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Composer Frederick Delius (1862–1934) wrote this to Percy Grainger (1882–1961) on January 23, 1924 in acknowledgement of the significance of their friendship and Grainger’s work on his behalf. Despite the reciprocal appreciation reflected in their correspondence, the importance of their relationship and its musical and personal consequences is rarely acknowledged in the scholarly literature. This relationship prompted Grainger, on his arrival in the United States in 1914, to coordinate what he described as a “Delius campaign” after noticing that Delius’s music was not “being pushed here at all” (Grainger 1914a). Designed to promote and disseminate the music of his friend throughout the country, Grainger’s main goal for this campaign, as grandly outlined in a number of letters, was to do his part in establishing Delius “as one of the greatest of the greatest” (Grainger 1915a). His approach to this was manifold, organizing performances of Delius’s music, giving lectures and writing articles about Delius, as well as consistently championing Delius’s music when in contact with the press, publishers, and other musicians of influence. As so often happens with Grainger, however, these efforts were quickly influenced by his strident racist views, and from around 1919 Grainger expanded his campaign to include not only Delius, but all music he deemed to be of “Anglo-Saxon” or “Nordic” origin: music, by his own definition, “written by blue-eyed people anywhere, and showing the characteristics of that race” (Grainger 1930a). Grainger began to manipulate the image he presented of Delius through both his writings and concert programming, attempting to establish him as an exemplar of this constructed “Anglo-Saxon” or “Nordic” musician. Grainger specifically drew attention to the American genesis of some of Delius’s compositions and the trope of the natural landscape present in many of his works, suggesting that these were manifestations of a supposed “Nordic” compositional impulse.

In this article, I explore Grainger’s promotion of Delius in America
between Grainger’s arrival in 1914 and Delius’s death in 1934 as both a product of their personal relationship and as an aspect of Grainger’s own racist ideology in the context of the wider American Nordicist movement—a particularly virulent form of racial nativism—that had become prevalent in postwar America (Decker 1994, 53). I argue that while American audiences’ already firmly established ideas of Delius’s “cosmopolitanism”—albeit rather Euro-centric in conception—made Grainger’s campaign initially difficult for critics to accept, it was only through this perceived detachment from a single national or compositional school that Grainger was able to racialize both Delius and his music. I do this first by examining the critical trope of cosmopolitanism in Delius reception, with specific reference to its appearance in the American press and how this was received in the context of the social and musical “Americanization” movements of the early twentieth century. I then explore the development of race in Grainger’s Delius campaign as its expression moved from vague and contradictory terms to a virulent Nordicism. By linking Delius with America, either explicitly through referencing the inspiration Delius took from the time he spent in Florida, or through grouping Delius with American composers under the “Anglo-Saxon” banner, Grainger consciously exploited the widespread contemporary search for an American compositional voice, as well as a more sinister, growing cultural nativism. I also argue that by presenting Delius’s music in this racialized framing, Grainger specifically mobilized an array of eugenicist ideologies in service of the music’s reception, specifically in line with his own espousal of a variety of racist political and ideological projects.

Cosmopolitanism and Race

The issue of Delius’s personal and musical national identity is an area of ongoing debate. While regarded in many popular representations throughout the twentieth century as a typically “English” composer, the depiction of Delius as a cosmopolitan was widespread in discourses both during and after his lifetime. Much of this was related to Delius’s varied associations with a number of different countries and cultures. Born in Bradford, Yorkshire in 1862 to German parents, he received much of his early musical training in the United States while running an orange grove in Florida between 1884 and 1886. He continued his musical education in Leipzig where he developed a lasting friendship with Grieg, reinforcing his strong emotional attachment to Norway—a place where he spent over twenty summers of his adult life. Moving to Paris in 1888, he spent the next decade absorbing the influence of his wide circle of friends, made up of artists, writers, and musicians (including Gabriel Fauré, Maurice Ravel, Paul Gauguin, and
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Edvard Munch), before settling in Grez-sur-Loing outside Fontainebleau in 1897 with his future wife, painter Jelka Rosen (Anderson, Payne, and Carley, n.d.).

Delius was described as a cosmopolitan from his earliest reception, and this label has persisted well into modern scholarship. Most explicitly articulated by Christopher Palmer in his 1976 Delius: Portrait of a Cosmopolitan, this trope remains in even very recent publications, including Martin Lee-Browne and Paul Guinery’s 2014 Delius and His Music which notes that the word is “nowadays often used” to describe Delius “quite correctly” (51). Yet the definition of what actually constitutes a musical cosmopolitan is a fraught one, both in terms of wider historical musicological studies and in Delius’s reception specifically. Dana Gooley explains that, from the nineteenth century onwards, the term has been “used loosely as a synonym for ‘sophisticated,’ ‘worldly,’ ‘international,’ or ‘widely travelled.’” (2013, 523). But cosmopolitanism in music as a theoretical concept, often postulated in a dichotomous relationship with musical nationalism, is, as Martin Stokes argues, a “messy term,” aiding in understanding “the intellectual formations and dispositions of nationalist ideologues and reformers” but also able to be “used and asserted in local struggles for prestige and cultural authenticity” (2007, 9–10). Such “messiness,” as Gooley argues, can be seen in the difficulty present in attempting to identify the “location or site” of cosmopolitanism (525). It can be defined in particular practices, through distinct compositional techniques, genres, or styles (often through the amalgamation of “available national idioms”), by foregrounding repertoire or institutions, or by examining the lives of musicians compelled to become “citizens of the world” (526). Richard Taruskin, in the context of late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-century Russian composers, for example, argues that cosmopolitanism was judged by the assorted criteria of ethnicity, training, and style (2011, 133), giving what Gooley also describes as “the impression that the cosmopolitan consolidated various forms of otherness” (2013, 525).

In relation to Delius specifically, Sarah Collins’s pioneering 2015 study describes how “the notion of cosmopolitanism” itself could be “actively mobilized . . . not only to signal a political and cultural position, but also to describe a particular attitude—a distanced or detached persona—which applied to both music composition and music criticism” (106). Through the application of the term based on an understanding of these notions, Collins ultimately describes Delius’s cosmopolitanism as one that transcends matters of “nationality, language or spirit,” being greatly informed by Delius’s other “apparent transgression” of cultural expectations regarding social behaviour and engagement (2015, 106–7). This can be demonstrated in a number of ways.
First, the “elusive problem of [Delius’s] nationality,” as it was articulated by Philip Heseltine in the *Musical Times* in 1915, appears in contemporary literature with a pervasiveness that Collins has described as “striking” (2015, 105). Even from his earliest reception in England, such as the first British concert of his works in 1899, critics seemed preoccupied with questions of Delius’s national identity, noting the diverse range of musical influences as well as countries with which he was associated. Second, in addition to this ambiguity created by his lack of ties to one particular country, Delius’s music was also “highly individual”—described by Jeremy Dibble as a sort of “musical Marmite” (2015)—and was not associated with any precise national or aesthetic compositional school. Finally, Delius’s public image was also further complicated by what appears to be a distinct lack of concern with self-promotion in the public eye (he did, however, frequently promote himself to conductors and other composers, as demonstrated throughout Andrew Boyle’s recent study *Delius and Norway* [2017]). For example, as Lionel Carley has described, following Delius’s first concert in England, he returned to France almost immediately, showing a profound lack of interest in capitalizing on the positive public interest this concert created in him and his music (1998, 4).

