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“What For is Democracy?”: The German American Bund in the American Press, 1936-1941

By Minna Thrall

Chapman University

May 2020
It was eight o’clock in the evening of February 20th, 1939. A crowd of twenty thousand Americans applauded, saluted, or protested as stormtroopers dressed in Nazi uniforms marched onto the stage of New York City’s Madison Square Garden arena.\(^1\) For this rally, the arena was decorated with giant murals of George Washington, American flags, flags with swastikas, and banners reading *Free America!* As they marched through the aisles, the stormtroopers proudly hoisted American flags with a swastika banner. Thousands of American audience raised their arms in the Nazi salute, and the opening presenter took to the stage. “My fellow Christian Americans,” he began, “it is my privilege to welcome you to this impressive patriotic mass demonstration sponsored by the German American Bund.”\(^2\) Over the next few hours, several leaders of the Bund, including *Bundesführer* (Bund leader) Fritz Kuhn himself, delivered five speeches espousing American patriotism, German heritage, Aryanism, racism, anti-communism, and most of all, antisemitism.

This rally, which amassed thousands of Nazi sympathizers and anti-Nazi protestors, was the largest event ever put on by the *Amerikadeutscher Volksbund*, more commonly known as the German American Bund. The Bund was a pro-Nazi organization active in the United States from 1936 until 1941, founded and directed under the leadership of German immigrant Fritz Kuhn. Scholars believe it reached peak membership in 1939 with 20,000 to 25,000 official members, though it is debated how many more fell under its influence.\(^3\) Bund members held meetings and events throughout eighty posts divided among three *Gaus* or regions, which represented the East

---


\(^3\) The size of the Bund is difficult to establish because it destroyed most of its membership ledgers. This was done in order to protect the organization, its leaders, and its members during investigations into Bund activities conducted by the House Un-American Activities Committee beginning in 1938. Susan Canedy, *America’s Nazis: A History of the German American Bund* (Menlo Park, CA: Margraf Publications Group, 1990), 86-88.
Coast (Gau Ost), the Central and Midwestern region (Gau Mittelwest), and the West Coast (Gau West). Its members were predominantly first-generation German immigrants, many of whom joined the Bund because it offered a place for German-Americans to bond with their community and celebrate their German heritage. However, the German American Bund did not attract a large amount of German-Americans by any means; when it peaked with 20,000-25,000 members in 1939, there were 12-15 million German-Americans living in the United States, meaning only 0.01% - 0.2% of the German-American population had Bund membership.

The Bund was a pro-Nazi organization, but it was not part of the German Nazi party, nor was it sponsored by the German government. It was an entirely American-bred movement. The Bund’s pro-Nazi ideology took flight in the 1920s and 1930s, when German-Americans faced ostracization from American society due to the tensions and distrust that came out of World War I and Hitler’s rise to power. Under Fritz Kuhn, the Bund attempted to consolidate German-Americans’ conflicting German and American identities by taking the German Nazi platform and Americanizing it. Bundists therefore thought of themselves as “obligated to America” but “tied to Germany.” However, the Bund failed to receive any support from Germany, due to the Nazi disinterest with engaging in affairs outside of Europe at the time.

During its active years, the Bund was the subject of heated debate and criticism by Americans, due to its vocal nature and parallels to the Nazi Party. The American public’s mixed perception of the Bund exhibited the fears and anxieties Americans had for their country at the
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4 Canedy, America’s Nazis, 83-84.
5 Canedy, America’s Nazis, 21.
7 Canedy, America’s Nazis, 21.
brink of World War II. In addition, it solidified their belief in the strength and the democratic power of the United States. These perspectives and responses are visible in newspaper articles about the Bund published by the United States’ largest papers such as the Los Angeles Times and New York Times, as well as small local presses scattered across the country. Through an analysis of these newspaper articles, which include editorials, journalist reports, and write-in letters, this paper examines how American newspapers characterized the German American Bund. Ultimately, this study argues that the American press characterized the Bund as a foreign Nazi threat to American society, and highlighted a debate over whether or not the Bund’s First Amendment rights to free speech and assembly should be protected or retracted. Together, the American perception and debate about the Bund shed light on the nature of American anxieties toward fascism in the United States at the brink of WWII. It shows that American concerns about antisemitism and racism were greatly overpowered by fears of fascism growing and destroying democracy.

Despite the Bund’s size and reach across the United States, as well as its anomalous political nature, very little academic literature has been produced about it. The first serious study about the Bund was an article called “The Failure of Nazism in America: The German American Bund, 1936-1941” published by Leland Bell. This study argued that the Bund’s failure in the United States, even among Germans, rested in its inability to exercise moderation in respect to its praise of Germany and German policy. In 1974, the first book on the Bund, entitled The Nazi Movement in the United States, 1924-1941, was published by Sander A. Diamond. This book was the first comprehensive examination about the Bund. Diamond argued that the Bund was founded on the lies and deceptions of Fritz Kuhn, who created the Bund for personal gain after

---

Diamond, Nazi Movement, 201-211.
the collapse of its predecessor organization, the Friends of New Germany. In 1985, Bruce Ashkenas published the article “A Legacy of Hatred: The Records of a Nazi Movement in America.” Ashkenas argued that the majority of Americans viewed the German American Bund as foreign anomaly to the United States, and for the same reason, most Americans of German descent did not support the Bund. In 1990, Susan Canedy published the most recent study about the Bund in a book called America’s Nazis: A History of the German American Bund. Canedy added that the Bund movement happened because of the German-American effort to make their voices heard after a period of American distrust towards Germans.

