Michael Huffmaster

Arabella Fields: Black Nightingale or Black Chameleon?

Known most consistently as »The Black Nightingale« during a career that spanned over a quarter of a century and much of the European continent, Arabella Fields presents something of an enigma in terms of identity. What little is known about her is assembled in German music historian Rainer E. Lotz's 1997 book, *Black People: Entertainers of African Descent in Europe and Germany*. Lotz raises the problem of Fields's identity in his brief introduction to his chapter on her: »Contemporary billings referred to her as an African, an Indian, a Red Indian, an American, a South-American, an Australian, [and] a German-African!«[1] The exclamation point is apt, for it is indeed surprising that all of these designations could refer to one and the same person.

Lotz wastes no time in getting to the bottom of the conundrum, however. His next sentence concedes that »many Africans from the German colonies performed in the Imperial Reich« and that »Miss Fields spoke fluent German«, but nonetheless establishes, on the word of jazz musician and bandleader Sam Wooding, with whom Fields performed, that she was a native Philadelphian. He then supports his assertion convincingly with the evidence of a passport application from the US Embassy in Vienna from 1909 in which Arabella Fields gives as her place of birth Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. With that, the riddle is solved, and the matter dropped. But in doing so, Lotz neglects to ask what might account for such huge discrepancies in the historical record. This essay pursues that question. And the answer it finds is in fact already hinted at in the last of Lotz's introductory comments, in which he remarks that, although Fields's repertoire comprised mainly American minstrel songs such as those of Stephen Foster, »her greatest successes with the German public were her performances of German *Lieder*, sung in German and, even more difficult to visualize, her yodelling performances, dressed up as an Alpine cowgirl«.[2] In this essay, I argue that the key to understanding the disorienting array of ethnic and national identities ascribed to Fields by the record lies in the figure of her onstage persona.

Apart from three paragraphs of narrative introduction and one paragraph toward the end, Lotz's chapter on Fields is basically a chronology of her career, listing in order the dates and locations of her documented engagements, occasionally with excerpts from show reviews or billings. Confronted with this chronology with all its conflicting references to Fields's national and ethnic identity, one's initial reaction is bewilderment (expressed in Lotz's case by his exclamation point). The impression one gets is that the divergent designations of her origins are random, the results of haphazard reporting or careless editing, ignorance or indifference, or some combination thereof. This impression is strengthened by the many variations on her name, some of which are clearly misspellings or mistakes, such as »Hilda,« »Lilli,« and »Bet-Ti-Fild«. The question then arises whether such rampant carelessness could be attributable to the editing standards of the trade journals from which most of the documentation on Fields comes, or whether, with regard at least to her national or ethnic identity, it might express a colonial, imperialist mentality of ignorance and indifference to do with her being black.

Howard Rye seems to suggest as much in his introduction to Lotz's book, citing »the cultural diversity amongst the indigenous people of […] Europe« as an explanation for »the tendency of European audiences to lump all black people together without distinctions«.[3] Rye is referring specifically to the different kinds of music performed by African-American artists in Europe around the turn of the century, the failure of audiences to distinguish among the different genres, and the consequent reception of various styles generically as ›black music‹. But his reasoning – essentially that a differentiated self-image accounts for an undifferentiated view of the other – can apply as well to the issue of Fields's identity. The logic squares with the insight offered by identity theory that identities are typically defined through difference and expressed in terms of binary oppositions. The upshot in Fields's case would be that it was not important to reviewers or editors to corroborate her identity; they either repeated misinformation or simply made up ›the facts‹, but it did not matter either way because she was black. The attitude is an expression of a colonial discourse which declares that »the Negro is a savage«, never an Angolan or a Nigerian, but only ever a Negro,[4] and which thereby serves to sustain racial domination. Plausible though such an explanation may be, the very assumption it relies on – that reviewers or editors were responsible for the discrepancies – may be the wrong starting point, in which case a different explanation would need to be sought.