Thus, Delius’s cosmopolitanism can be considered a combination of “geographical, geo-cultural and ethnic associations . . . (namely, his foreign parentage, overseas travel, and sympathies with broader European art)” along with “other aspects related to Delius’s refusal to participate in economic, commercial, cultural, and political life” (Collins 2015, 112–13). All of these aspects contributed to the labeling of Delius as a cosmopolitan, in what Collins has argued demonstrates the “hermeneutics of musical modernism” which is “predicated upon the association of [the] musical autonomy” that Dibble and others have described of Delius’s style “with other, non-aesthetic types of detachment” (2015, 97).

The ambiguity created by Delius’s apparent cosmopolitanism has provided, at times, opportunity to shape perceptions of his persona and music to deliberate political ends. As Robert Stradling argues, Delius’s music was consciously “repatriated” to England by figures such as Heseltine and Cecil Gray during his lifetime. Gray was among the most influential of Delius’s English promoters. Exploiting the “first great movement of middle-class pacifism” following the First World War, he attempted to replace Elgar and the “jingoistic imperialism with which . . . [he] was ineradicably associated” with the “tranquility and repose” of Delius in the British national consciousness (Stradling 1989, 79). Following Delius’s death, Thomas Beecham also worked hard to reestablish Delius’s reputation as an “English” composer. Beyond promoting and conducting Delius’s work, Beecham was
also involved in organizing for the literal repatriation of Delius’s body to
England, where he was reinterred to a churchyard in Limpsfield, Surrey in
1935 (Stradling 1989, 78–79). All these men profited from Delius’s sparse
public image—as well as his musical individualism and lack of obvious na-
tional ties—by aligning specific elements of his persona and music with an
ideology appropriate to postwar British audiences. Through his apparent
cosmopolitanism and the fact that he rarely challenged any public repres-
sentation of himself made by others, Delius was, in a way, a blank canvas
upon which individual ideological—and, in particular, nationalist—values
could be painted. This same lack of concrete alignment made Delius a par-
ticularly suitable vessel through which Percy Grainger could exploit and
transplant his own developing racist ideologies, as will be discussed below.

The critical trope of cosmopolitanism prevalent in descriptions of
Delius in Europe during his own lifetime presents what Collins considers
to be “a surprising absence of delineation” between the various “locations”
or “sites” of cosmopolitanism (those sites described by Gooley, noted
above), “demonstrating instead the multilevel operation of cosmopoli-
tanism” (2015, 108). It is equally evident that in early twentieth-century
America, both the critical trope of cosmopolitanism and the distinct lack
delineation in its meaning are also consistently present in assessments
of Delius’s music. For example, following the 1910 premiere of *Brigg Fair*
(1907) (only the second Delius work performed in the US) by the New
York Philharmonic Orchestra, a review in the *American Hebrew & Jewish
Messenger* commented on Delius’s “lonely life . . . under widely varying
musical influences,” while other articles described a socially detached
man under the influence of composers ranging from Grieg and Debussy
to Wagner and Brahms. For example, Carl van Vechten in the *Symphony
Society Bulletin* suggested a mixture of French and English influence in the
work, with “the bearded face of Debussy, together with his strange harmo-
nies” being occasionally “noticed peeping over the fence and looking into
the English garden to which we are introduced in ‘Brigg Fair.’ ” Similarly,
the program notes to the January 1912 US premiere of *In a Summer Garden*
(1908), by Joseph Strinsky and the New York Philharmonic Society, open
by describing Delius as coming “as near [to] being a cosmopolitan in art
as anybody alive.” Biographical articles often reference his cosmopolitan-
ism. For example, Eric De Lamarter’s “Frederick Delius: Cosmopolitan
Composer” in the *Boston Evening Transcript* in 1916 describes Delius as
obviously having taken “all musical knowledge for his province,” intending
“to be a cosmopolite” (Gillespie and Beckhard 1998, 85).

Yet the United States at this time did not provide the most tolerant at-
mosphere for the acceptance of a “rootless” European like Delius. The New
York in which Grainger launched his campaign in late 1914 was one whose musical tastes and expectations had been framed by more than a century of European Romantic domination. Late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-century audiences were essentially conservative, and while new works were frequently premiered, contemporary composers were often poorly received. Attempts to promote new compositions in this period often failed (Shanet 1975, 232) as “democratized new audience[s] . . . preferred canonized European masters to contemporary or American creators” (Horowitz 1995, 71). Audiences in fin-de-siècle America were also deeply concerned with Victorian notions of morality (Shanet 1975, 227–28). This preoccupation is made clear, in relation to Delius, in the critical response to the first performance of his music in America. The Boston Globe reported that a “Wild Night of Orgy is Set to Music” following the 1909 premiere of Paris: The Song of a Great City (1899). This review contrasted the “orthodox musical creed” of a Mozart symphony also on the program with the “doubly distilled heresy” and “cacophonous profanities” of Paris, describing Delius as “a new musical pagan” (Gillespie and Beckhard 1998, 60).

However, leading up to and during the First World War, a reaction to this prevailing Eurocentric model of high culture created a “sometimes militantly nationalistic Americanization movement . . . [that] swept across U.S. cities” (Gienow-Hecht 2009, 159). While American musical audiences were “increasingly interested in how their country fit in with the rest of the world—politically, intellectually, and culturally,” as Katherine Preston states, “a desire for transnational connection . . . did not inevitably negate a quest for national identity” (2013, 535). This search for a national compositional voice, coupled with building international tensions, created a fervent patriotic atmosphere in which the musical community “in addition to trying to develop a national music identity, feared cosmopolitan corruption” (Levy 1983, 88). This climate of distrust in cosmopolitanism can be seen explicitly in some of the criticism of Delius in the US. Some articles, such as Henry Krehbiel’s November 1915 New York Tribune piece entitled “A German Englishman writes American Music,” go beyond simple references to Delius’s detachment from a single national compositional school. While Krehbiel is highly enthusiastic about the idea of Delius’s music overall, he also deems Delius’s cosmopolitanism to be “not without its embarrassments.” As Gooley has argued, cosmopolitanism was something largely defined negatively in the nineteenth century in a highly nationalistic Europe, as the “absence of roots, folk spirit, developed subjectivity or the capacity to transmit authentic feeling” (2013, 524). It is clear that such a response remained present in early-twentieth-century America, as Krehbiel demonstrates, seemingly implying that a lack of a single national
identity was something of which to be ashamed. Later, British critic Ernest Newman, writing in the *New York Times Magazine*, highlighted some of the aspects that had contributed to the perception of Delius as cosmopolitan or rootless, particularly in America, and voiced many of the prevailing anxieties surrounding his earlier reception. Newman believed that the difficulty of placing Delius within any particular local or national musical tradition was a reason for his lack of popular success in the United States, stating that, as he “is difficult to fit into any of the categories so beloved of the general public,” the listener would have difficulty knowing exactly what he “stands for” (Newman [1930] 2008, 108).