The findings of this study contribute to the historiography of the Bund by placing the Bund into a broader scope of American attitudes towards Nazism, fascism, and antisemitism in the years leading up to World War II. Previous scholars have written about the Bund’s inception and demise, and explained how it attracted members and later lost them. This study examines what the American press said about the Bund, and how that press coverage reveals pre-WWII anxieties about Nazism in America. Previously, scholars built their arguments about the Bund on primary sources that are mostly government investigation reports and newspaper articles, which can be biased materials. This study intends to call out those biases, and explains why they exist in respect to American fears about the Bund. This study not only contributes to the history of the Bund in the American media, but also illustrates how uncomfortable and fearful Americans perceived Nazi sympathetic movements in the United States. Ultimately, the findings of this

---

study shed light on Americans’ understandings of fascism, racism, and antisemitism in the late 1930s.

Foreign Fascism: The German American Bund as a Dangerous Nazi Anomaly

American newspapers made the German American Bund out as a dangerous, foreign-born Nazi movement that was working with Germany to destroy American democracy. This portrayal is symptomatic of underlying American fears that Nazi Germany was planning a fascist revolution in the United States. Such a fear is summarized in a single quote from the spring of 1937, when a concerned citizen wrote into the Chicago Tribune wondering “what are the American people going to do about the Nazi army in the USA? Just let them take us over?” These fears did not exist without reason. The Bund worked hard to make itself appear as a true Nazi party. In order to convince people of its strenght and legitimacy, it actively manipulated its followers and opposition into believing that it was indeed under direct support from Hitler and Germany.

Out of context, the Bund’s tactics and aesthetic made it appear no different from the official Nazi party. The Bund’s official emblem, which appeared on Bund flags, uniforms, documents, banners, propaganda, and more, was a swastika with the initials “AV” (Amerikadeutscher Volksbund, the Bund’s German name), which was a show of fealty to Hitler and the Nazis. The Bund also had its own uniformed stormtroopers, which paralleled Nazi

---

15 The Bund quoted a passage from Adolf Hitler’s Mein Kampf in a propaganda slide that explained the use of the swastika: “In the swastika, we see the mission of the struggle by Aryans and at the same time the victory of the thought behind creating labor, which in itself was ever and always will be anti-Semitic....” Amerikadeutscher Volksbund, “Charts,” Slides 4-5.
stormtroopers in dress, aesthetic, and military-like discipline. This rank of stormtroopers, called the Ordnungs-Dienst (OD), or “Orderly Service,” was trained in marching, rifle shooting, and self defense, among other things. It was present at all Bund events and rallies with instructions to ensure the safety of Bund members. Regulations within the Bund officially stated that the OD was not a military body, and OD members were not permitted to carry weapons other than police batons, but their similarities to the dangerous Nazi stormtroopers in Germany caused a great deal of concern among Americans.16

Furthermore, the Bund had Judengruppen, or Youth Groups, styled after the Nazi Hitler Youth: it held regular grassroots rallies similar to those in Nazi Germany, wherein Bund Leaders would give impassioned ideological speeches; they had rank and organizational systems styled after those of the Nazi party; they sometimes spoke in German during meetings, and they adopted German words to describe themselves, their surroundings, and their worldview; it had a Führer, Fritz Kuhn; and most importantly, they were passionately pro-Nazi and antisemitic.17 For all these reasons, the Bund was labeled as a German entity and an extension of the official Nazi party by many Americans.

However, since the Bund was an American-bred organization, it did not have German support. In 1935, before the Bund was formed, the German government decided to end all ties with pro-Nazi organizations in the United States, except for the allocation of German propaganda to the United States. The organizations, including the Bund’s predecessor, the Friends of New Germany, were disturbing United States politics. Due to its preoccupation with European politics and affairs, Germany was not ready to go up against the United States as an opponent. In addition, Germany concluded that these movements were not “true” National Socialist

---

16 Canedy, America’s Nazis, 91-96.
17 Canedy, America’s Nazis, 73-74, 82, 90, 96-101.
movements because the German-Americans who partook in them were not willing to relinquish their American identities and become part of the Reich. Therefore, Germany withheld support for American pro-Nazi movements, which meant that the Bund operated completely outside of German control.  