After one's initial bewilderment in reaction to the divergent documentation on Fields's identity, something of a pattern emerges if one examines the evidence closely. The earliest mention of Fields in the historical record is from 1899, the latest from 1931. Of the 133 documented engagements in her chronology, a mere ten are from the post-war period (and only one of these mentions her nationality, as American,

though significantly all but one refer to her blackness, either by naming the groups she appeared with – the *Chocolate Kiddies*, *Black People*, *Black Follies Girls* – or by calling the shows »negro-reviews«). The bulk of the documentation on Fields thus comes from the two decades prior to and including World War I. In this period a dividing line can be drawn right about in the middle, 1909/10, with nearly the same number of documents from the period 1899 to 1909 as from the period 1910 to 1919 (46 and 47, respectively). In the first ten years of Fields's European career, whenever her nationality is referenced, she is consistently identified as American, with the one exception of a 1904 engagement in Berlin for which she is billed as German-African. It is only in the following decade that the discrepancies concerning her identity proliferate. This distinct feature of the records suggests the possibility of some intention, a will at work, an agent. Such a supposition finds support in the fact of Fields's uniqueness. In the case of the two dozen or so other black entertainers whose careers Lotz documents, the records also occasionally contain misspellings or identify as African an African-American performer – lending weight to the idea that editorial carelessness is to blame for the inconsistencies with regard to Fields – but in terms of references to national or ethnic origins there is nothing comparable to the kinds of discrepancies evident in Fields's case. This circumstance, combined with the concentration of the discrepancies within a discrete period, leads to the speculation that Fields herself may have played a role in the inconsistency.

Once one allows for the possibility of agency on the part of Fields in determining her own identity, what becomes clear is that considering the issue one of editorial haphazardness focuses on her reception alone. If it were the case that reviewers' or editors' carelessness was in fact responsible for the divergent historical records on Fields's national or ethnic origins, then that could certainly be the expression of a colonial discourse that supports racial domination. But the point is that in its starting assumptions, such a line of questioning itself perpetuates a hegemonic colonial discourse of identity construction by denying the subject agency. I would therefore like to suggest instead an understanding of the question of Fields's origins that above all grants her agency. Drawing on postmodern notions of identity, I examine Fields's onstage performances to argue that these might shed light on the enigma of her national and ethnic origins. Further, I glean evidence from the historical record to suggest how Fields's lived experience could have led to a radical understanding of identity. Finally, in line with the theme of this special issue of *ÖZG*, I situate the question within current debates that seek to reconceptualize historical phenomena from a transnational perspective.

In her seminal article *Postmodern Blackness*, bell hooks advocates the critical appropriation of postmodern theory as a means of asserting agency in the process of identity construction:

> The critique of essentialism encouraged by postmodernist thought is useful for African-Americans concerned with reformulating outmoded notions of identity. We have too long had imposed upon us, both from the outside and the inside, a narrow constricting notion of blackness. Postmodern critiques of essentialism […] can open up new possibilities for the construction of the self and the assertion of agency. […] Such a critique allows us to affirm multiple black identities, varied black experience. It also challenges colonial imperialist paradigms of black identity which represent blackness one-dimensionally in ways that reinforce and sustain white supremacy.[5]

The approach to identity construction that hooks suggests resonates with the historical record of Fields's national or ethnic origins. But because of Fields's special status as an entertainer and hence a public figure, any consideration of the question of her identity must also take into account this facet of who she was.

