinton, Iowa, and remained in the United States until 1900. Not only did the Grundtvigians during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries build their own churches and seminaries, folk high schools, and Sunday schools, and establish both a religious and a secular paper (*Kirkelig Samler* (1872) and *Dannevirke* (1880), respectively); notably, they also founded a number of Danish Grundtvigian settlements. Those included Tyler and Askov in Minnesota, Withee in Wisconsin, Dagmar in Montana, Danevang in Texas, and Solvang in California.⁶² As the younger Grundtvig envisioned it, Tyler would be “a small fortress for Danish folk life in America.”⁶³ When Grundtvigians established the Danish People’s Society (Dansk Folkesamfund) in 1887, prior to their first meeting they sent out a call in which they not very modestly announced, “It is our belief that the Danish people possesses a spiritual heritage not without significance for the human race.”⁶⁴

Even though nationalism did not play the same role for the Inner Mission, they also built their own institutions, including churches, Sunday schools, and seminaries. Indeed, with the Grundtvigians for several years having taken the lead in importing pastors directly from Denmark—and even establishing a short educational program at Askov folk high school in the southern part of Jutland in 1872 for would-be ministers planning to go to the United States—their competitors within the Inner Mission were the first to found their own Danish seminary in the United States—

at Blair, Nebraska, in 1884.⁶⁵ They also established both a religious and a secular paper *Dansk Luthersk Kirkeblad* (1877) and *Danskeren* (1892), respectively. Indeed, they also took the lead in creating a number of Danish settlements, including Kenmare, North Dakota; Sidney, Montana; Danebo, Oregon; and Turlock, California.⁶⁶ We might add that the most important early historian of Danish-American history was Peter Sørensen Vig (1854-1929), a prominent pastor within the Danish United Church. Thus, also people associating with the Inner Mission group took quite an interest in things Danish. If the main purpose of the Grundtvigians was to retain and even expand Danishness in the United States, the Inner Mission hoped to save as many Danish souls as possible from the sea of religious temptations luring and threatening in the United States.

Most Danish Lutheran immigrants subscribed to some version of a benign type of cultural pluralism that allowed them to retain important aspects of their inherited Old World culture while also celebrating aspects of their New World identity. To the German-born Forty-Eighter and prominent Republican politician Carl Schurz (1820-1906) is ascribed the memorable adage, “I love Germany as my mother. America as my bride.” In his seminal work, *The Minds of the West*, historian Jon Gjerde dubbed this insistence by many European immigrants that they could be two things at the same time, their “complementary identity.”⁶⁷

Whereas any Danish-American public event during the second half of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth—for instance a church celebration or a public parade organized by, say, the secular Danish Brotherhood—inevitably featured both the Danish and American flags, the tendency to celebrate Danish identity was particularly pronounced among the Grundtvigians. In 1896, Emil Ferdinand Madsen (1861-1930), a notable folk high school pioneer, published the novel *Fra de stille Skove* (*From the Silent Woods*) about life among a group of Danes in a forest settlement somewhere in the Midwest.⁶⁸ The narrator offers that, “Once upon a time, God must have created this area after having arrived straight from Denmark and been in excellent spirits!”⁶⁹ In-

deed, here “Danish spiritual life” has found “such a peaceful garden [...] deep inside North America’s virgin forests, many miles away from the cities and railroads! How marvelously is it not shielded from the rough storms of the world that may, to be sure, penetrate the thousands of trees but will have lost some of their force before reaching that far.”⁷⁰ As it turns out, however, the mood in the settlement has been darkened by the stern local pastor—clearly of the Inner Mission variety—who does very little to keep any sense of Danishness alive. But with the arrival of Thorvald and Anna—a young Grundtvigian couple and the novel’s two heroes—everything changes. They dream of their two children growing up here to become “good Danish people,” far removed from the surrounding society where they risk being “seriously corrupted by the depraved, inane American life that otherwise devours so many Danish youths across America—especially in the city!”⁷¹ They challenge the gloomy pastor by introducing songs from the fatherland, as well as games from the folk high schools, and much against his will they attempt to embellish the local literary society’s library with books by N. F. S. Grundtvig and the Danish folk high school leader and writer Anton Nielsen.⁷² At a fall celebration, veterans from the War of 1864 march together: “The old warriors strode ahead in the campaign of ‘64! The sons of Denmark marched to Dannevirke! *Long live Denmark!* was inscribed on the podium near the large lime tree. [...] Anton wept. Søren felt like rising and shouting so that it would resonate across the entire settlement: *Long live Denmark!*”⁷³