Nevertheless, in order to legitimize its existence, the Bund crafted a perceived relationship with Germany, which resulted in a poorly handled balancing act between its claims to American loyalty and claims to German loyalty. The Bund insinuated German ties in a multitude of ways. They heavily relied on propaganda produced by the German Ministry of Propaganda. Bundists frequently travelled between Germany and the United States to search for ways they could improve German Kultur (culture) and Deutschtum (Germanism) in the United States. Bund leader Fritz Kuhn even got a picture with Hitler during a trip to Berlin in 1936, which he brought back to the Bund as “proof” that they had the support of Der Führer. In reality, Hitler rejected Kuhn’s request for support, and took the photo for nothing more than formalities. The Bund could only go so far with this relationship with Germany, however; it directly contradicted the Bund’s claim that their allegiance was to “the Constitution, the flag and the institutions of the United States of America.” Consequently, in order to legitimize itself as pro-Nazi but at the same time convince the public of its loyalty to the United States, the Bund awkwardly juggled between showing its “ties” to Germany, claiming that it had “no official connection with Germany” and “receive no orders from there.” Ultimately, this untrustworthy

---

18 Diamond, Nazi Movement, 183-201.
19 Diamond, Nazi Movement, 183-201.
20 Canedy, America’s Nazis, 116.
and conflicting relationship between the Bund, Germany, and the United States served as the foundation for the American fear that Bund was working with Germany to cause a fascist revolution in the United States.

Even though the Bund was not an official Nazi Party, American newspapers created a paradigm in which there was no difference between the Bund and the Nazis. According to the papers, the organizations were the same, and therefore, the terms could be used interchangeably. In an account of the Madison Square Garden rally, one reporter noted with concern that there was a “singing of the German song ‘Horst Wessel,’”—the anthem of the German Nazi party—as well as a “Nazi salute, and...three cheers for ‘Gentile Americanism.’”23 Another article charged the Bund with being the “counterpart in America of the Nazi movement in Germany,”24 and yet another declared the Bund was the “Nazi movement in the United States.”25 Article titles about the Bund, such as “Nazi Advocacy of Roosevelt’s Death Charged,”26 “Seven Are Injured at Nazi Rally Here When Legionnaires Heckle Speaker,”27 and “Nazi Aide is Convicted”28 conveyed to readers that the articles were about the actual Nazi party and its members. The Bund was certainly sympathetic to the Nazis, but they themselves were not real Nazis. In fact, the Bund was not even a political party. Fritz Kuhn himself admitted that it would take many years of

expansion for the Bund to get to that point. Nevertheless, the concerns that it was an official Nazi political organization, and the lack of distinction between the terms “Bund and “Nazi,” reveal that Americans were deeply afraid of foreign Nazi intervention into American politics.

In addition to representing the German American Bund as a Nazi party, newspapers speculated that the Bund was directly tied to Nazi Germany and controlled by Adolf Hitler. The *Chester Times* of Pennsylvania reported that “the German American Bund is linked directly to official Germany.” Upholding this bold claim, the article wrote that Fritz Kuhn admitted to a U.S. investigator that “a secret relationship exists between the Bund and… [the] German ambassador to the United States and German consuls throughout the country.” Reports stated that “the German Ministry of Propaganda and Enlightenment” was “working through the Bund” to include “Americans and United States residents” in the Nazi sphere. On top of this, New York District Attorney Lindsay R. Henry was quoted in the papers saying that the U.S. court system would eventually prove that “the Bund is an oath-bound organization subservient to Adolf Hitler.” An editorial in the more conservative *Christian Science Monitor* outrightly proclaimed that the Bund “owes allegiance to foreign powers” and “takes orders from abroad,” implicating Nazi Germany and its allies as the Bund’s puppet master. In another report, which detailed a Congressional inquiry to force communists and Nazi sympathizers to register with the government, a Congressman apparently presented “evidence” that “further [indicated] that the

---

29 Canedy, *America’s Nazis*, 118.
German American Bund [was] an agent of the Nazi Party in Germany.” 34 Each of these articles, at least to some capacity, accused the Bund of being directed by Hitler. However, the Bund was completely native to the United States, and was not sponsored, directed, or in any way affiliated with Hitler, Germany, or the German Nazi party. 35

American newspapers spotlighted fears that the German American Bund was capable of destroying American democracy and establishing Nazism in its place. After the Bund’s February 1939 rally in Madison Square Gardens, the New York Times published an article stating that the Bund was “determined to destroy our democracy and to establish in its place a fascist dictatorship.” 36 A few days later, the editor of the New York Times released a statement asserting that Americans would have “no doubt” over “what the Bund would do to...this country.” Simply, it "would set up an American Hitler.” 37 A Madison Wisconsin State Journal article recounted with concern that Bund leaders—who were more loyal to Germany than to America because they spoke in German during chapter meetings—“advocated [an] overthrow of the government of this country” and “talked attempts to obtain control of the government of this country by force.” 38 These articles reflect the fear that the Bund’s activities in the United States might result in a fascist coup of the United States government, similar to the Nazi Party’s coup of the German government in 1933. They illustrate how Americans were profoundly afraid of anyone who might advocate a German-style fascist government in the United States.

---

35 Canedy, America’s Nazis, 109-118.
The idea that the Bund was planning an overthrow of the government sponsored by Germany sometimes originated from the testimonies from former Bund members. Former Bund youth leader Helen Vooros testified “that ‘she was taught’ on a visit to Germany that the Nazi plan of expansion embraced a United States anschluss—like that with Austria.” In addition, Vooros was quoted in saying that Germany recognized Bund leader Fritz Kuhn as the “United States’ ‘Fuehrer,’” a title which in Germany was reserved only for Hitler, the national leader.39

The fact that Germany, the Bund's closest ideological ally, considered Kuhn as the Fuehrer of the United States rather than the actual President of the United States implied the Bund's goals were oriented around the overthrowing of American government. Vooros’ recounts of the Bund, as revealed by the newspaper media, served as evidence of that the Bund favored Germany over the United States and intended to overthrow democracy and replace it with Nazi-led fascism.