While the racism behind Grainger’s promotion of Delius in his later “Anglo-Saxon” campaign was perhaps uniquely applied to music by Grainger, these ideas were linked to those of the time more generally. Grainger’s intensely problematic discussion of what he interchangeably called “Anglo-Saxon” and “Nordic” music, as will be discussed below, built on the racist texts of prominent early-twentieth-century eugenicists. Grainger’s terminology, for instance, was taken directly from Madison Grant’s 1916 *The Passing of the Great Race*, a work he had read in 1919 (Grant himself had taken his terminology from William Z. Ripley’s 1899 *The Races of Europe*) (Pear 2000, 34). The writings of Grant and his followers (including Houston Stewart Chamberlain and Lothrop Stoddard, both also influential to Grainger’s ideas) gained popularity through what John Higham has called America’s “tribal twenties”—a period that saw the rise of both eugenics and American Nordicism in social and political thought (Higham 1988, 265).

Nordicism, an ideology derived from a racial eugenics that divides populations into separate races based on characteristics of physical appearance, espouses the belief that northern Europeans, or “Nordics,” are the most genetically superior of the three “white” races—more intelligent and physically strong than their “Alpine” or “Mediterranean” counterparts—and that the intermingling of Nordics with any of the other races was “a destructive process of ‘mongrelisation’” (Higham 1988, 272). A continuation of prewar prejudices against Catholic, Jewish, and Southern and Eastern Europeans, the influence of these theories cannot be underestimated, circulating in “academic and popular forums alike” (Decker 1994, 54). The widespread eugenicist and Nordicist movements were ultimately responsible for several international congresses on eugenics held in the United States, and the Immigration Act of 1924, which restricted the migration of people from Southern and Eastern Europe in favor of those from the North. By the end of the decade, eugenic measures were widely implemented, including widespread restrictions on interracial marriage.
and government-imposed forced sterilization of people with disabilities in twenty-four different states (Burgers 2011, 138). As Burgers argues, given that the “defects” that could suggest an individual for sterilization included “moral degeneracy” and “general tendencies toward criminality,” this discourse had a “direct analogue in… immigration policy” (2011, 138). As eugenicist Henry Laughlin presented to the 1922 House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, he believed that migrants “present[ed] a higher percentage of inborn socially inadequate qualities” (quoted in Burgers 2011, 138).

Arguments for the superiority of Nordics also appeared in the popular press, including letters and articles in the New York Times, which grew particularly heated in the years 1921 and 1922 (Decker 1994, 54), and, in the early twenties, as Higham notes, “the most widely read magazine in the United States, the Saturday Evening Post, began to quote and urgently commend the doctrines of Madison Grant” (1988, 265). The movement even found outlets in revisionist history. As Jeffry Decker describes, the New York Times published debates on the supposed Nordic origins of modern America itself, with some arguing that Christopher Columbus had Scandinavian heritage. Alternatively, others argued that it was not, in fact, Columbus who had colonized the country, but rather Icelandic explorer Leif Erikson, “from whose strong Nordic stock our early pioneers derived their rugged virtues” (quoted in Decker 1994, 54). By the early 1920s, Grainger was able to articulate his own racist views in the context of these widely circulating ideas, and, consequently, was able to participate in and reinforce this populist racism in order to promote music that he believed fit within “Nordic” and “Anglo-Saxon” constraints.

The Delius Campaign

Delius and Grainger first met in 1907, and immediately established a close friendship that would endure throughout the rest of Delius's life. This friendship—which involved ongoing correspondence, meetings throughout Germany and Norway, and Grainger's visits to an increasingly infirm Delius in Grez-sur-Loing—blossomed through a mutual love of each other's music, and they both felt a reciprocal and particularly special understanding of each other's work. As Delius wrote to Grainger in 1914, “you understand better than anyone what I am trying to do” (Delius 1983, 126), and, in 1917, “we have an enormous lot in common, perhaps even more than you realise and I feel that I understood you like no one else—right from the first too” (Delius 1917). Similarly, Grainger often wrote of the emotional connection he felt to Delius's compositions, telling Delius in 1914, in his ever-effusive style, that the musical mood of both On Hearing
the First Cuckoo in Spring (1912) and the Dance Rhapsody (1908) “feel closer to me personally than my own work does, it utterly voices what I most inwardly long to hear expressed or to express” (Grainger 1914b).

Beyond his emotional response to Delius’s music, Grainger also referred frequently to what he saw as its aesthetic affinity with his own work. Following their first meeting, Delius provided Grainger with a score to his Appalachia (1896). Soon after, Grainger wrote out Delius’s first eight-bar iteration of the “old slave song” upon which these variations were based and sent them to his girlfriend, Karen Holten, disguised as his own harmonization (Figures 1 and 2). He asked her to “please (& the truth) let me know if you think the harmonies are really typical of me, or if they’re too Griegish, or Wagnerish, or something” (Grainger 1907). In his next letter he told her that he had tricked her, and that he was “jubilant” that she had “fallen into” his trap (Grainger 1985, 108). Grainger wrote of Delius:

Frequently he and I write exactly the same harmonies without ever having heard each other’s works, as in the piece I sent you. . . . In him & me many same impressions must have occurred in somewhat the same proportions to produce moments of such undistinguishable likeness. (Grainger 1985, 107)

Grainger concluded that while the work itself was in many ways “very different” to his own output, the treatment and setting of the African American folk tune in Appalachia “nobody could tell from my work, I am sure” (Grainger 1985, 107).

This first encounter with Appalachia in 1907 was clearly striking enough to Grainger for him to recount it several times throughout his life. He wrote of his first playing through the score, “I was so amazed to find that anything so like my own chordal style existed. It struck my mother in the same way: ‘What piece of yours is that?’ she called from the next room, taking for granted that it was mine, yet not able to recognize it” (Grainger [1934] 1976, 122). This feeling was apparently reciprocated by Delius, and Grainger claimed that around the same time, when first shown a selection of Grainger’s compositions and settings of folk tunes Delius’s immediate response was “but our harmonies are identical!” (Bird 1998, 126). Grainger wrote to Delius in June 1917 similarly, stating that “there has been something in common between us,” citing their mutual love of Scandinavia and folk song, and their general “freedom-yearning.” He concluded, “it was a tremendous moment for me when I first saw the score of Appalachia and felt so close to it, and it so close to my own music” (Grainger 1917). Grainger’s belief in both the aesthetic and emotional closeness between his own and Delius’s music clearly provided the initial motivation for his monumental Delius promotional campaign, but there were also other reasons.
Figure 1: Percy Grainger, letter (holograph) to Karen Holten, 16–21 April 1907. W21-59, Bay 5: Box 34. Reproduced with permission, Grainger Museum, University of Melbourne.