Despite this powerful appeal to Danish nationalism and simultaneous denigration of American spiritual life, a certain appeal to being both Danish *and* American remains in the novel. As the narrator at one point explains, “Karen has sewn the Danish flag, and Marie has sewn the Star-Spangled Banner.”⁷⁴ That type of appeal to a complementary identity was in fact widespread. As Madsen himself wrote in another connection, “Indeed, our two flags, the Star-Spangled Banner and Dannebrog, fly over a position today that will not fall tomorrow but which will mean prosperity and progress.”⁷⁵ And as a writer in the Grundtvigian settlement of Danevang, Texas, put it in 1908: “Do not surrender yourselves but guard

the treasure you were handed down from your fathers and fight cheerfully and faithfully under America's flag, and simply raise Dannebrog continually alongside the Star-Spangled Banner.”⁷⁶

In 1907, eleven years after publishing his novel, Madsen was the driving force behind the establishment of the settlement of Dagmar in Sheridan County in the northeastern corner of Montana. Named after the queen married to Valdemar II of Denmark, the settlement expanded near three lakes that were given well-known Danish names, i.e., Furesø, Skarridsø, and Arresø. Here, not only was an attempt made to create a Danish-language public school but Grundtvigian women's and youth clubs were established along with a meeting house and a church. A high point of the settlement's community life was the annual midsummer night's celebration that reportedly attracted Danish Americans from far and near.⁷⁷ An undated photo with the caption, “Home of E. F. Madsen, Dagmar, Mont.,”—with that person undoubtedly being Emil Ferdinand Madsen—in the possession of the Local Historical Archives of Stevns, Denmark, depicts five adult people along with three horses at a farm house. In the yard is a flagpole atop which fly *both* the Danish Dannebrog *and*, above it, the U.S. Stars and Stripes.

This type of pluralism based on a complementary identity remained forceful among many Danish immigrants until World War I. Outside religious circles it was seen when secular Danish mutual-aid societies—notably the Danish Brotherhood, established in 1882—organized parades and other ethnic celebrations. At one such festivity in Racine, Wisconsin, on June 5, 1900—Denmark's Constitution Day—nine lodges representing the Danish Brotherhood of Racine, Milwaukee, Chicago, and their vicinity, participated along with members of the Danish Sisterhood, established in 1883, and four other Danish-American associations. The fun truly took off in Lincoln Park where some 5,000 participants listened to the tunes of the Hamlet Singing Society and to the music played by Professor Olsen's Musical Corps, and the Columbian Band, with many participants also dancing to the tones of Lawson's Orchestra. The festivities featured songs honoring both Denmark and the United States, including tunes celebrating the Danish Constitution

and the United States, including “My Country ‘tis of thee,” the unofficial anthem of the United States.⁷⁸

Even before Israel Zangwill had coined “the melting pot” phrase (1908) and Horace Kallen the “cultural pluralism” term (1924), one Grundtvigian Danish pastor had begun formulating deep thoughts about being Danish in the United States. *Fra de store Søers Land (From the Land of the Great Lakes, 1901)*, written by Danish-born Holger Vilhelm Rosenstand (1849-1933) who served as a Grundtvigian pastor in the United States from 1873 before returning to Denmark in 1878, anticipated some of Israel Zangwill and Horace Kallen’s ruminations on Americanization and ethnic identity. Reminiscing on a Fourth of July parade he witnessed in Manistee, Michigan—his main domicile during his stay in the United States—he remembered how one ethnic group after another had marched by, each featuring its own orchestra. Where Horace Kallen fifteen years later would envision “an orchestration of mankind” and a “symphony of civilization,” Rosenstand at first experienced only dissonance: “A variegated multitude of colors and music from many different musical bands, each playing to its own tune so that it all became a cacophony.” He himself had participated in such parades on previous occasions but decided not to do so this time. “The decision had just been made when from the distance I heard ‘King Christian Stood by the Lofty Mast’” [“Kong Christian stod ved højen Mast”]. With the music approaching, “Dannebrog emerged along with the other Nordic flags.” Rosenstand was so moved that he now reversed his earlier decision: “I had to join.” At this point he felt a warm sensation, “like an inner electric current gushing from head to toe. I felt at one with my people.” Not only that. Soon, Rosenstand experienced being at one with the whole parade. A larger feeling of brotherhood with the other peoples now streamed through him. The cacophony was turning into a symphony. He simply had to admit it: “This great human universality in which differences are erased, when the usually so clearly demarcated borders between the peoples are obliterated, can be strangely fascinating. [...] I felt some of this on that Fourth of July.” He insisted, however, that precisely the fact of his marching together

with other Danes had caused this sensation. “How would it have gone had I not been among my own people; would I then have sensed anything of that strong general spirit?”⁷⁹