Fears that the Bund was a militaristic and potentially violent organization also came out of newspapers. A government investigator reportedly called the Bund “a ‘completely military’ organization patterned after the ‘ruthlessly efficient’ machine set up in Germany by Adolf Hitler;”40 another claimed that the Bund trained “some 200,000 uniformed American Nazi sympathizers” in “military drill, sometimes with guns.”41 These statements were grossly exaggerated. At its height, the Bund had only 20,000-25,000 members, nowhere near the 200,000 figure that the latter article reports.42 The Bund did keep a reserve of uniformed stormtroopers, the Ordnungs-Dienst, but during peak membership in 1939, they were only about

42 Canedy, 86.
5,000 strong. Bund regulations officially stated that the OD was not a military body, and they were not permitted to carry weapons other than police batons, but its visual similarities in dress and discipline to Nazi stormtroopers, most Americans mistook the OD for a Nazi army.

While the notion of the Bund overthrowing American democracy was concerning enough, articles stirred fears about its potential for rapid expansion in the United States. The Los Angeles Times reported that a Los Angeles Bund member “declared that an American-appearing organization could make more headway in the United States than the German American Bund.” This statement implied that the Bund intended to grow its membership of non-German Americans by enticing them through a patriotic facade. Another article confirmed based on government investigations that the Bund intended to include “not only German-Americans” in the Nazi sphere of influence, “but native Americans and United States residents of other nationalities,” which made it a danger to the integrity of American democracy. Moreover, the Bund itself was reported in 1938 to state that it expected “175,000 members within a year,” despite having only about 10,000 members at the time. Such statements demonstrate the idea that the Bund was poised to sweep through the United States and pull in supporters, similar to what the Nazi Party did in Germany. This idea reflects that Americans feared the spread of fascist ideology.

---

43 5,000 OD members is the best estimate historians offer as to the size of the Bund. The exact number of OD membership is unknown because records were destroyed in an attempt to protect the Bund and its members from government investigations. It is likely that the OD accounted for about 10% of the Bund’s size, similar to the proportion of SA to the NSDAP in Nazi Germany. This is what Fritz Kuhn stated to be the ideal proportion of a military in respect to its party, and based on investigations done by HUAC, Kuhn most likely kept the OD to 10% of the Bund size. Canedy, America’s Nazis, 92.

44 Canedy, America’s Nazis, 91-97.

45 Associated Press, “Nazis after America.”

Articles about Americans joining the Bund signaled to readers that the Bund was successful in gaining strength. A *Chicago Daily Tribune* article printed an article written by a local man who testified that “a few weeks ago I became a member of the Bund. Never at any time have I observed anything contrary to my sense of loyalty to this country.”\(^{47}\) The *Washington Post* ran an article about a Latin teacher by the name of Dr. Buchett who caused a stir at the high school she worked at after attending Bund meetings. “‘I am proud to be here,’ she told the group [Bund]... I had a taste of revolution yesterday.”\(^{48}\) These newspaper stories of everyday Americans joining the Bund or attending their meetings signaled to Americans that Nazi ideology had the ability to expand beyond the German American community, and was therefore an unprecedented threat to society. The concept that the Bund was expanding, rhetoric about the Bund being an extension of Nazi Party, and claims that the Bund was working with Germany to overthrow the United States government ultimately reveal that Americans genuinely feared the reach of German fascism in the United States.

**A “Mingling of Kindred Souls”: The Bund, the Klan, and Fascist Organizations**

Newspapers often linked the Bund to other fascist and nationalist organizations that operated in the United States. One prominent organization that newspapers often paired the Bund with was the Ku Klux Klan. The Klan was a racist, white supremacist organization which shared parallels with the Bund. Both were right-wing nationalist minority groups, which were anomalous to the rest of American society. The Klan and the Bund had small but vocal chapters.

---
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that stretched from coast to coast within the United States. They used similar rhetoric to display their so-called patriotism for the United States: the Klan’s slogan was “100% Americanism,” and the Bund’s rallying cry was “Free America!” They were both gentile white supremacist groups, who vehemently opposed all non-whites and non-Christians—namely Jews—from being in any positions of social, political, or economic power. Both the Klan and the Bund staged rallies and parades, and spread ideological propaganda throughout its various chapters in the United States. Both organizations were also viewed as far-right fascist groups by the majority of Americans, and had a cult-like following among members.49

The parallels between the Bund and the Klans enabled newspapers to speculate about the Bund and its relationship to the Klans in a way that American audiences were receptive to. Papers reported that John C. Metcalfe, an investigator from Congress who infiltrated the Bund by joining it undercover, claimed “the Bund was seeking to consolidate” with the Klan to promote “a Nazi-Fascist movement in this country.”50 Since the Bund and the Klan were organizations with such

On August 18th, 1940, a particular incident that involved the Bund and the Ku Klux Klan crossing paths during meetings at a campground in New Jersey sparked a great amount of perceived linkage between the Bund and the Klan. One article called it a “mingling of kindred souls” and claimed that they allied over a “conception of Klan-Bund ‘Americanism’” that

intended to “weaken American democracy.”51 Another article was simply titled *Klan Has 'Americanism' Rally at Bund Camp: Members of Both Orders Mingle in Jersey*, which conjures images of the nationalist groups exchanging ideas and warming up to one another.52 In reality, the Bund and the Klan had simply crossed paths at this campground because they had rented it back-to-back. Even though the Bund and the Klan were not involved with each other, these articles consecrated fears that the Bund was capable of sharing its ideas with other anomalous organizations of the time.