Figure 2: Frederick Delius, *Appalachie* Piano Reduction arr. Otto Singer II (Berlin: Harmonie, 1907), mm. 100–9.
Grainger’s championing of Delius in such a substantial way has been questioned repeatedly in the literature as something that requires an explanation beyond an aesthetic preference for Delius’s music on Grainger’s part. Rachel Lowe (1981) suggests that Grainger’s promotion of Delius was based on his need to repay an imagined debt for Delius’s own early promotion of Grainger’s work. When they first met in 1907, Delius had facilitated Grainger’s transition from performer to working composer, organizing the first public performance of a Grainger composition (Lowe 1981). Conversely, Lionel Carley proposes that their friendship may have stemmed from Delius having no children and Grainger, having had little paternal contact, requiring a successor for his “filial affection” following the death of Grieg (1981, 33). Carley also suggests that Grainger was simply a self-promoter, especially in the early New York years, and that his promotion of Delius was merely a tool to further his own career (36). Yet, in 1915 Grainger was still establishing his own reputation. Given Delius’s relative anonymity in America, and the rather negative view many of those who were aware of him took of his cosmopolitanism, Grainger must have genuinely believed in the worth of the music to risk his own career prospects on it. Ultimately, while Lowe’s and Carley’s suggestions are as valid as any, as the campaign developed, there is evidence of a wider ideological motivation behind Grainger’s efforts. While it is evident that Grainger genuinely loved Delius’s music, his categorical Nordicist racism also clearly informed the way he encountered Delius’s music.

Before Grainger’s arrival in New York, Delius was not considered a particularly significant composer. Grainger wrote to Delius in early 1915, laying out his plans for a promotional campaign in detail:

Of course it will everywhere be my plan to establish myself a solid favour-rite with the public before introducing your concerto, but as my success with the Grieg Concerto . . . was gorgeous I now consider New York ripe for the Delius concerto, have suggested it to the Philharmonic and am definitely booked to play it here on Friday, Nov 26. . . . I now wish to work on as much of a “Delius campaign” as I can before I play the concerto for both our sakes, and shall write about you in the musical papers and do all I can in every way. (Grainger 1915a)

Grainger’s approach to the dissemination of Delius’s music in America was manifold. The New York press, no doubt aware of Grainger’s international reputation as a pianist, and perhaps even of his successful performance of the Delius concerto at the Torquay Festival in England the previous year, provided Grainger’s first line of promotion, manipulating the press’s interest in himself to the advantage of Delius. He told Delius that “as my coming tour will be largely advertised in the musical papers here I think I shall have numerous chances of bringing your name forward again
and again” (Grainger 1915a). Along these lines, Grainger asked Delius to copy or rewrite and send back to him a letter to distribute to the press which read:

“It is a great joy to me that it will be you who will introduce my Piano Concerto to America. Your perfect performances of my work at the various Festivals remain in my memory as singularly satisfying feats of true interpretive genius. I only wish I could be in New York to hear you do it! You are that rare phenomenon [sic]; a musician who is equally great as a creator and as an executant.”

Could you write me this, or something similar (Laying the jam on pretty thick as I have, as U.S.A needs this!) in a letter so that I could show it in your writing if need be? (Grainger 1915a)

In addition to attempting to influence the press in this manner, Grainger also wrote to Delius’s publishers requesting more scores be sent to the US and contacted many American conductors to introduce them to Delius’s works. He was quickly able to report that both Walter Damrosch and Leopold Stokowski (the latter “a big bug here,” according to Grainger) were eager to introduce more Delius to the US public (Grainger, 1915b).

Beyond these logistical considerations, November 1915 saw a proliferation of Delius, as filtered through Grainger, in New York. In all of Grainger’s writing on Delius, race and the natural landscape played a significant role in the way he framed his discussion, but the manner in which these themes are presented is often vague and sometimes contradictory. At this point Grainger had not yet firmly established the specifically “Nordicist” theories that would characterize his later writings. In a 1915 article in the *Musical Quarterly*, for example, Grainger described Delius as “the rarest and most precious musical genius of our age,” linking “the inspiration he received . . . in Florida” with what he later describes as Delius’s “superlative genius among ‘nature music’ composers.” Citing as evidence Delius’s use of African American song in *Appalachia*, what he called “English peasant song” in *Brigg Fair*, and Norwegian folk song in *On Hearing the First Cuckoo in Spring*, Grainger emphasizes the highly problematic, primitivist concept of folk-song as intrinsically linked to “nature” (Grainger 1999a, 43). Simultaneously, Grainger was heavily quoted in Daniel Gregory Mason’s program notes to Walter Damrosch and the New York Symphony Society’s performance of the Two Pieces for Small Orchestra: works Grainger had introduced to the conductor in June that year (Damrosch, 1915). Again, Grainger highlights the inspiration Delius had taken from features of the natural landscape of Norway, the river in France, and the English countryside.

Elsewhere, Grainger specifically emphasized the influence of America
on Delius, in many places attempting to present Delius as an American himself, or at least a composer of American music. In these instances, he focused on themes inspired by the orange grove in Florida that pervade many of Delius's compositions (themes like that of Appalachia, which, as demonstrated above, first attracted Grainger to Delius's music) (Anderson, Payne and Carley, n.d.). In the Musical Courier in November 1915, writing of the Delius Piano Concerto (1897, rev. 1906) that he was soon to perform, Grainger argued that Delius was composing truly American music, emphasizing what he felt to be the influence of African American music particularly present in the slow movement (Grainger 1915c). In so strongly emphasizing Delius as a product of America, Grainger was clearly attempting to capitalize on a growing atmosphere of musical patriotism.

In the week prior to this concert, Henry Edward Krehbiel, a critic and writer with a particular interest in African American music (having in the previous year published a book on this topic), also published his above-mentioned New York Tribune article, discussing the influence of America on Delius (Grant 1998, 82). While Krehbiel was undoubtedly attuned to the inclusion of African American themes, it is probable that much of his information was provided by Grainger as part of these widespread promotional efforts. This article described the concerto as “in a two-fold sense an American document”: by its genesis in Florida and by the inclusion of two distinctly American melodies.

It seems that Grainger's attempts to situate the Piano Concerto within the discourse surrounding the search for a distinctive “American” music were unconvincing. This can be seen in the critical reception of the premiere, as reviewers unsuccessfully searched for audible American elements. It appears that most critics accepted the inclusion of African American music as integral to the conception of an “American Music,” as had been articulated by many musical theorists well back into the previous century. Examples of this can be seen in Ralph Waldo Emerson's 1837 essay “The American Scholar,” which argues for an American cultural model that acknowledged “America's own ethnic and racial diversity” (Tibbets 1998, 346). Similarly, discussions of white or European composers quoting African American folk song, much like in Delius's Piano Concerto, were ongoing in music circles for at least the previous two decades, since Dvořák's New World Symphony and his famous statement of “a great and noble school of music” founded on “negro-melodies” that he had made in 1893 (Peress 2004, 24). Dvořák's words, “which stirred bitter controversy…presented a sharp contrast to the prevailing social, political, and cultural attitudes in American society at the time,” which continued well into the twentieth century (Snyder 1993, 129–30).