In *Heavenly Bodies*, Richard Dyer discusses how star images are made. A star becomes a star by virtue of the fact that she is an entertainer, someone who performs in public and typically assumes different roles as part of her profession. The star, however, is not the roles she plays, but rather the public image she acquires outside of her career roles. Dyer argues that the star image relies on an essentialist ideology of identity, the idea that there is an irreducible core that makes up the self. He details the ways in which modernity has eroded the notion of such an identity – through Marxism, psychoanalysis, behaviourism, linguistics, and consumerism – yet he acknowledges that »the notion of the individual is […] a necessary fiction for the reproduction of the kind of society we live in«.[6] His main point is that the star phenomenon serves to sustain such an essentialist notion of identity. The star is assumed to be the private, ›real‹ person, and yet by definition a star is a public persona. A star is »always inescapably« a person in public, and while »the magic« of a star may be that she seems to be her private self in public, she »can also be about the business of being in public, the way in which the public self is endlessly produced and remade in presentation«.[7] So although a star's public persona is usually taken to embody the private, authentic person, it may also be seen and enjoyed as image and appearance.[8]

Dyer's primary concern is to expose the myth of an essential identity, but for my purposes it is not necessary to deny the existence of a private, real person but rather to emphasize the position of the public persona as always straddling and drawing in varying degrees from these two poles of identity: pure performance, expressed conspicuously in an entertainer's professional roles, and the real individual. With this model in mind, it becomes obvious that the question of Fields's national or ethnic identity has been considered thus far only in terms of the private person, who she ›really‹ was (which is how Lotz approaches the problem and why he is able to solve it so deftly).

I would like to suggest instead considering the issue as one relating to her public persona. And because an entertainer's persona is always inextricably tied up with the roles she performs and is known for, I will examine Fields's onstage performances in the expectation that the evidence from the historical record on these will illuminate the issue of the contradictory national and ethnic identities ascribed to her.

One aspect of Fields's onstage persona that has some bearing on the question of her identity is her singing voice. The question of her voice resembles that of her origins in that the historical record is also rife with contradiction on the matter. Advertisements for and reviews of performances variously classify her voice as soprano, alto, contralto-soprano or mezzo-soprano, tenor, baritone, and bass. Confronted with these contradictions, one assumes they result from the difficulty reviewers evidently experienced trying to characterize Fields's voice. While such difficulty would reflect not so much ignorance or indifference as perhaps genuine uncertainty in judgment, the mere existence of such discrepancies forms a parallel with those regarding Fields's national or ethnic identity and reinforces the impression that the cause in both cases lies in her reception. Yet several reviews mention Fields's remarkable vocal range. If the gamut of singing voices ascribed to her in the record reflects more her talent and skill than confusion on the part of her audience, then the question of categorizing her voice becomes moot: it is not that she was either a soprano or alto or tenor or baritone or bass – she was all of these. Beyond the symbolic significance this obtains, as voice per se indexes agency, the fact that she commanded such an astounding range bears witness to extensive technical training, to the wilful development of a given talent, and hence to her real, material agency. Thus, considering Fields's active role in mastering a wide vocal range, the parallel between the discrepancies regarding her voice and those pertaining to her origins supports the suggestion that some agency on her part might also be implicated in the documented contradictions concerning her national and ethnic identity.

Since singing voices are by definition gender-associated, the matter of Fields's vocal range necessarily also involves questions of gender identity. A couple of references highlight the connection: an advertisement for one engagement calls her a »lady baritone«, and one reviewer categorizes her as a »female bass«. The incongruity of these examples seems to crystallize the inconsistencies in the record with regard to her voice, and significantly, it also resonates with the incongruities regarding her origins. In a review of Fields's only known recordings, Max Chop states: »I would have classified her straight away as a regular tenor with baritonal colouring, had not the label informed me that it is actually […] a coloured lady […]. [M]y natural response was again and again: ›But it ought to be a male, after all!‹«[9] The most intriguing thing about Chop's confusion is not that he is astonished at Fields's voice, but rather that he invokes her blackness to resolve the quandary of her gender. Recalling a group of male

African-American minstrels he had seen a few years earlier, he claims to recognize »similarities in sound, identical treatment of the vocal parts, the voice, the pronunciation«, which leads him to conclude that Fields »was born ›down on Swanee [sic] River‹ and must have dark rather than white skin«.[10] This reported line of reasoning is actually disingenuous on Chop's part, as he explicitly admits having knowledge of Fields's race from the record labels, but it significantly reveals a colonialist paradigm of black identity. Paradoxically, an undifferentiated black essence that obliterates gender distinctions can account for and clear up Chop's confusion!