Newspapers also linked the Bund to other fascist groups that were active in the United States, which included the Italian Blackshirts, American Silver Shirts, Ukrainian Brown Shirts, and the Mexican Gold Shirts. In the U.S., these different “Shirts” groups were minority fascist groups made up of Americans of different national descents. Since the Bund was also a minority group representing Americans of German descent, and since it adopted the fascist platform of the Nazi party, Americans were suspicious that the Bund was conspiring with the other fascist groups to create a major fascist movement. Such collaboration did not, in fact, exist; historians dismiss the idea that the Bund ever collaborated with other fascist movements in the United States, mostly because there is no evidence of such collaboration, and also because the Bund wanted to maintain its image as a German-majority organization.53 Still, in the minds of the press, these reported links were realistic; Americans feared that fascist groups would consolidate to take down democracy.

---

Article after article speculated a conspiracy between the Bund and other fascist organizations to consolidate their collective power into one group. The *Washington Post* declared that the Bund was “seeking to consolidate” with “the Italian Black Shirts, the Ukrainian Brown Shirts, the Silver Shirts, the Gold Shirts of Mexico, and the Russian National League of America.”54 Another article claimed that the F.B.I. was searching for connections between the “Bund and such organizations as the Silver Shirts, the Silver Legion, etc.”55 A report read that “the Bund marches with the Italian blackshirts and the Ukrainian Brown Shirts. Leaders of these groups have revealed plans to enlist the support of other fascist-inclined groups.”56 One particular article boasted the title, “*Bund, Ku Klux Klan, and Gold Shirts Linked: Los Angeles Nazis Promoting Merger to Start Revolution*...” This article reported that Congressional investigator John C. Metcalfe “testified California Bund leaders told him they were ‘in close touch with the gold shirts of Mexico, who ‘reportedly were planning a fascist revolution.’” The report also claimed that the Bund admitted to working with the Ku Klux Klan, the American Silver Shirts, the Italian Black Shirts, and the Mexican Gold Shirts. Apparently, these groups intended to merge into “a big political party” based out of Chicago. The resulting party would then be powerful enough to incite a fascist revolution under the leadership of a mysterious man called “Mr. Jenkins”.57 Even though the article said Mr. Jenkins denied any knowledge of this merger, the speculation was firmly planted into the minds of Americans. The idea of a fascist

54 Associated Press, “‘Isms Inquiry Told.’

Published by Chapman University Digital Commons, 2020
organization merger, in addition to ideas about the Bund joining with the Ku Klux Klan, disseminates the American fear that far-right and fascist groups could threaten the stability of American democracy.

“Ever and Always” Antisemitic: The Bund’s and Antisemitism

In addition to articulating the threat of Nazism in the United States, American newspapers voiced concerns about the antisemitic ideology of the Bund. These concerns show that Americans feared the Bund’s antisemitism not because it was a threat to humanity, but because it was indicative of animosity toward United States democratic society. The Bund was certainly antisemitic. More broadly, it operated on a racist platform that prejudiced all peoples who were not of “Aryan” descent. In its pledge, the Bund declared that its objectives were to “oppose all racial intermixture between Aryans and Asiatics, Africans and other non-Aryans,” and “to break up the Jewish-international minority.” The latter objective, however, was the Bund’s primary concern.

Like the Nazis in Germany, the Bund focused heavily on antisemitism in their ideology and actions. Bund propaganda quoted Adolf Hitler’s Mein Kampf to describe the Bund’s mission, saying that as Bundist Aryans “ever and always will be anti-Semitic.” Like Hitler and the Nazis, the Bund believed that Jews made up a race which was inferior—even subhuman—compared to German “Aryans.” This meant they thought Jews had no place in any civilized society, and therefore, had no place in the United States. Furthermore, they believed in Judeo-Bolshevism, which was a false antisemitic and anti-communist claim that Jews were the