In this sense, Rosenstand emerged as an early proponent of that type of pluralism that Kallen and Randolph Bourne world propagate during the World War I era. He emphasized that the United States was a vigorous and expansive nation that could absorb even the most challenging immigrants: “It [the United States] has not only stomached it [immigration]; it has even proven strong enough to transform a great number of the immigrants *in its own melting pot*” (“i sin egen Smeltedigel”; italics added).” In its own melting pot! Seven years *before* Zangwill, Rosenstand was using the melting pot as an ethnic metaphor. Notably, to him the melting pot was not about forced Americanization, as it would soon be to Kallen and Bourne: “It is not to remelt them in an Anglo-Saxon melting pot, in the same way that the Prussians in Southern Jutland have made changelings out of the Danish children by teaching them to sing—‘ich bin ein Preuse’[...]⁸⁰

In Rosenstand’s view, at its worst, the melting pot represented American superficiality, with all schoolchildren irrespective of ethnic background being taught to shallowly appreciate various “great” American men, as “our great men” and American history as “our history,” as if those men and that history always represented their own heritage. At its best, however, the American melting pot symbolized a release of the immigrant’s pent-up energy, because each individual carried within him “a king and a slave.” In the free atmosphere of the United States, it was up to the individual to realize this potential energy. Freedom was making Americans out of the immigrants but on an ethnically diverse basis. In the United States, Danish immigrants could release their inner king but retain their Danish characteristics: “I also know that young Danes like calling themselves Americans but likewise dubbing themselves ‘Danish Americans.’”⁸¹ Thus, the “melting pot” that Rosenstand envisioned was strongly pluralist in its expression. Incidentally, it was quite unlike the disturbing crucible painted by the Norwegian-American newspaper editor and writer Waldemar Ager who in

1917—two years after Kallen’s landmark essay and one year after Bourne’s—published *On the Way to the Melting Pot*, a novel in which Norwegian immigrants entering the pot do so at the cost of stripping away their family ties, their language, and their heritage.⁸²

Rosenstand and many other Danish Americans dreamed about a type of Americanization that would unfold in a tolerant and pluralist fashion without the use of coercion. The idea was *exactly* to allow the Danish immigrants to love Denmark as their mother and the United States as their bride. As the Danish People’s Society put it in 1887: “It is our firm belief that we are exactly the best American citizens when we persist in being Danish.”⁸³

This cultural pluralist framework that so many Danish and other immigrants subscribed to, was badly shaken during World War I. In 1915, Theodore Roosevelt, the former president, began thundering against “hyphenated Americans” who divided their loyalties between their country of birth and the United States. Soon that harsh language was replaced by even more vehement calls for “one-hundred percent Americanism.” Even though most of this angry rhetoric was aimed at German Americans, the Danish Americans also felt the heat, especially after the United States entered the war on April 6, 1917.⁸⁴

With this kind of pressure mounting, the defense of a more tolerant and pluralist vision of the United States was heard first and foremost from Peter Sørensen Vig, one of the leaders of the Inner Mission Danish Americans, rather than from the Grundtvigians. That same year, he published *Danske i Kamp i og for Amerika* (*Danes in Battle in and for America*), a book that aimed to demonstrate how the Danish people had always been imbued with a fighting spirit, right from the age of the Vikings to the American Civil War. With equal measures of bitterness and sarcasm he noted that during the Norman invasions, the presence of brave “hyphenated Anglo-Saxons” had benefitted Britain. In forwarding these arguments, Vig took a position somewhere between the Grundtvigians’ insistent Danish nationalism on the one hand and the hysterical calls for one-hundred percent Americanism on the other. In a slap at the Grundtvigians, he claimed that immigrants must endeavor to

live in the present rather than “constantly go backward and look back to a past that in reality they have no living connection with.” In a slap at the one-hundred percenters, however, he also asserted: “It is not possible to change languages and customs like you change your clothes, and if that were possible, the whole world would have been crazy a long time ago.” If already this assertion exuded notes of cultural pluralism, so did the statement that followed: Was it not true that a special characteristic of the Danes was that they honored their fathers, both the grand and distant ones and the more humble and recent? Vig expressed a wish that “this trait in our people’s character should never be eradicated but instead become more noticeable than it has been until now, also among the Danes in America.”⁸⁵

In May 1918, Governor William L. Harding of Iowa signed a decree banning the use of other languages than English in public space, including the churches—a decree flying in the face of many a Danish Lutheran pastor whose English might be rusty at best. The *Sac City Sun*, a local paper, even reported that Governor Harding in a July 4 address that same year criticized Danes in the large Elk Horn-Kimballton settlement for not giving their children an American upbringing but rather teaching them to be “one-hundred percent Danish.” Supposedly, the governor even claimed that immigrants who had left “the filth of Denmark” would never be able to repay what Iowa had given them. Harding, however, subsequently denied ever having made that statement.⁸⁶