Two more documents that are relevant to the matter of Fields's voice and gender also relate to the question of her national or ethnic origins. For one engagement in Amsterdam in 1917 she is billed as both »The Female Caruso« and »The South-American Caruso«.[11] And on the cover of the sheet music to a song called *My Indian Boy (Habanera)*, published in Amsterdam in 1919, her image appears along with the following description: »Sung by Arabella Fields the South-American Caruso«.[12] As with the incongruous references to her voice and gender discussed above, the comparison with Italian tenor Enrico Caruso jars, not only because of the gender difference, but also on account of the discrepancy in ethnic and national identities. On a naive level the comparison seems to be a quaint way of indicating Fields's vocal range, yet what these examples reveal is less a description of her voice than the creation of a stage persona.

While the reference to geographical origin (notably ambiguous with respect to nationality and ethnicity) can certainly be read as pertaining to the private, real person, here, as part of an epithet, it is clearly part of a *made* image, an onstage persona, which then contributes to and interacts with the making of Fields's public persona. In fact, these examples illustrate nicely how an entertainer's persona draws on elements of and overlaps both her onstage performances as well as her supposedly authentic private self. A persona, Dyer insists, is an image that is made, »produced by the media industries« but not alone, for »the audience is also part of the making of the image«, and, to a degree that »varies enormously from case to case«, so is the individual person.[13] The point to emphasize for my purposes is that an entertainer does play a role in determining her public persona, however great or small that role may be. Dyer adds the important provision that the process of making a public persona always »allows for variation, inflection, and contradiction«.[14] The reference to national and ethnic origins that in these last examples is both ambiguous and clearly part of a public persona provides further warrant for approaching the question of Fields's national or ethnic identity as one facet of an image – varied, contradictory, and multidimensional – in the making of which she herself asserted some degree of agency.

The aspect of Fields's onstage performances that bears most directly on the question of her national or ethnic identity is perhaps their most distinctive feature. The

billing for one 1909 engagement characterizes her show felicitously: »Arabella Fields in Her New Vocal- and Transformation-Act«.[15] This description not only highlights the centrality of Fields's singing in her performances, it also intimates the polyphonic quality of her voice through the formal parallelism of »Vocal- and Transformation-«. But the transformation referred to here is technically not that involving her singing voice, but rather that involving her act: the different costumes she wore and the corresponding variety of musical genres she performed. As reported above, Lotz mentions in his introduction that in addition to American minstrels, Fields sang German *Lieder* and yodelled in an Alpine dirndl. An advertisement for an engagement in Leipzig in 1910 depicts her in such dress (fig. 1), while two other illustrations for engagements, one in Vienna in 1910 and one in Budapest in 1911, show her as a high society lady (figs. 2 and 3), and yet another, apparently for the same 1910 engagement in Vienna but from a different trade journal, portrays her in what appears to be some kind of African dress, standing in a desert landscape holding a guitar, with a pyramid in the background (fig. 4). Taken together, these documents provide a good graphic sense of the varied character of a Fields performance. In addition, the review of a show in Bucharest in 1910 praises »her Red-Indian dances«, evidence of a further transformation Fields underwent on stage.

What is notable about the transformations Fields performed is that she was not, apparently, playing any particular individual characters, nor was she even playing stock characters. She was rather assuming roles that are cultural types, even stereo-

Fig. 1: Advertisement for Leipzig, Blumensäle, in: Der Künstler 3/32 (1910). © Rainer E. Lotz collection, Bonn, Germany. Reprinted with permission.