---

58 German American Bund, untitled promotion tabloid.
59 Amerikadeutscher Volksbund, “Charts,” Slides 4-5.
designers of communism. The Bund, like Hitler and the Nazis, were convinced that Jews wanted to take over the world in order to establish global communism, and were consequently labeled the number one enemy of all states. Bund propaganda, meetings, and rallies gravitated around antisemitic and Judeo-Bolshevist rhetoric. The Bund despised the U.S. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, whom they believed was a Jew and a part of a Judeo-communist conspiracy to take over the world. Along with Roosevelt, they despised major media outlets like radio stations, Hollywood, and the New York Times, because they believed they were all controlled by Jewish communist propaganda.\(^6^0\) The Bund declared wishes to remove Jews from any roles of power or significance in the United States, which included public office, business ownership, high-paying jobs, and jobs in Hollywood.\(^6^1\) Unlike the Nazi Party, the Bund pursued much less violence means in order to achieve this objective. According to known history, the Bund never murdered any American Jews, but it did act as a terrorist organization against them. It conducted vandalisms of synagogues, frequent boycotts and pickets of Jewish-owned stores, and even engaged in instances of street violence against Jews. In comparison to the pogroms happening in Germany and the rest of Europe at the time, these acts of antisemitic violence were small, few, and very contained. Nevertheless, they were hate crimes that constitute the Bund as an antisemitic terrorist organization.\(^6^2\)

Newspapers helped to bring America’s attention to the antisemitic objectives of the Bund. In 1937, when the Bund was only one year old, the Christian-Science Monitor published an article asserting that “the chief result of the [Bund’s] campaign… is to stimulate anti-

\(^6^0\) Canedy, America’s Nazis, 101-120.
A year later, an article from a different newspaper quoted Bund leader Fritz Kuhn saying that the goal of the Bund was “‘to build an Aryan movement under the swastika to liberate Americans from the Jews.’” Another article reported with alarm that the Bund’s leadership expressed wishes to “spread among 18,000,000 persons of German blood” in the United States that “there is a war… between Aryans and Jews and that it cannot be compromised.” Another article claimed that “the F.B.I said it had been told confidentially that the Bund was working with certain anti-Semitic groups in this country,” which implied that the U.S. government recognized the Bund’s plans to spread antisemitism. Other articles wrote that the Bund “actively sought to foment racial and religious hatreds,” and that the Bund did “not believe in religious freedom” and was therefore a danger to American society. By writing on the Bund being an organization committed to growing antisemitism in the United States, newspapers implicated that Americans were afraid of religious intolerance destroying American society.

Newspapers also used the Bund’s antisemitic ideology to further develop the case that the Bund was an un-American organization. An upset citizen wrote into the *New York Times* saying that the Bund’s “character” was “alien to the democratic system,” because its antisemitic and racist ideology “could undoubtedly weaken the strength and unity of America.”

---

member of the Steuben Society, another German-American organization active at the time, was quoted in an article stating that the Steuben society knew the Bund was “‘un-American in their ways and ventures’” due to the Bund’s intolerance for “‘religious freedom.’”

By demonstrating that a more “American” German-American society denounced the Bund based on its antisemitism, this particular article made it clear that the Bund was not a true American organization. American fears about antisemitism therefore stemmed from the threat that antisemitism posed towards American democratic society.

Furthermore, another article quoted the Bund’s demands that “no Jews shall hold ‘positions of importance’ in government, national defense forces and educational institutions,” and the Bund’s call for a “‘thorough cleaning [of Jews from] our most important medium of propaganda end entertainment, the Hollywood film industry.’”

In response to all this, an editorial in an Ohio newspaper published a statement that the “Bund intends to rid this nation of Jews—American citizens if you please,” so therefore, it was “time the nation rids itself of Fritz Kuhn and his German American Bund.” A significant editorial, printed multiple papers across the country, reminded Americans that the Bund “[recruits] chiefly by painting a terrific Jewish menace” and “willfully misrepresent[ed] the facts about Jews in the United States.”

Each of these articles demonstrate ways in which newspapers credited the Bund’s antisemitic ideology alone as proof that the Bund was un-American, because discrimination based on religion was

---

70 Pegler, “Fair Enough.”
considered un-American. This reveals that Americans feared antisemitism—or more broadly, religious intolerance—as an anti-American force that could destroy society.

The Dies Committee: The Investigation into the Bund’s Reported Activities

Newspapers inflated, exaggerated, and speculated at the Bund’s negative characteristics, revealing several anxieties that Americans felt about the Bund and its un-American activities. One of the most prominent channels for these anxieties was a government investigation into the Bund conducted by the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC). HUAC was a government agency that sought to investigate disloyal activity in the United States. Formally, HUAC aimed to determine “the extent, character, and objects” of un-American propaganda, the “diffusion within the United States” of such propaganda, and “all other questions in relation” that would help Congress make punitive legislation against un-American organizations and individuals.  

HUAC was called the Dies Committee from its establishment in 1938 until 1944, after its founder and chairman Representative Martin Dies of Texas. Under Dies, its prime objective during its first three years was to investigate the German American Bund, and identify evidence that the Bund was, in fact, an un-American organization.