Even so, the reaction among Danish Americans was swift. A protest from the Danish-American Jacob A. Riis League—named after the famous Danish-born photographer and urban reformer, organized in May 1918 to prove Danish-American patriotism to the United States, and led by the Chicago-based businessman Max Heinius (1859-1935)—was promptly printed in several Danish-American papers.⁸⁷ Also, Søren Peter Damsgaard Rodholm, a Danish-American Grundtvigian minister, called the governor’s language decree “unjust, unlawful, unconstitutional, and even pro-German in effect, if not in intention.”⁸⁸ Again, however, Peter Sørensen Vig, the Inner Missionary leader, writing in the *Des Moines Register*,

may have used the harshest words: “A person may be born in Denmark and still be a good American citizen, and a dog may be born in America and still be a dog. No language in itself is either loyal or disloyal, but it is the use made of such languages that counts.”⁸⁹

Two months later, the Jacob A. League printed an overall defense of Danish-American identity. Like the protests against Governor Harding, this statement was written in a pluralist vein: “We are not ‘foreigners,’ a term that almost has become an epithet. Nor are we native-born Americans, notwithstanding those among us who think that such a ‘camouflage’ is fitting. No! We are and remain born in Denmark! And for those who are ashamed of this there is no place in the League.”⁹⁰

Despite such assertions—and notwithstanding that editor Sophus Neble (1858-1931) of *Den Danske Pioneer* in 1923 self-righteously asserted that during the war, when “fanaticism got out of hand,” he alone had fought for the Danish language, whereas “all Danish pastors sat back silent and mute”—the truth was that the pressure of the Great War was having a real effect on the Danish Americans and many other immigrant groups.⁹¹ Almost at the very point when the cultural pluralism formulated by Horace Kallen—and in reality also promoted by Randolph Bourne—finally saw the light of day, the not quite as systematically articulated pluralism of Danish immigrant leaders—mirroring the practical pluralism of many Danish settlers—had begun to fade.⁹² With shrinking economic pressure to migrate from Denmark in the early twentieth century and with the coming of World War I, of immigration restriction in the 1920s, of the Great Depression in the 1930s and of World War II, along with the aging of the first generation of settlers, the stage was set for exaggerating the assertion that Danes had always been fast to Americanize.

Notes

¹ These are my calculations based on the following sources: Danish migration 1868-1900: Danmarks Statistik, *Statistisk Tabelværk*, 5. række, litra A, No. 5, Copenhagen: Statens Statistiske Bureau, 1905, 43; Danish migration 1901-1930: Danmarks Statistik, *Statistiske Undersøgelser*, No. 19, Copenhagen: Det Statistiske Departement 1966, 117; Norwegian migration: Imre Ferenczi and Walter

Willcox, *International Migrations*, vol. 1, *Statistics*, New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, for the International Labor Office, 1929, 747, 752; Swedish migration: Nils William Olsson and Erik Wikén, *U.S. Passenger Arrival Statistics for Swedes Landing in the U.S., 1840- 1850*, Stockholm: Schmidts Boktryckeri AB 1995, 27-140; Sten Carlsson: “Chronology and Composition of Swedish Emigration to America” in *From Sweden to America: A History of the Migration*, Harald Runblom and Hans Norman eds., Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 1976, 117-119. On the many statistical problems with these data, see Kristian Hvidt, *Flugten til Amerika eller Drivkraæfte i masseudvandringen fra Danmark 1868-1914*, Aarhus: Jysk Selskab for Historie, Universitetsforlaget i Aarhus, 1971, 80-88; Jørn Brøndal: *Ethnic Leadership and Midwestern Politics: Scandinavian Americans and the Progressive Movement in Wisconsin, 1890-1914*, Northfield, Minnesota: Norwegian-American Historical Association and University of Illinois Press, 2004, 295-296; Torben Grønegaard Jeppesen, *Danske i USA 1850-2000: En demografisk, social og kulturgeografisk undersøgelse af de danske immigranter og deres efterkommere*, Odense: Odense Bys Museer 2005, 122-124, 186-189. Some of the arguments put forward in the present article were originally formulated in my Danish-language book, *Danske Amerikanere*, Aarhus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag, 2020 but have here been further developed and presented in a more theoretically defined setting. All translations in this essay from the Danish language are by me.