Yet, even Krehbiel, in his Tribune review of November 27 of that year,
while indeed noting the presence of a “Habanera rhythm . . . we can well believe Mr. Delius picked up on his Florida plantation,” was disappointed by the work overall, believing it to be “sadly invertebrate—lacking in continuity of architectural line and coherence of purpose,” and was unable to find any further tangible references to America. On the same day Richard Aldrich of the New York Times voiced a fairly representative opinion when he wrote that there was nothing to describe as a “potent reminder of the negro influence.” The proliferation of references to landscape and nature in Grainger’s writings on Delius also had the unfortunate consequence of distracting the press from critically engaging with the music. In the case of the Mood Pictures program, one critic thanked Grainger for the addition of “geographical data,” and most got sidetracked by Grainger’s description of the bassoons mimicking the frogs on the river Loing. As Beckhard and Gillespie have noted, critical coverage was diverted “into areas of geology and zoology. Birds and Frogs replaced musical substance” (Gillespie and Beckhard 1998, 79).

Despite the somewhat unfocused efforts of Grainger to “place” Delius’s music geographically, either in America or in a more general “natural” landscape, the trope of cosmopolitanism remained far more prominent in the reception of these 1915 concerts. There are numerous examples of critics referring to Delius’s cosmopolitanism, and describing him at once as English, French, and German. There was also a clearly marked preoccupation with place and nationality in many of the reviews, but rarely in the way in which Grainger intended. This is most strikingly demonstrated in an unsigned Morning Telegraph review of the Piano Concerto entitled “Young Australian Pianist Tires Audience with Yorkshire Tschaikowsky’s Concerto—Why?:”

Percy Grainger, the pianist, who has been literally acclaimed in New York, and deservedly so, not only as a costly exotic golden human chrysanthemum, but as a composer and pianist of striking merit, makes a serious error when he compromises the prosperity of his own appearances by foisting the compositions of his British compatriots upon us. Yesterday it was Delius of Bradford, Yorkshire, who spins music, much as the looms of his native town manufacture cloth, only the cloth can be worn, and Misterherr Delius does not wear . . . Oh! Percy, Percy, the Hotspur of the piano: thou who hast redeemed the Kangaroo from the reproach of a lack of creative imagination; thou who hast thrilled the hearts of the matrons of St. Kilda, which is the suburb of the suburb of the universe: we gathered in our thousands to hear thee yesterday and thou didst hurl raw chunks of Delius, the Yorkshire-pudding Tschaikowsky, at us.8
This review demonstrates a clear distrust of cosmopolitanism, emphasizing and undermining Delius’s relationship to several different countries. Firstly, this is done through repeated and unflattering references to the English county of Yorkshire in which Delius was born. This is compounded by a barb directed at Delius’s German heritage in addressing him as “Misterherr,” in a further demonstration of the anti-German sentiment that Gillespie and Beckhard argue was present in America at the time (1998, 89n65). Grainger is also attacked in this review in terms of nationality in the critic’s open disparagement of Australia. For example, St. Kilda, an area of Melbourne close to where Grainger was born, was described as “the suburb of the suburb of the universe,” in a way intended to emphasize the parochial, colonial nature of Australia. This reference plays on a quote from Arthur Wing Pinero’s *Iris*, in which England is described as a “land of money-worship, of cant and pharisaism, of false sentiment and namby pamby ideals, in every department of life, the suburb of the universe!” (Hamilton 2013, 388). All of these comments show a preoccupation with individual nations and appear to overshadow in the critic’s mind any of the American influence that Grainger had tried to emphasize.

The “Anglo-Saxon” Campaign

While Grainger’s Delius campaign took a hiatus following his enlistment in the United States Army in 1917, on his release in 1919 he carried on with his Delius promotional efforts. This time these were presented under the guise of an explicit and newly formulated campaign for “Anglo-Saxon” music, which was based on theories of the American Nordicist movement. As Grainger’s ideas on race crystallized, this campaign took on an explicitly racist agenda, as his efforts expanded to promote all music that he believed could be classified within his own definition of “Anglo-Saxon” music. This campaign can be seen as rather self-serving, in that Grainger was using the music of his friends not for their own individual artistic merits, but to present an aesthetic element to his own, quite idiosyncratic political and ideological viewpoint. However, Grainger also seems to define the boundaries of his campaign around music he already liked and wanted to promote, rather than the rigid race categories espoused by Grant, leading to some bizarre inclusions. For example, as described below, rather than eschewing music by African American composers from his campaign (as they did not fit within the traditional “Anglo-Saxon” categorization), he instead decided that African Americans must in fact be composing “Anglo-Saxon” music. As Gillies and Pear state, what Grainger gained from the American Nordicist movement was “a simple framework for his racial thinking and
new racial terminology; beyond that, he tended to pick and choose what he found personally useful to justify his preferences, prejudices and inspirations” (Gillies and Pear 2007, 120).

Grainger’s application of these theories differed from the mainstream Nordicism outlined above, as “he professed not to believe in the ‘magic of blood’” (Harris 2000, 24). Instead, he felt the local landscape to be most important in forming musical-racial traits, arguing that as a product of their environment “Scandinavian and English speaking people have craved, above all things, plenty of elbow room for themselves” and that this was manifested musically in their composition (Grainger 1999c, 115). Here Grainger diverts considerably from the eugenicist definitions of specific races (such as those espoused by Grant, Chamberlain, and Stoddard). He believed, due to the influence of supposedly similar local and natural landscapes, that, for example, African American and Polynesian people could also be regarded as “Nordic” or “Anglo Saxon.” Additionally, he considered the people of the whole of East Asia to fall within a subset which he defined as “Mongolian-Nordic” (Gillies and Pear 2007, 122). This is perhaps the most striking example of Grainger’s picking and choosing between different elements within various racist theories to justify his own individual musical preferences within his specific racial ideology. Thus, it was common for Grainger to include non-Western musics among what he considered to be the highest forms of art (once describing the Māori songs he had heard sung by Cook Islanders as a “treat equal to Wagner” [Barwell 2005, 7]) and to place works by African American composers such as Nathaniel Dett alongside those by composers who fit within mainstream Nordic categorization (that is, from Scandinavia, England, Australia, and white North America) in programs during his campaign.