The Dies Committee’s investigation into the Bund received widespread newspaper coverage until the Bund disbanded in 1941. The Committee’s findings were not always accurate, but they reflected American fears about the Bund's activities in the United States. A Committee investigator reportedly uncovered “half a million persons” involved with the Bund in the United
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States, which was an important development because previously, Americans did not know how large it was. This report was wildly inaccurate—the actual number of Bund members at its peak was about twenty-five thousand—but it reveals that Americans had no clear idea of the Bund’s size, and feared that it had a broad scope in the United States. The Committee was also reported to have uncovered Bund schemes to initiate a “powerful ‘sabotage machine’” by employing Nazi spies in major aircraft factories, and by working Nazi propaganda into public schools through the guise of “German language classes.” According to scholars, it is unclear whether these reports were true or not, because the Committee had an “elastic definition of un-Americanism” which may have misconstrued the mundane activities of Bund members. Regardless, such reports identify the fear that the Bund was infiltrating Nazi agendas into everyday society. Additionally, the Committee investigated allegations that the Bund was “conducting a vigorous, Nation-wide campaign to recruit American skilled laborers to work in the munitions factories of Nazi Germany.” This allegation turned out to be false, but the fact that it was taken seriously by the Committee and the media shows how worried Americans were about the Bund’s pro-German and anti-American activities in the United States. The Committee’s investigations, as reported by the press, indicated that the American public was afraid of what the Bund was doing in everyday society.
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Exaggerated testimonies about the Bund in front of the Dies Committee also received plenty of attention in the American press. These testimonies served as the basis for American fears about the Bund’s activities, and what they meant for American society. One article detailed the testimony of Henry D. Allen, a Bund associate and self-described antisemitic and anti-communist from California. Martin Dies and the Dies Committee conducted Allen’s testimony. Allen testified that Nazi Germany worked through the German Embassy in Los Angeles to control the Bund.\footnote{Frederick R. Barkley, “Links Bund Effort To Reich Embassy: Before Dies Committee” \textit{The New York Times}, 23 August 1939: 9, accessed 19 November 2019 from \textit{ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times}.} This testimony was untrue; Nazi Germany and the German American Bund were not directly involved with one another. However, papers printed this testimony as a fact which solidified American fears about the Bund as a foreign-controlled threat. In another case, papers reported the testimony of a nineteen year-old Helen Vooros, who was a former Bund member. Through Vooros’ testimony, “immorality” was discovered in the Bund’s activities, through a list of dozens of examples: the Bund had her carry a “secret ‘package’ to [a] political contact;” a 42 year-old Bund youth leader was scandalously “found with a 17 year-old Bronx girl;” complaints of sexual misconduct went ignored; Bund members “were handed anti-Catholic pamphlets” and told to support “sterilization” for the “children of Germans married to Jews.”\footnote{Robert C. Albright, “Immorality in Bund Charged by Girl, 19: brooklyn Brunet Testifies Youth Leaders Told, on Trip to Germany, That Nazis Plan to “Turn to America” \textit{The Washington Post}, 19 August 1939: 1, accessed 20 November 2019 from \textit{ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The Washington Post}.} The papers reported these complaints as reality, which contributed to the Bund’s characterization by the press. It is unknown whether or not the girl’s statements were true, but according to scholars, they are not unreasonable. The Bund was wrought with moral problems; leader Fritz Kuhn set a negative image of the Bund by openly spending time at bars and clubs with many different women, which was shameful in the 1930s, and the Bund
engaged in fraud, embezzlement, and racketeering, which contributed to its demise. Nonetheless, these accusations further developed fears about the Bund being a threat to American society; it not only posed a Nazi threat, but it posed a moral threat to the United States.

**The “Very Essence of Democracy”: Debating the Bund’s First Amendment Rights**

American newspapers not only criticized the German American Bund for being a fascist Nazi organization, but they publicized different opinions about how Americans should handle the Bund. At large, the Bund’s actions triggered an intense debate among the American public regarding the protection of the Bund’s First Amendment rights to the freedom of speech and freedom of assembly. Politicians, concerned citizens, newspaper editors, and others divided over whether or not the Bund should have these rights revoked. From coast to coast, these debates were made evident in American newspapers.

Some Americans believed the Bund did not deserve the rights to free speech and assembly. An Alabama Senator was quoted to have “favored ‘concentration camps for those trying to spread un-American propaganda,’” and called for the revoking of the Bund’s rights of free speech. An editorial reminded readers that the U.S. “is a free country—but it is NOT free for racist radicals to set up a program ‘patterned after Hitler.’” The editorial argues that “the license of free speech in the United States can be abused—abused to the point where it becomes a menace,” and therefore, the Bund should be suppressed. Some articles expressed the severity of the Dies Committee’s main objective against the Bund, which was to “seek an early end to
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[its] activities...by declaring revocation of all state charters under which it operates,” including speech and assembly rights. More moderately, an editorial published in The New York Times said that the Bund’s military-like strongmen guards at the 1939 Madison Square Rally were “unnecessary” and “totally out of keeping with the atmosphere of a public meeting in a democratic country,” implying that the Bund pushed the limits of free assembly. And, in an impassioned editorial published by the Washington Post, journalist Dorothy Thompson criticized liberals for defending the Bund’s free speech and assembly. According to Thompson, such support for the Bund illustrated “how degenerate, how cut-off from the roots, how devoid of philosophical and moral content, how intellectually impotent, how frivolously careless, how lacking in the first instinct of self-preservation liberalism has become.”