² To be sure, several scholars have discussed the creation and maintenance of ethnic institutions like the churches and the press among Danish migrants in the United States but with no or very limited consideration of the concept of pluralism, cf. Paul C. Nyholm, *The Americanization of the Danish Lutheran Churches in America*, Copenhagen: Institute for Danish Church History, 1963, 41, 58, 440; Henrik Bredmose Simonsen, *Kampen om danskheden: Tro og nationalitet i de danske kirkesamfund i Amerika*, Aarhus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag, 1990, 193; Jette Mackintosh, *Danskere i Midtvesten: Elk Horn-Kimballton bosættelsen 1870-1925*, Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1993, 9-10. A few general works do discuss aspects of pluralism, even if that is hardly their main focus, cf. Erik Helmer Pedersen, *Drømmen om Amerika*, Copenhagen: Politikens Forlag, 1985, 270, 307-308; Torben Grønegaard Jeppesen, *Fra skandinavisk immigrant til amerikaner: Teori og empiri om assimileringen i det amerikanske samfund*, Odense: Odense Bys Museer, 2017, 35-47; this latter work argues for an overall “segmented assimilation” of Danish Americans into U.S. society. *Ibid.*, 137. Marion Tuttle Marzolf, *The Danish-Language Press in America*, New York: Arno Press, 1979 does place the Danish-American press within a pluralist framework but focuses more on narrating the history of the Danish-American press than on exploring the concept of pluralism.

³ Brøndal, *Danske Amerikanere*, 43-45, 51-53, 60-62.

⁴ To be sure, some travel writers also focused on assimilatory tendencies among the Danish immigrants, cf. Jørn Brøndal, “Atop a Hierarchy of Whiteness: Danish Americans as Portrayed by Danish Travel Writers in the Second Half of the 19th Century,” in *Nordic Whiteness and Migration to the USA: A Historical Exploration of Identity*, eds. Peter Kivistö, Terje Mikael Hasle Joranger, Erika K. Jackson,

and Jana Sverdljuk Bentze, London: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group, 2020, 89-94.

⁵ Philip Gleason, “The Melting Pot: Symbol of Fusion or Confusion?,” in Gleason, *Speaking of Diversity: Language and Ethnicity in Twentieth-Century America*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992, 5-6, 9.

⁶ David A. Hollinger, “Amalgamation and Hypodescent: The Question of Ethnoracial Mixture in the History of the United States,” *American Historical Review*, vol. 108, no. 5 (December 2003), 1366.

⁷ Thomas J. Archdeacon, *Becoming American: An Ethnic History*, New York: The Free Press, 1983, 164-165.

⁸ John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925*, New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1983, 204-212.

⁹ Randolph Bourne, “Trans-National America” (1916), in *The American Intellectual Tradition, vol. 2, 1865 to the Present*, David Hollinger and Charles Capper eds., New York: Oxford University Press, 1989, 171.

¹⁰ Horace Kallen, “Democracy Versus the Melting-Pot,” *The Nation*, vol. 100, no. 2591, 220; Philip Gleason, “The Odd Couple: Pluralism and Assimilation,” in Gleason, *Speaking of Diversity*, 51-52.

¹¹ On civic versus ethnic or racial nationalism, see Anthony D. Smith, *National Identity*, London: Penguin Books, 1991, 1-18; Michael Ignatieff, *Blood and Belonging: Journeys into the New Nationalism*, London: Pushkin Press, 1993, 5-9; Gary Gerstle, *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2nd edition, 2017, 5-9; also Philip Gleason, “American Identity and Americanization,” in Stephan Thernstrom, ed., *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1980, 38-47.

¹² Gleason, “The Odd Couple,” 57-58.

¹³ Gleason, “The Odd Couple,” 60. On the tendency to conflate “race” and nationality, see the United States Congressional Joint Immigration Commission, *Reports of the Immigration Commission Presented by Mr. Dillingham*, vol. 5: *Dictionary of Races or Peoples*, by Daniel Folkmar, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1911, 3-4.

¹⁴ Milton M. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1964, 135.

¹⁵ On Danish travel writers’ discussions of African Americans, Asian Americans, and Native Americans, see Jørn Brøndal, “In a Few Years the Red Man Will Live only in Legend and in Cooper’s Charming Accounts”: Portrayals of American Indians in Danish Travel Literature in the Middle and Late Nineteenth Century, *American Studies in Scandinavia*, vol. 48, 2 (Fall 2016), 83-105; Brøndal, “‘The Fairest among the So-Called White Races’: Portrayals of Scandinavian Americans in the Filiopeitic and Nativist Literature of the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries,” *Journal of American Ethnic History* vol. 33, 3 (Spring 2014), 5-36; Brøndal, “Atop a Hierarchy of Whiteness, 75-97; ‘An Early American Dilemma? Scandinavian Travel Writers’ Reflections on the Founding Ideals of the United States and the Condition of African Americans, ca. 1850-1900,” in *Les constitutions: des révoltes à l’épreuve du temps aux Etats-Unis et en*

BETWEEN PLURALISM AND THE MELTING POT

Europe/Constitutions: On-going Revolutions in Europe and the United States, eds. Marie-Elisabeth Baudoin and Marie Bolton, Editions du Centre Michel de L'Hospital, Paris: Librairie générale de droit et de jurisprudence, 2016, 137-159.