The music and people who bore the brunt of Grainger’s racism were of central and southern Europe, fitting within the other two putative “European races” seen in opposition to the “Nordic”—that is “Alpine” and “Mediterranean”—as they were described by Grant. Grainger was particularly critical of music of southern Europe, describing a “‘gradual fading of loftiness into frivolousness’ as one moved from the Nordic north to the Mediterranean south” (Gillies and Pear 2007, 123). He had a particular hatred of Austrian and Italian music, for example, once claiming, in his idiosyncratic “blue-eyed English” that Mozart’s music was “the heartless tonery that caused the French Realm-clash ((Revolution))” (Grainger 2006b, 207). By the mid-1940s he had developed a complex ranking system for particular composers and types of music, in which he placed Mozart as the absolute worst, closely followed by German folksong and Verdi (Grainger 2006b, 205). Oddly, he ranked Delius somewhere in the middle,
and himself just below Cyril Scott, in equal ninth place with African American songs in arrangements by Natalie Curtis. Much later in life, he also explicitly linked European music to migration, writing in 1953 that as a democratically minded and socialist Australian (he often described Australia as the “Scandinavia of the South”) he felt about playing the music of Chopin, Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven as he did about immigration of “inferior” races to Australia (Grainger 2006a, 172).

In this respect, Grainger’s racism clearly fit with the American zeitgeist, with sections of both public actions and government policy attacking many European groups. The early 1920s particularly saw many violent racist incidents, with the West Frankfort riots targeting Italians in Illinois in 1920 as just one particularly striking example (Ueda 1998, 143). The 1924 Immigration Act, cited above, also intensified this racism by placing restrictive quotas on migration from countries outside of Britain, Germany, and Scandinavia, in what Higham describes as the essential continuation of prewar ideological “trends” through systemic discrimination (1988, 266). The fact that “remarkably few” Americans (excepting members of the groups being targeted) opposed this sort of policy indicated, as Murrin et al. argue, “how broadly acceptable racism and nativism had become” at this time (2016, 659).

At times, Grainger also synonymously used the label “Teuton” alongside “Nordic” and “Anglo-Saxon” (as in his “Nordic Characteristics of Music”), clearly taking on elements of Houston Stuart Chamberlain’s 1899 *Die Grundlagen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts* that advocated that “the greatest minds in the world were Teutonic” (Pear 2000, 40). Yet at the same time, he sometimes classed Germans as amongst “the more southerly European races” (Grainger 1999c, 115). This highlights the ambivalent position of Germany in Grainger’s campaign, and indeed, in Grainger’s thinking more broadly. Regardless of where Grainger placed Germans within his racial categories, the fact remained that the musical community in the United States during and following the First World War maintained a strong anti-German sentiment. This is demonstrated through programming by, for example, Joseph Stransky’s New York Philharmonic, which in the prewar era programmed about 60 percent Austro-Germanic music. By 1917, only around 40 percent of their programming could be considered broadly German, and this was made up of entirely of works by canonical and long-dead composers. Richard Strauss, for example, while relatively popular pre-war, was dropped completely from programs, as he was still living and would have therefore been entitled to royalties, which could have been seen as providing financial support for the enemy (Shanet 1975, 227–28). In the race politics of those who subscribed to American
Nordicism, Germany also did not fit: according to Carl C. Brigham’s *A Study of American Intelligence*, Germany was only racially 40 percent “Nordic,” but 60 percent “Alpine” (Pear 2000, 35).

Delius, who was certainly kept informed of the campaign’s progress (Grainger regularly sent him copies of the articles he wrote and press clippings of reviews) and rarely commented on it with anything other than pleasure, was clearly aware of the effect an association with Germany might have on his reception. It is telling that the only time throughout the whole campaign where he makes any explicit reference to his own nationality in corresponding with Grainger is in relation to the use of the label “German.” In a letter to Rose Grainger in 1915, Jelka Delius wrote on behalf of her husband, “we are entirely disgusted with the behaviour of the Germans. . . . Fred is most anxious that Percy should on no account proclaim him as an Anglo-German. His feelings are and always have been entirely English” (Delius 1915). Delius was evidently thinking of his reputation during the war, and it has indeed been suggested that knowledge of his German parentage may have affected his reception in the US (he was occasionally referred to by his German name Fritz in the American press) (Gillespie and Beckhard 1998, 89n65). Delius, however, apparently held no ill will against Germany more generally, reestablishing his relationship with his German publishers as little as three weeks after the Armistice as though nothing had changed (Delius 2007, 136–37) and continuing to visit throughout the 1920s. As the conductor Alfred Hertz wrote to Grainger of Delius in February 1916, “I suppose the poor fellow has to be a real cameleon [sic] during these war years. He never knew exactly what nationality he was, and it must be pretty hard for him now to balance between English, French and German” (Hertz, 1916).

Grainger described what he believed to be the characteristics of “Anglo-Saxon” music in vague terms, listing the use of “solemn or spiritual” melodies that lacked ornaments, long passages of sustained notes, “gapped scales,” and a focus on harmonic or polyphonic complexity in contrast to the “Mediterranean” tradition that he felt comprised “nervous excitable florid tunes with quickly fluctuating notes, closely filled-up scales and a tendency to seek surface complexity in technical passage-work and vocal coloratura” (Grainger 1933). It hardly needs to be said that few of these characteristics hold up to close examination. As Amanda Harris has shown, while Grainger identified sliding chromatic notes as “characteristic of Nordic composers’ attempts to include sounds heard in nature in their music,” the example of chromatically sliding notes in Delius’s *North Country Sketches* given by Grainger makes the melody appear “less ‘gapped’ than ‘closely filled-up’” (Harris 2000, 28).
Through a series of lectures and articles given in the 1920s Grainger racialized the use of references to nature in music, suggesting these were the domain of the “Nordic” composer, using Delius as his most common example, alongside his own work and that of Grieg, MacDowell, and Cyril Scott. Grainger suggested that “no other racial group has been so consistently inspired to write music about the elements and about rivers, mountains and plains as we have” (1933, 264), although much of his argument appears to come from programmatic titles of works rather than extended musical analysis. He wrote: “we are not sentimentalizing unduly when we say that typical Nordic music is the voice of the wide open spaces, the soul of virgin nature made manifest in sound, and this is as true of our greatest art music (such as *The Song of the High Hills*, by Frederick Delius) as it is of our most primitive folksongs” (Grainger 1933, 261). He contrasted this with the Gallic composers (namely, Debussy and Ravel) who “paint the charms of fountains, of gardens, of temples, or semiurban scenes, of life where man’s hand and mind has left its impress” (Grainger 1999b, 135). (This does lead one to wonder where he would place Delius’s *Paris* in all of this.)