Fig. 2: Advertisement for K. K. Gartenbau, Vienna, in: Das Programm 439, 04.09.1910. © Rainer E. Lotz collection, Bonn, Germany. Reprinted with permission.

Fig. 3: Advertisement for Budapest, Royal Cabaret, Artisten Revue Budapest, 09.1911, in: Der Künstler 4/8, 22.11.1911. © Rainer E. Lotz collection, Bonn, Germany. Reprinted with permission.

Fig. 4: Advertisement for Vienna, K. K. Gartenbau for the third time this year, in: Der Künstler 3/37 (1910). © Rainer E. Lotz collection, Bonn, Germany. Reprinted with permission.

types. And it is not so much the individual types of the roles she performed considered separately that are of interest as the fact that she performed them all, the (f)act of transformation itself. In moving among musical genres from divergent cultural traditions with corresponding changes of dress, Fields's performances staged the transgression of cultural boundaries. And while assuming such cultural types as roles may serve to reinforce their validity, the act of leaving one off and taking on another obtains subversive potential by highlighting the constructed nature of such identities and exposing the myth of their authenticity. Such an understanding of Fields's performances resonates with the kind of approach to identity construction that bell hooks advocates: »Part of our struggle for radical black subjectivity is the quest to find ways to construct self and identity that are oppositional and liberatory«.[16] And clearly, as with Fields's vocal range, her mastery of musical genres spanning different cultural traditions – which included, at least in the case of the German *Lieder*, learning a foreign language – together with her incorporation of these into her performances and the corresponding changes in attire all point to agency. She could have just as well restricted her repertoire to American music, even to American ›black‹ music, but that is precisely what she did not do.

The period in which Fields lived was marked by the most extreme nationalism Europe had ever experienced. In the years leading to the First World War, the ›nationality question‹ had become one of the most pressing issues in Austria-Hungary, with ethnic tensions among the peoples of the Empire at an all-time high, while the atmosphere among European nations was no less volatile. Such was the situation in which the ›powder keg‹ of the Balkans exploded. Nationalism depends on the construction of national identities grounded in an essentialist ideology of the self, and to that end it presses into service, among other technologies, the image of an ›authentic‹ folk culture. Against this background, Fields's performances obtain the oppositional and liberatory power hooks imagines. The nature of the transformations she performed on stage flaunts the constructedness of national or ethnic identities, flouting essentialist paradigms of nationality and ethnicity and hence the nationalist ideology that contributed to the world's first total war. The stage provided a safe space, so to speak, to challenge dominant ideologies of identity, and every indication is that Fields's interventions struck a responsive chord with audiences – though certainly the act of singing German *Lieder* wearing a dirndl in Vienna or Dresden or Hamburg would have quite a different significance, for Fields as well as for her audience, than it would in Budapest or Bucharest or London or Lvov. But the crux of my argument is that Fields's onstage performances influenced the crafting of her offstage public persona, and thus that the varied and conflicting documentation concerning her national or ethnic origins should also be understood as a strategy of undermining essentialist, imperialist paradigms of identity that sustain the nationalist enterprise.

Switching between a German folk idiom and an American one, Fields must have been cognizant that the American identity she performed was no more authentic, no more truly representative of who she was, than the German one. After all, many of the standards of her repertoire were minstrels supposedly representative of an authentic, Southern black experience, but actually composed by white Northerner Stephen Foster, a native of Philadelphia like Fields herself. Other facts of her biography corroborate such a supposition. An emigrant most of her adult life, Fields lived in a kind of self-imposed exile, an experience that can often reinforce and solidify national identities but that is just as likely to lead to doubts about the validity of an essential identity. Furthermore, the record admits no evidence Fields ever immigrated; on the contrary, except for the gap in documentation from the six years following the war (which Lotz supposes Fields spent back in the United States), the record shows that she traveled constantly throughout Europe, crossing national borders and traversing regional boundaries in pursuit of her career the way she crossed cultural boundaries in her onstage performances. Though the bulk of records comes from shows throughout the German-speaking lands, including Switzerland and Austria, engagements are also documented in Bohemia, Silesia, Galicia, Russia, England, Italy (three tours), Hungary, Moravia, Romania, Turkey, Holland (at least four tours), Sweden, and Denmark. Travel was a constant of Fields's life, one that might very likely have contributed to a radical understanding of identity, particularly with regard to national belonging.