¹⁶ A. Langballe Hansen to *Den Danske Pioneer*, April 7, 1904.

¹⁷ Pastor P. Ø. Gade in *Dannevirke*, October 20, 1920; reprinted from *Kristeligt Dagblad* in Denmark.

¹⁸ *Dannevirke*, March 7, 1894. See also Simonsen, *Kampen om danskheden*, 107.

¹⁹ *Den Danske Pioneer*, June 25, 1896.

²⁰ *Dannevirke*, November 16, 1898.

²¹ L. Henningsen, *Dansk Folkesamfund i Amerika: 25 Aars Virksomhed. Jubilæumshefte*, Aarhus, Denmark: S. Jensen Sort, 1914, 33; also quoted in Simonsen, *Kampen om danskheden*, 183; on pastors Henningsen and Kjølhede, see Peder Kjølhede, “Den danske, evangelisk-lutherske Kirke i Amerika fra 1871-1901,” in [anonymous editor] *Danske i Amerika*, vol. 1, part II, Minneapolis and Chicago: C. Rasmussen Publishing Company, 1908, 107 and 111.

²² *Dannevirke*, April 26, 1899; see also *Den Danske Pioneer*, April 27, 1899; August 2, 1900; April 26, 1894.

²³ *Danskeren*, April 27, 1899.

²⁴ *Den Danske Pioneer*, August 29, 1901.

²⁵ *Den Danske Pioneer*, July 2, 1903.

²⁶ *Den Danske Pioneer*, July 6, 1899. In connection with a similar strike in Illinois the previous year, an editorial in the same paper suggested that Black scabs were simply ignorant of what they were doing, and that it was in the interest of the owner of the mine to stir racial unrest among the miners. *Ibid.*, September 8, 1898.

²⁷ Jeppesen, *Danske i USA*, 244.

²⁸ *Bien*, April 21, May 5, June 2, June 23 (opium), and July 21, 1882. *Bien*

²⁹ *Den Danske Pioneer*, July 29, 1901.

³⁰ *Bien*, April 19, 1907.

³¹ *Den Danske Pioneer*, February 15, 1917.

³² Rasmus Paulson: “De Danske i Pleasant Valley, St. Croix Co., Wis.” (1908), in [anonymous editor] *Danske i Amerika*, vol. 2, Minneapolis and Chicago: C. Rasmussen Publishing Company, 1916, 55-57.

³³ On that tradition, see Brøndal, “In a Few Years the Red Man Will Live only in Legend and in Cooper’s Charming Accounts,” 87-89.

³⁴ Peter Sørensen Vig, “Danske i Amerika, 1800-1840,” in *Danske i Amerika*, vol. 1, part I, 157-158; anonymous author, “Danske i og ved Rosholt, Portage Co., Wis.,” in *Danske i Amerika*, vol. 2, 460.

³⁵ The first issue with this masthead appeared on April 30, 1896. Prior to that, the masthead was rather similar, but the white man was placed to the left and the Native American to the right, rendering the implicit idea of the left representing the west impossible. The older masthead dates back to at least August 23, 1888 (the only surviving issue of the paper from that year). It may well date to the time when Sophus Neble became editor of the paper, i.e., in 1887. On Neble’s takeover of the paper, see Marzolf, *The Danish-Language Press in America*, 57.

³⁶ G. S. Strandvold, “Illinois,” in *Danske i Amerika*, vol. 2, 58.

³⁷ Lawrence Fuchs, *The American Kaleidoscope: Race, Ethnicity, and the Civic Culture*, Hanover, New Hampshire: Wesleyan University Press, 1990, 5.

³⁸ Brøndal, “The Fairest among the So-Called White Races,” 6.

³⁹ Orm Øverland, *Immigrant Minds, American Identities: Making the United States Home, 1870–1930* (Urbana, IL, 2000), 8; Brøndal, “The Fairest among the So-Called White Races,” 9-14.

⁴⁰ Kristian Østergaard, *Udvandrerbogen*, Copenhagen: Olaf O. Barfoed & Co., 1904, 45.

⁴¹ Brøndal, “Atop a Hierarchy of Whiteness,” 85.

⁴² Karen Marie Madsen to Peter Madsen, April 25, 1893, in Erik Helmer Pedersen, ed., *Brev fra Amerika: Danske udvandrbreve 1874-1922*, Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1981, 163.

⁴³ L.P. Jensen, “Den danske Koloni ved Rutland, Humboldt Co., Iowa,” in *Danske i Amerika*, vol. 2, 61.