Throughout these lectures and articles, Grainger employs Delius’s apparent cosmopolitanism to his own campaign’s ends. By sometimes emphasizing Delius’s ties to several different nations and supposed racial groups—or those things that made his cosmopolitan label applicable—Grainger could demonstrate what he believed to be the direct impact of the natural landscape on his imagined musical-racial characteristics. Race, as he saw it, like nature, transcended both place and “blood.” He wrote, “the most truly English…one of the most truly Nordic composers is Frederick Delius. Yet he is, I believe, partly Jewish of race…. It seems local influences are more potent in determining artistic type than is blood,” specifically citing Delius’s long stretches in Norway as the most influential to his composition (Grainger 1999b). It should be noted that Grainger, also a notorious anti-Semite, developed something of an obsession with describing Delius as Jewish, or partly Jewish, in his later life, despite the fact that there is no evidence that he was (Grainger 2006, 150). As Gillies and Pear note, by the 1950s, Grainger was becoming “particularly vexed” by the fact the he “actually liked” music composed by people who he believed to be Jewish (2007, 121). It is possible that the way in which Grainger emphasized the influence of an external environment on racial characteristics was an argument he felt necessary to justify his own identity as a “Nordic” or “Anglo-Saxon.” He thought of himself as a “genetic flaw” that had “contaminated his mother’s Nordic line” due to his “father’s ‘dark-eyed,’ ‘Southern Mediterranean’ background” (Pear 2000, 28). This demonstrates
how deeply Grainger’s ideas of race were steeped in the eugenic project. His Irish father, simply by virtue of his dark-coloured eyes, was classified as “Southern Mediterranean.”

In concert practice, Grainger’s “Anglo-Saxon” campaign began with two monumental events in which he conducted the Bridgeport Oratorio Society. The first of these was held on April 28, 1924 in Bridgeport, Connecticut, and the second two days later at Carnegie Hall. Here, Grainger presented the US premieres of Delius's *North Country Sketches* (1913–14) and *Song of the High Hills* (1911–12). Grainger had written of these concerts to Cecil Sharp:

>This is the beginning of what I hope to be a long and lasting campaign for the spread of Anglo Saxon music not only in America but also in Europe in later seasons. It was always my mother’s idea and mine that I should some day earn enough money to be able to do for other composers something what Liszt did in his day. (Grainger 1994, 67)

The campaign is clearly demonstrated in the repertoire choices Grainger made, including several of his own works, two Psalms from Grieg’s Op. 74 (1906), and Rachmaninoff’s *Vsenoshchnoye bdeniye* (1915, known colloquially as *Two Songs of the Church*). Gillespie and Beckhard (1998) describe this as the event “probably responsible for halting lagging interest in Delius’s music in America after World War I” (89). However, while this concert was, as a whole, well received (Gillespie and Beckhard describe the Carnegie Hall concert as “receiving unanimous critical praise”), the Delius works received almost universal negative press, particularly in New York (Kirby 2015, 39–50).

The extravagant program notes Grainger provided for the two works by Delius were filled with descriptions of “Alpine nature in all its virgin austerity” and the gentle “more domesticated scenes of Northumbria,” emphasizing the continuity nature provided to a composer “unusually cosmopolitan in his affinities, divorced alike from modernistic and anti-modernistic limitations.” In reception, once again the explicit references to specific features of the natural landscape tended to distract critics from engaging with the music more thoroughly. Though one critic in the *Bridgeport Times* of April 29 thought Delius “makes one think of all kinds of outdoor things,” the critic felt that, without Grainger’s program notes, “the average concert attendant would not have understood” these references. In New York, the *Song of the High Hills* was described, “with its succession of four climaxes,” as reminding critic Frank Warren of the *Evening World* on May 1 “of the Duke of York, who led his army up the hill and led them down again.” Similarly the *North Country Sketches* were found by W. J. Henderson in the
Sun on the same day to be “chromatically discursive observations … on the seasons in Northern England [that] did not inspire confidence that they would survive the chill of last evening.”

However, despite negative reviews, Grainger continued his “Anglo-Saxon” efforts unabated, combining his ideological writing and concert programming through a series of lecture-recitals on “Anglo-Saxon Music” given between 1924 and 1926, some of which were also broadcast over local radio. Through these lecture-recitals Grainger made concerted attempts to present works by “Anglo-Saxon” composers including Cyril Scott, Henry Balfour Gardiner, and Herman Sandby (whose identities as categorically British or Scandinavian fit with far less manipulation into the “Nordic” ideal), and, importantly, American composers John Alden Carpenter, Leo Sowerby, and Natalie Curtis. Delius’s Dance Rhapsody (in Grainger’s own two-piano arrangement) was performed numerous times throughout 1924, 1925, and 1926, in programs that also contained, among other “Anglo-Saxon” works, Carpenter’s Concertino for Piano and Orchestra (arranged for two pianos), and a Grainger arrangement of Curtis’s Group of Negro Spirituals—a work that could be deemed “Anglo-Saxon” by Grainger’s standards twice over, with Curtis being American and Grainger’s categorization of African American music as “Nordic.” These lecture-recitals were given in a number of cities across the northern part of the United States including New York; Chicago; St. Paul, Minnesota; and Spokane, Washington. Here, Grainger framed his campaign for promoting “Anglo-Saxon” music in association with the movement championing American composition. Much as the now widespread Nordicist movement saw North America and Northern Europe as racially unified, Grainger hoped audiences would see music of the “Anglo-Saxon” world as a logical extension to their American tradition—a tradition he described as “typically Nordic” with its depictions of “virgin nature.” For example, Grainger repeatedly described Carpenter’s Concertino (1920) as inspired by the Mississippi, while conveniently ignoring his more recent ballet Skyscrapers (1923–24) (Grainger 1999b, 134–35).

There is a perceptible shift in the reception of Grainger’s efforts, including the presentation of works by Delius from around this time. American Nordicism reached its political peak in 1924–25 with the New York eugenics conferences and restrictive Immigration Act, and the movement maintained momentum for some time (Higson 1988, 327). It is at this point that critics generally begin to accept Grainger’s argument for the promotion of an apparently discrete “Anglo-Saxon” musical tradition. The “Anglo-Saxon” lecture-recitals were generally received very well, with one performance at the Schubert Club of Schenectady, New York on April 16, 1926 prompting the suggestion in the Schenectady Gazette that the town should institute an
annual Grainger Festival. In the same review, the critic appears to accept Grainger’s justification for the “Anglo-Saxon” campaign, conflating composition by American composers with Grainger’s racial labels. The critic explains that all programs should include at least one Anglo-Saxon work, “not for exaggerated patriotism, but for the same reason that no program would be given in Paris without a French composition or in Berlin without a German number,” concluding that “the hearing of American works is the only way to come to a real appreciation of them.” This acceptance can be seen across the country, with, for example, the Spokane Review of November 4, 1924 reporting that the label “Anglo-Saxon should include the American and the English composers, as German and Austrians had been grouped.”