Conversely, some Americans defended the protection of the Bund’s First Amendment rights, based on American constitutional democratic ideology. While these individuals opposed the Bund’s ideology, they firmly believed that all citizens were protected by the United States Constitution. As one senator put it in a 1939 article following the Bund’s Madison Square rally, “I detest this kind of meeting but I’d fight like hell to let them keep it.” This senator was not alone in thought. The editor of the New York Times published an article stating that “[The Bund’s] members are entitled to free speech and to the other constitutional guarantees,” and that “we cannot deny these rights and still call ourselves a democracy.” In 1941, the state of New Jersey sued the Bund in the state’s Supreme Court over allegations that the Bund spread Nazi
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ideology. However, the court upheld the Bund’s rights to free speech and assembly. In an article reporting on this case, the decision was justified based on the fact that the court “[could not] say that the statements made by the plaintiff-in-error [the Bund]” were “a clear and present danger” to society, which would have nulled first amendment rights.91 One article even praised New York City for allowing the 1939 Madison Square rally to occur; the article claimed “the very essence of democracy was exemplified by the official sanction for this pro-Nazi rally.”92 In each of these articles, newspapers reflected America’s commitment to constitutional democracy without condoning the behavior of the Bund. By offering the argument that the Bund should be allowed to keep its First Amendment rights, American newspapers likely challenged Americans to consider what constitutional democracy means for organizations like the Bund.

Some Americans supported the Bund’s rights to free speech and assembly because they feared what could happen if the movement were to go underground. An editorial in the Chicago Tribune argued that “Democracy’s strength is in the open discussion of issues. To drive an organization such as the Bund underground is to resort to the tactics of Hitler.”93 Another article wrote that mayor Fiorello LaGuardia “referred to the Bund meeting as an ‘exhibition of international cooties,’ and he said he believed in exposing cooties into sunlight rather than keeping them bottled up,” meaning that Americans should continue to allow free speech and assembly to the Bund.94 A ‘Letter to the Editor’ article in the New York Times argued that
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Americans should be “thankful for the Bill of Rights that gave this unpopular minority the right of free speech and assembly,” because it “showed us to public view its abuses of freedom, its intolerances, its sad misconceptions of Americanism and the menace of camouflage.” Together, these articles provide reason for why American democracy works, and why the First Amendment rights are important: if the Bund didn’t have free speech or assembly, fascism and antisemitism may have gone underground and expanded, completely outside of public knowledge. Newspapers fortified the idea that free speech and assembly were an avenue for Americans to keep an eye on the Bund’s activity.

Between 1936 and 1941, the German American Bund operated as pro-Nazi organization in the United States. Because of its extremist ideology, the Bund became the center of a considerable amount of newspaper media attention. Through their characterizations of the Bund, newspaper articles reveal how the Bund was perceived by Americans, and how those perceptions reflect American anxieties about Nazism, fascism, and racism in the years leading up to World War II. The press characterized the the Bund as a direct branch of the Nazi party, which indicated American fears about German Nazi penetration into the United States. Theories that the Bund co-conspirator with other fascist and nationalist organizations active in the United States also existed. Such theories affirm that Americans feared a fascist movement in their democratic country. The Bund revealed itself to be an antisemitic entity, which was perceived by Americans to be a threat to democracy. The newspaper media highlighted exaggerations and accusations made against the Bund through reports of government investigations, which exposes how Americans feared the Bund’s activities and intentions. In addition, the media spotlighted a heated debate over whether or not the Bund’s American rights to free speech and assembly should be

upheld or retracted. This study sheds light on how Americans at large understood homegrown Nazism, fascism, and racism during the onset of World War II. Americans believed these institutions were not native to Americans, but rather the result of foreign thoughts and efforts. Moreover, Americans were deeply engrossed in the fight against fascism, which to a degree overshadowed the issue of homegrown racism in the United States.

This study opens up a broader discussion about America’s reluctance to take responsibility for its dangerous alt-right nationalist groups. The American narrative of the Bund, as demonstrated by this work, makes the alt-right Bund out to be a foreign organization that couldn’t exist within the values of American democracy. Such a narrative fails to recognize that the Bund was an American organization that was born and bred within the ranks of American democracy itself. This study also calls for a discussion about America’s reluctance to discuss racism and religious intolerance as a significant and independent issue in the United States. Rather than handling the Bund’s antisemitism as its own human rights or civil liberties issue, the American media addressed it as an anti-democratic feature of the Bund. This aided the construction of the argument that the Bund was a foreign threat to American democracy, even though antisemitism was an issue that existed among American citizens independently of Nazi influence. Incidents of the Bund’s antisemitism were treated by the media as acts of opposition toward democratic society, rather than as hate crimes that were symptomatic of the much more complex issue of racism and religious intolerance in the United States.

Future scholarship should delve deeper into these discussions about America’s relationship with homegrown alt-right movements and racism. By examining the narratives that Americans told themselves about the Bund and other homegrown ultra-nationalist and racist movements, historians can learn precisely what role the United States played in their existence.
How did the American news media, education institutions, government, Hollywood, and so on portray these groups in relationship to American culture at large? To what extent did America acknowledge its own role in fostering nationalism, fascism, and racism? Were there any specific narratives that appeared to strengthen or weaken the existence of anomalous organizations, and if so, how and why? Ultimately, by understanding the nuances within American narratives of anomalous organizations, American society is better equipped to address and destroy current ultra-nationalist and racist organizations.
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