⁴⁴ Julius Johnsen, “De Danske ved Øvre Walnut Creek, Marshall Co., Kansas,” in *Danske i Amerika* vol. 2, 20.

⁴⁵ Brøndal, “Atop a Hierarchy of Whiteness,” 81.

⁴⁶ Simonsen, *Kampen om danskheden*, 184; Østergaard, *Udvandrerbogen*, 97.

⁴⁷ Johnsen, “De Danske ved Øvre Walnut Creek,” 25; Anne Lisbeth Olsen and Niels Peter Stilling, *Et nyt liv: Den danske udvandring til Nordamerika i billeder og breve*, Copenhagen: Strandbergs Forlag, 1985, 137-138.

⁴⁸ Nyholm, *The Americanization of the Danish Lutheran Churches in America*, 397; Holger Rosenstand, *Fra de store Søers Land*, Copenhagen: Karl Schønbergs Forlag 1901, 115-116.

⁴⁹ Theodore C. Blegen, *Norwegian Migration to America: The American Transition*, Northfield, Minnesota: Norwegian-American Historical Association 1940, 97.

⁵⁰ Dag Blanck and Jørn Brøndal, “The Concept of Being Scandinavian-American,” *American Studies in Scandinavia*, vol. 34, no. 2 (Autumn 2002), 5-20.

⁵¹ Østergaard, *Udvandrerbogen*, 13; Rosenstand, *Fra de store Søers Land*, 153-154.

⁵² Rosenstand, *Fra de store Søers Land*,

⁵³ Olsen and Stilling, *Et nyt liv*, 40, 165-166; Rosenstand, *Fra de store Søers Land*, 101.

⁵⁴ Brøndal, “Atop a Hierarchy of Whiteness,” 90; J. L. Nygaard, “Den danske Koloni i Denmark, Lincoln Co., Kansas,” in *Danske i Amerika*, vol. 2, 399.

⁵⁵ Anders Bobjerg (on the basis of H. Rosenstand, K. C. Bodholdt, J. P. Paulsen, John Freiberg, and N.A. Nielsen), “De Danske i Manistee, Mich.,” in *Danske i Amerika*, vol. 2, 213; Christian Falk and L.K. Nielsen, “Danske i Union Precinct, Kimball Co., Neb.,” in *Danske i Amerika*, vol. 2, 336.

⁵⁶ Peter Ebbesen “Historisk Omrids af Danske Kolonier i Howard County, Nebr.,” in *Danske i Amerika*, vol. 2, 84; M. Sørensen, “Fra Viborg, South Dakota,” in *Danske i Amerika*, vol. 2, 314.

⁵⁷ Pedersen, Erik Helmer, ed., Hans M. Kokjer to his sister Maren, March 14, 1880, in *Brev fra Amerika: Danske udvandrbreve 1874-1922*, Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1981, 56; letter by Maren Lorensen, July 21, 1893, in Olsen and Stilling, *Et nyt liv*, 44, 64-65.

BETWEEN PLURALISM AND THE MELTING POT

⁵⁸ Torben Grønegaard Jeppesen, *Danske i USA, 1850-2000—en demografisk, social og kulturgeografisk undersøgelse af de danske immigranter og deres efterkommere*, Odense: Odense, 2005, 202-203.

⁵⁹ Jørn Brøndal, “Danes and Danish Americans, 1870-1940,” in Elliott Barkan, ed., *Immigrants in American History: Arrival, Adaptation, and Integration*, Santa Barbara, California: ABC-Clio, 2013, vol. 1, 323-331.

⁶⁰ Peter Sørensen Vig, and I. M. Hansen, “Den forenede danske evangelisk-lutherske Kirke i Amerika,” in *Danske i Amerika*, vol. 1, part II, 137-138; Peder Kjølhede: “Den danske, evangelisk-lutherske Kirke i Amerika fra 1871-1901,” in *Danske i Amerika*, vol. 1, part II, 101.

⁶¹ Andreas C.L. Grove-Rasmussen, “En Rejse i Amerika,” *Nordisk Månedskrift for folkelig og kristelig Oplysning*, vol. 1, no. 2 (1871), 249.

⁶² For an impressive overview of the history of Grundtvigian settlements, folk high schools, seminaries, Sunday schools, and other institutions, see Simonsen, *Kampen om danskheden*.

⁶³ Simonsen, *Kampen om danskheden*, 44.

⁶⁴ Lorentz Henningsen, “‘Dansk Folkesamfund’ i Amerika fra 1887-1908,” in *Danske i Amerika*, vol. 1, part II, 167; Simonsen, *Kampen om danskheden*, 58.

⁶⁵ Nyholm, *The Americanization of the Danish Lutheran Churches in America*, 76; Simonsen, *Kampen om danskheden*, 28.