Another fact of Fields's biography may also have prompted a critical awareness of identity: her status as a language learner. After arriving in Europe in 1899, she toured mainly in the German-speaking lands. The first mention of her including German in her performances comes from 1907, after which such references proliferate, many of which praise her excellent pronunciation. A stretch of several years allows ample time for someone immersed in a foreign language environment to learn that language, and learn it well, to an extent that influences the person's own perception of who she is. Research in sociolinguistics bears this out, stressing the impact of acquiring a foreign language on a person's conception of self:

> The narratives [of language learners] depict the experiences of people who have both physically and symbolically crossed the border […] between one way of being and another and perceive themselves as becoming someone other than who they were before.[17]

Fields's acquisition of German thus very likely contributed to a transformed consciousness of self, informed by an attendant critique of essentialist notions of national and ethnic identity.

In addition to these facts revealed in the record, evidence exists of one event in particular that may have played a catalyzing role in Fields's rejection of an essentialist ideology of identity and her assertion of agency in constructing a multiple, varied persona: her application for a passport from the US Embassy in Vienna in 1909. In this document Fields »solemnly swear[s]« that her permanent residence is Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; that she left the United States in April 1908 and is »temporarily sojourning« in Vienna; and that she »intend[s] to return to the United States within a year with the purpose of residing and performing the duties of citizenship therein«. The application also contains an oath of allegiance:

> Further, I do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; and that I take this oath freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion: So help me God.[18]

For someone who has lived in self-imposed exile, whose itinerant lifestyle subverts conventional notions of dwelling and belonging, and who has acquired a second language, such a direct confrontation with the power structures that reinforce essentialist notions of identity and thus uphold nationalism and imperialism would come as a shock, flying in the face of the person's lived experience. One response that is »oppositional and liberatory« in the way hooks envisions would be to construct an identity for oneself that is multiple, varied, and even contradictory. Such a response, I am contending, is precisely what Fields attempted and, depending on one's perspective, what she achieved in the creation of her public persona. And the fact that the discrepancies in the record concerning her national or ethnic origins proliferate only after her passport application supports such an assertion.

In *Black Empire*, Michelle Ann Stephens interrogates the notion of transnational blackness developed by Anglophone Caribbean intellectuals in the post-World War I era. The thinkers she examines imagined a global black community that transcended national borders, yet the discourse of black transnationalism during this period remained largely bound to notions of statehood and sovereignty inherited from imperialism and nationalism.[19] Stephens points out the existence of what she calls black empire narratives already in the late nineteenth century, stories that also imagined a transnational blackness, and many of these »held within them a vision of black freedom that centered less on the race's right to statehood in Africa, and more on the New Negro's right to travel freely the colonial spaces of an emerging modern world«.[20] As Stephens describes them, the narratives depict journeys of black protagonists that are strikingly similar to Fields's experience:

> These journeys would be the precursor to an alternative vision of black internationalism focused less on the consolidation of statehood and the self-securities of home and more on the inherently insurgent and oppositional nature of free black movement within a racialized global context.
> The movements of this traveling black subject, a more worldly New Negro, were not circumscribed within the boundaries of the United States. As a result of their transnational travels, worldly black subjects developed a much broader, more global sense of their own blackness and their relationship to other colonial subjects. They imagined and moved through a black, colonial, and diasporic world, one that existed in the shadows of empire both geographically and imaginatively. The white, modernist, and nationalist formations dominant during the 1910s and 1920s were not the only sources for the twentieth-century New Negro's primary identifications. Rather we see in the traveling New Negro the traces of alternative forms of identification that developed among hybrid, multinational, and multiracial populations traveling in the spaces between the New and the Old Worlds, throughout the centuries of colonial settlement and imperial development.[21]