The shift in the reception of Delius’s music particularly can be seen most dramatically in the US premiere of the Cello Concerto (1920–21) in December 1925, conducted by Grainger in New York’s Aeolian Hall in another “Anglo-Saxon” concert. The program also contained Herman Sandby’s Havstemning (or Sea Mood, 1921), Grieg’s Songs for Male Voices (1863), Balfour Gardiner’s Shepherd Fennel’s Dance (premiered 1911), Natalie Curtis’s arrangement of “Four Negro Folk Songs” (1918–19), and Leo Sowerby’s Piano Concerto (1916, rev. 1919). Grainger’s program notes for this concert focus particularly on the musical depictions of landscape and nature in the Grieg, Sandby, and Gardiner, and, while speaking little of Delius’s works alone, emphasize the apparent similarities between all the works. In this context, the Cello Concerto was perceptibly better received, described in the Musical Courier of January 9, 1926 as a work that would “repay further hearings because of its individuality, its poetic sincerity and its moments of melodic beauty. It is a subjective and rather contemplative rhapsody in one movement, with occasional flights of exaltation.”

Grainger seems to have finally hit upon the right balance in his presentation of these works to elicit a positive response from the musical press. The critical consensus was that the American works were important, but that the entire program was worthwhile. Grainger, now an American citizen, was showing “his loyalty,” to quote the Sun of December 30, 1925, “by making constant propaganda for not only English and Scandinavian but American composers as well.” This generally positive, if subdued, response to Delius continued through the rest of the campaign, where even repeat performances of the rather problematic Piano Concerto found a largely sympathetic audience.

* * *

As I have shown, Grainger manipulated the presentation of Delius and his music in America to deliberate political and, ultimately, strikingly racist
ends. In writing, lecturing, and curating concert programs, Grainger specifically used the location of composition and musical allusions to nature and landscape that appear in many of Delius’s works to reinforce his idea of musical “Nordicism” or “Anglo-Saxonism.” While Grainger may not have achieved his initial goal—to establish Delius “as one of the greatest of the greatest”—he was able to provide opportunities for the American public to hear and engage with his music. At first unsuccessful in his certainly energetic but equally scattered attempts to present Delius as a composer of “American” and “nature” music, by racializing some of the musical and programmatic content of Delius’s compositions, Grainger’s later efforts provided critics with a new framework within which to view his music. By situating him within the same “Anglo-Saxon” or “Nordic” field as local American composers and drawing out their (sometimes tenuous) similarities in inspiration, Grainger could both exploit the “almost desperate search for a ‘great American composer’” that had regained momentum during the 1920s (DuPree 1983, 305) as well as capitalize on the extraordinary racism of the American Nordicist movement that was gaining traction in the wider sociopolitical sphere.

The prevalence of the critical trope of cosmopolitanism in the discussion and reception of Delius in the early part of the campaign was initially a hindrance to Grainger’s attempts to promote Delius as a composer of “American” music. Critics’ perceptions of Delius’s persona and music were often colored by his reputation as a European cosmopolitan as well as a marked distrust of this “rootlessness.” Yet it was, ironically, this very perception of Delius’s cosmopolitanism that would ultimately facilitate Grainger’s later campaign. Firstly, Grainger would not have been able to present Delius as the paradigmatic “Anglo-Saxon” if Delius already had an established national or compositional allegiance (say, one founded on his German heritage or French residence—groups decidedly not within Grainger’s Nordic ideal, but arguably holding equally valid claims on his compositional and personal identity). Secondly, Grainger was able to use Delius—with his multinational background and sea of influences—as an example of what he saw as the overarching impact of race and the natural landscape on a common compositional output. While it is clear that Grainger genuinely cared for and loved Delius’s music, and did sincerely want to help his music thrive in the US, this aim became secondary to his overarching racist objective to promote music he considered “Anglo-Saxon” or “Nordic.”

Notes
I would like to thank Stewart Manville and Barry Ould of the Percy Grainger Society for granting permission to quote from previously unpublished letters from the Grainger Mu-
seum at the University of Melbourne, Australia. I would also like to thank Kerry Murphy, Sarah Collins, and the two anonymous readers for their feedback. Shorter versions of this article were presented at the Music History and Cosmopolitanism conference at Helsinki, 2016 and Rethinking Delius: A Critical Symposium at the British Library in London, 2016 and I am grateful for the feedback I received at these.

1. Grainger's distinctive spellings and use of punctuation have been retained throughout. His liberal use of underlining for emphasis has been represented in italic. Additionally, occasional instances of his eccentric “blue-eyed English” appear (see footnote 9). Where quotations have been found in secondary sources, the editorial decisions made in those publications have also been retained. For more information on the idiosyncrasies of Grainger's writing, see Dreyfus (1985, xviii–xxi).

2. A similar example could be given in John Powell (1882–1963), also a pianist and racialist making a public case for the promotion of Anglo-Saxon folk song (see Frogley 2007, 254–56), however he appears not to have had such a complete and manifest agenda in the same way as Grainger.

3. Nordicism, in the form of the racial theories postulated in the United States by Grant and others, is here considered as distinct from the form of national identity within the Nordic countries that reached its political peak in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. For discussion of music and Nordic identity, particularly in relation to nature and landscape in the music of Grieg in Norway, Sibelius in Finland, and Nielsen in Denmark, see the work of Daniel Grimley, particularly Grieg: Music, Landscape and Norwegian Identity (2006), “‘Tonality, Clarity, Strength’: Gesture, Form, and Nordic Identity in Carl Nielsen’s Piano Music” (2005), and the edited collection Jean Sibelius and His World (2011).


5. Delius, in fact, had never heard Grainger perform the concerto; however, a letter of this nature from Delius (lacking the sycophantic tone of Grainger's original, and much truer to Delius's writing style) was published in several New York newspapers in the week preceding the concert.

6. While no correspondence between them has so far been found, there are letters of a familiar tone between Rose Grainger and Krehbiel's wife which predate this concert in the Grainger Museum.

7. This work goes by a number of different titles. Often referred to in the press as the Mood Pictures, it is also known as the Two Pieces for Small Orchestra, or by the names of the two pieces “On Hearing the First Cuckoo in Spring” (1912) and “Summer Night on the River” (1911), which are performed both independently and as a pair.

8. The “human chrysanthemum” reference draws a comparison between Grainger and Polish pianist Ignaz Paderewski, alluding to their fair and unruly hair. The Maitland Daily Mercury quotes some of the “Transatlantic gush about Paderewski: ‘The peerless Pole-star of the pianistic firmament;’ ‘the tawny tyrant of the keyboard;’ ‘the champion ivory-spanker;’ and ‘the human chrysanthemum,’” in “Items of Interest,” February 7, 1894, 3.

9. "Blue-eyed English" was the title given by Grainger to a language he constructed as a result of his belief that English had been “weakened by the uncritical adaptation of words of foreign derivation” (Dreyfus 1985, xx) and his consequent “desire to purge English of
Mediterranean, particularly Latin, influences” (Gillies and Pear, n.d.). He began to substitute words he believed to be of “foreign derivation” for ones he felt were closer to the Anglo-Saxon origins of English. For example, “conductor” becomes “band-boss,” and “museum” becomes “hoard-house.” (This also extended into his composition: “molto crescendo,” for example, becomes “louden lots.”)

10. When writing in “blue-eyed English,” Grainger often provides the more common English version of a word in double brackets following a “blue-eyed” term in order to make his meaning clear.
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