⁶⁶ Simonsen, *Kampen om danskheden*, 128-132, 137-138, 141-142, 245.

⁶⁷ Jon Gjerde, *The Minds of the West: Ethnocultural Evolution in the Rural Middle West 1830-1917*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997, 59-66.

⁶⁸ Simonsen, *Kampen om danskheden*, 165-168.

⁶⁹ Emil Ferdinand Madsen, *Fra de stille Skove. En Fortælling*, Minneapolis: O. W. Lund 1896, 23-24. Thorvald Hansen, *Church Divided: Lutheranism among the Danish Americans*, Des Moines, Iowa: Grand View College 1992, 76, suggests that Madsen may have been inspired by the West Denmark settlement in Polk County, Wisconsin, when writing his novel.

⁷⁰ Madsen, *Fra de stille Skove*, 2.

⁷¹ Madsen, *Fra de stille Skove*, 123.

⁷² Madsen, *Fra de stille Skove*, 108-109.

⁷³ Madsen, *Fra de stille Skove*, 183.

⁷⁴ Madsen, *Fra de stille Skove*, 189.

⁷⁵ Quoted from Simonsen, *Kampen om danskheden*, 152.

⁷⁶ P. J. Agerskov-Petersen, “Danevang, Wharton County, Texas” in *Danske i Amerika*, vol. 2, 432.

⁷⁷ Simonsen, *Kampen om danskheden*, 167-168.

⁷⁸ *Folkets Avis* (Racine), June 14, 1900; Peter Jacobsen: “De Danske i Racine, Wisconsin,” in *Danske i Amerika*, vol. 2, 137; Ludvig M. Hoffenblad, “Det danske Søstersamfund i Amerika,” in *Danske i Amerika*, vol. 1, part II, 227-230.

⁷⁹ Holger Vilhelm Rosenstand, *Fra de store Søers Land*, Copenhagen: Karl Schønbergs Forlag, 1901, 127-129.

⁸⁰ Rosenstand, *Fra de store Søers Land*, 172-173.

JØRN BRØNDAL

⁸¹ Rosenstand, *Fra de store Søers Land*, 191.

⁸² Waldemar Ager, *On the Way to the Melting Pot*, Madison, Wisconsin: Prairie Oak Press, 1995 (translated by Harry T. Cleven, originally published in Norwegian in 1917), 197-198.

⁸³ Lorentz Henningsen: “‘Dansk Folkesamfund’ i Amerika fra 1887-1908,” in *Danske i Amerika*, vol. 1, part II, 168; also Simonsen, *Kampen om danskheden*, 58.

⁸⁴ Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, 196-200, 207-209, 242-250; Russell A. Kazal, *Becoming Old Stock: The Paradox of German-American Identity*, Princeton, New Jersey, 2004, 151-194.

⁸⁵ Peter Sørensen Vig, *Danske i Kamp i og for Amerika*, Omaha, Nebraska: Axel H. Andersen, Inc., 1917, 25, 33-34.

⁸⁶ Enok Mortensen, *The Danish Lutheran Church in America*, Philadelphia: Board of Publication. Lutheran Church in America, 1967, 177-178; Peter L. Petersen, “Language and Loyalty: Governor Harding and Iowa’s Danish-Americans During World War I,” *Annals of Iowa*, vol. 2, no. 6 (1974), 406, 411-412.

⁸⁷ *Dannevirke*, May 15, August 14, 1918; *Danskeren*, May 15, 22, August 14, 1918; *Den Danske Pioneer*, May 16, August 15, 1918; *Bien*, August 23, 1918.

⁸⁸ Mortensen, *The Danish Lutheran Church in America*, 178.

⁸⁹ Vig here quoted from Petersen, Language and Loyalty, 413.

⁹⁰ *Dannevirke*, September 19, 1918; *Danskeren*, September 18, 1918; *Den Danske Pioneer*, September 19, 1918; *Bien*, September 20, 1918.

⁹¹ *Den Danske Pioneer*, January 25, 1923.

⁹² Despite the overall fact of Danish-American pluralism fading, strategies have been implemented by some Danish Americans to retain various strands of ethno-religious identity across multiple generations, also at levels more intense than what Herbert Gans referred to as “symbolic ethnicity,” cf. Pernille Skovgaard Christensen’s study of Danish Americans in Blair, Nebraska, Tyler, Minnesota, and Chicago: “Safeguarding Danishness? Ethnicity, Religion and Acculturation among Danish Americans in Three Danish Space in the U.S.,” *American Studies in Scandinavia*, vol. 48, No. 2 (2016). See also Herbert J. Gans, “Symbolic Ethnicity: The Future of Ethnic Groups and Cultures in America,” *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 2 (January, 1979), 1-20.