A crucial difference is that the black transnationalism envisioned in these stories occurs in the collective popular black imagination, while Fields actually lived out such a vision through the creation of her persona. Alongside all the inconsistencies in the record regarding Fields's national or ethnic identity, there curiously coexists the other most distinctive feature of her persona: the consistent reoccurrence of her epithet ›The Black Nightingale‹. Throughout the documentation on Fields's career with its disparate references to her origins, her blackness remains a constant. The coexistence of blackness with various national and ethnic identities points not only to the historical fact of the African diaspora, but also to the potential of blackness as a floating signifier.[22] What I am suggesting is that Fields exploited the inherent ambiguity of blackness in order to craft an identity for herself, a public persona, that encompassed the kind of multidimensional, »radical black subjectivity« that hooks advocates. In the same way that she used her voice to bend categories of gender, she also exploited her blackness to repudiate and transcend colonial paradigms of national and ethnic identity. One reviewer who remarks on Fields's indeterminable vocal range also questions the appropriateness of her most common appellation:

> The comparison with a nightingale is, however, not at all adequate […] Fields possesses a deep mezzo-soprano which could already be called an alto, whereas a nightingale is renowned for coloraturas and fiorituras, at least that's what one says.[23]

The reservation lodged here resonates with the general question of Fields's identity. The sobriquet ›nightingale‹ may also be inappropriate in terms of national origins and gender. The nightingale is native to Europe (though also seen in Persia and Arabia, and in the winter in Africa), and further, it is the male of the species that sings (though poetic tradition has it otherwise). But in light of all the contradictory facets of Fields's persona, the incongruity inherent in ›The Black Nightingale‹ when applied to her is actually quite representative. And one characteristic of the nightingale does correspond with the historical record on Fields: the fact that it does not endure captivity. Another fitting epithet, though, considering the kinds of transformations Fields performed on stage as well as those she incorporated into her public persona, might be ›The Black Chameleon‹, for contrary to popular belief, the chameleon changes skin colour not only in adaptation to its environment, but also in expression of its mood and physiological states.

Notes

1 Rainer E. Lotz, Black People: Entertainers of African Descent in Europe and Germany, Bonn 1997, 225.
2 Ibid.
3 Howard Rye, Introduction, in: Lotz, People 1997, xv.
4 See Frantz Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth, New York 1963, 221.
5 bell hooks, Postmodern Blackness, in: Postmodern Culture 1 (1990), http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/postmodern_culture/toc/pmc1.1.html, par. 10f.
6 Richard Dyer, Heavenly Bodies: Film Stars and Society, London 1986, 10.
7 Ibid., 14.
8 See ibid., 15f.
9 Quoted in: Lotz, People 1997, 229.
10 Ibid.
11 Quoted in: Ibid., 241.
12 Quoted in: Ibid., 242.
13 Dyer, Bodies 1986, 4ff.
14 Ibid., 4f.
15 Quoted in: Lotz, People 1997, 232.
16 hooks, Blackness 1990, par. 11.
17 James P. Lantolf and Aneta Pavlenko, Second Language Learning as Participation and the (Re)Construction of Selves, in: James P. Lantolf, ed., Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning, Oxford 2000, 174.
18 Quoted in: Lotz, People 1997, 243.
19 Michelle Ann Stephens, Black Empire: The Masculine Global Imaginary of Caribbean Intellectuals in the United States, 1914–1962, Durham and London 2005, 14ff.
20 Ibid., 58.
21 Ibid., 59.
22 See Stuart Hall, Race: The Floating Signifier, Northampton/Mass. 2002.
23 Quoted in: Lotz, People 1997, 230.